Charismatic, Transformational, and Servant Leadership in the United States, Mexico, and Croatia

Suzana Dobric Veiss[1]

ABSTRACT

Cross-cultural leadership attempts to understand how leaders function in a highly globalized market. Certain dimensions of the three leadership theories: charismatic, transformational, and servant were endorsed as important for effective leadership. Major aspects of the leadership theories were compared and contrasted in three different cultures. The cultures were selected by utilizing the GLOBE study: Anglo cluster with focus on the United States, Latin America cluster with focus on Mexico, and Eastern European cluster with focus on Croatia. While certain aspects of charismatic, transformational, and servant leadership were endorsed as important for effective leadership, only certain dimensions were endorsed across the three cultures studied. Analysis of Croatia, not available in the original GLOBE study, provides a more comprehensive evaluation of leadership in the region, especially since Croatia has recently emerged as the latest country joining the European Union.

1.0   INTRODUCTION

Globalization has advanced a need to understand how to influence and manage individuals in a cross-cultural context. As a result, research on cross-cultural leadership is important and has been increasing (Yukl, 2013). Most of the leadership studies so far have been conducted in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe, however, leadership studies on non-Western cultures is increasing (Yukl, 2013). Global leaders need to be skilled in acquiring cross-cultural visions, relating and working with individuals from different cultures, and understanding cultural environments (Adler & Bartholomew, 1992). An analysis of leadership and societal cultures is performed in an Anglo cluster with an emphasis on the United States, the Latin America cluster with the focus on Mexico, and the Eastern European cluster with an emphasis on Croatia. The selection of the countries and the clusters was based on the data from the GLOBE study. GLOBE researchers developed the clusters based on the results from previous research, common language, geography, history, and religion (House et al., 2004). GLOBE researchers formed 21 primary dimensions of leadership and from those defined six global leadership behaviors:

---

[1] Regent University

charismatic/value-based leadership, team-oriented leadership, participative leadership, humane-oriented leadership, autonomous leadership, and self-protective leadership (Dorfman, Mansour, Hanges, Dastmalchian, House, 2012).

While specific definitions of transformational, charismatic, and servant leadership theories vary based on the researchers and the focus of the studies, all three leadership theories have unique characteristics that define each theory and illustrate some main aspects as typical values and behaviors (Northouse, 2013; Yukl, 2013). Transformational leadership incorporates the influence of leaders to inspire followers' values and emotions but with the motive to benefit the organization (Yukl, 2013, p. 321). Servant leadership's focus illustrates contribution towards followers' positive attitude with specific emphasis on spirituality and morality (Senjava, Sarros, and Santora, 2008, pp. 417-419). Yukl (2013) argued charismatic leadership is primarily defined by the follower's attribution of charisma to the leader.

Comparison and contrasts of the applicability of charismatic leadership, transformational leadership, and servant leadership, was studied in three different cultural clusters: Anglo cluster with focus on the United States, Latin America cluster with focus on Mexico, and Eastern European cluster with focus on Croatia. This study includes the following sections: 1) the GLOBE study; 2) Anglo cluster/United States; 3) Latin America cluster/Mexico; 4) Eastern European cluster/Croatia; 5) charismatic leadership; 6) transformational leadership; 4) servant leadership; and 8) summary and recommendations for further research.

2.0   THE GLOBE STUDY

Yukl (2016) argued cross-cultural studies have multiple biases, limitations, and methodological challenges (p. 370). However, even with the identified difficulties in conducting cross-cultural studies on leadership, research is important and increasing (Yukl, p. 378). Numerous studies have been conducted to identify the dimensions on which cultures differ in order to understand the relationship between those dimensions (Northouse, 2013). Hall (1976) examined dimensions of individualistic verses collectivistic cultures. Hofstede's (1980) study on cultural consequences, based on research in over 50 countries established five dimensions: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, and long-term vs. short-term orientation. The cross-cultural research on leadership has been greatly influenced by Hofstede's dimensions.

As part of their own study on cross-cultural leadership and based on the conclusions by Hofstede (1980) and others, House, Hanges, Javidian, Dorfman, and Gupta (2004) created the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) project involving over 160 investigators in 62 countries. The researchers examined to what extent are attributes of leadership similar across different cultural groups (House et al., 2004). GLOBE study's main hypothesis was that each culture relates to a specific set of beliefs about leadership (House et al., 2004). Therefore, House et al. (2004) argued organizational and societal culture influences preferences for leadership style and preferred leadership behavior vary across cultures (p. 59). The GLOBE study greatly contributes to the cross-cultural research on leadership in all major regions of the world (Yukl, 2013). Based on the responses of 17,000 managers in more than 950 organizations, House et al. (2004) identified nine cultural dimensions: power-distance, uncertainty avoidance, institutional collectivism, in-group collectivism, gender egalitarianism, assertiveness, future orientation, performance orientation, and human orientation (Northouse, 2013). In the following section, cultural dimensions identified by House et al. (2004) are identified (Northouse, 2013, Yukl, 2013).

Uncertainty avoidance leadership dimension reflects the degree to which a society or an organization depend on establishing social norms, rituals, rules, and procedures to avoid uncertainty (Northouse, 2013, Yukl, 2013). Power distance dimension refers to the degree to which members of the group expect and agree that power should be shared unequally (Northouse, 2013, Yukl, 2013). Institutional collectivism describes the degree to which an organization or society encourages institutional or societal collective action as opposed to individual action (Northouse, 2013, Yukl, 2013). In-group collectivism refers to the degree to which people express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness toward their organization or families

(Northouse, 2013, Yukl, 2013). Gender egalitarianism measures the degree to which a society or an organization deemphasizes gender differences and supports gender equality (Northouse, 2013, Yukl, 2013). Assertiveness describes the extent to which individuals in a society are assertive, confrontational, and aggressive in their interactions with others (Northouse, 2013, Yukl, 2013). Future orientation describes the extent to which people in a culture participate in future-oriented behaviors such as planning, investing, and delaying gratification (Northouse, 2013, Yukl, 2013). Performance orientation refers to the extent to which a society encourages and rewards group members for superior performance and excellence (Northouse, 2013, Yukl, 2013). Humane orientation, the ninth cultural dimension, refers to the extent to which a society encourages and rewards people for being fair, altruistic, generous, caring, and kind to others (Northouse, 2013, Yukl, 2013). House et al. (2004) used these dimensions to analyze leadership attributes in the 62 countries studied.

The GLOBE project researchers used quantitative studies in order to assess leadership and cultural dimensions in 62 countries (Northouse, 2013). House et al. (2004) used nine cultural dimensions to analyze how cultures around the world view leadership. GLOBE researchers analyzed subjects' responses to hundreds of attributes believed to be related to outstanding leadership and then derived six global leadership behaviors: charismatic/value based, team-oriented, participative, humane-oriented, autonomous, and self-protective (Northouse, 2013). House et al. (2004) created 10 country clusters based on prior research, language, geography, and religion and history: Anglo, Nordic Europe, Germanic Europe, Latin Europe, Sub-Saharan Africa, Southern Asia, Latin America, Eastern Europe, Middle East, and Confucian Asia.

Northouse (2013) reported the GLOBE project concludes most cultures see good leadership emerging from leaders who value integrity, charisma, and interpersonal skills. Similarly, universal bad leadership is based on leaders' attributes: self-focused, dictatorial, and asocial (Northouse, 2013). The GLOBE study researchers wanted to find out how cultural differences were related to differences in viewing different approaches to leadership (Northouse, 2013). As a result, GLOBE researchers formed 21 primary dimensions of leadership and from those defined six global leadership behaviors: charismatic/value-based leadership, team-oriented leadership, participative leadership, humane-oriented leadership, autonomous leadership, and self-protective leadership (Dorfman, Mansour, Hanges, Dastmalchian, House, 2012).

Three of the GLOBE study clusters: Anglo, Latin America, and Eastern Europe were studied. When research was available, the specific focus was the United States in the Anglo cluster, Mexico in the Latin America cluster, and Croatia in the Eastern European cluster. It is important to note that Croatia was not one of the countries specifically studied in the original GLOBE project. However, based on the effort to characterize and understand the regional clusters, it could be argued, Croatia belongs in the Eastern European cluster together with Greece, Hungary, Albania, Slovenia, Poland, Russia, Georgia, and Kazakstan. In fact, some studies have utilized the GLOBE dimensions and preformed subsequent studies on Croatia classifying Croatia as one of the countries belonging in the Eastern European cluster. Analysis of perceived leadership traits in Croatia provides a more comprehensive evaluation of leadership in the region, especially since Croatia has recently become the newest member of the European Union.

2.1   ANGLO CLUSTER/THE UNITED STATES

The United States, Canada, Australia, Ireland, England, South Africa (white sample), and New Zealand form the Anglo Cluster (Northouse, 2013). According to House et al. (2004), "this cluster is based on several factors including ethnic and linguistic similarities, and migration patterns originating centuries ago from areas now identified as Northern Europe" (p. 183).

Characteristics. In the analysis of the GLOBE study, the population in these countries expressed high scores in the performance orientation and low scores in the in-group collectivism (Northouse, 2013). According to the analysis of the GLOBE study results, the countries in the Anglo cluster, and therefore the United States, are competitive and results oriented, however, they are less attached to their families

than other groups (Northouse, 2013, p. 391). The United States is highly individualistic, medium on masculinity, and low on uncertainty avoidance and power distance (Hofstede, 1980).

Leadership profile. Dorfman et al. (1997) predicted "supportive, contingent reward, contingent punishment, participative, and charismatic leadership will positively affect mediators and/or outcome measures" in the United States (p. 243). An ideal example of leadership for the Anglo cluster is leadership that is highly charismatic/value based, participative, and sensitive to people (Northouse, 2013). Anglo countries prefer leaders to be highly motivating and visionary, and considerate of others (Norhtouse, 2013).

2.2   LATIN AMERICA CLUSTER/MEXICO

According to the GLOBE study, this cluster was made up of Ecuador, El Salvador, Colombia, Bolivia, Brazil, Guatemala, Argentina, Costa Rica, Venezuela, and Mexico (Northouse, 2013). GLOBE researchers examined Latin American cluster through Catholic religion, Spanish and Portuguese language, and culture. Catholicism and paternalism were identified as having dominant influence (House et al., 2004) making the culture "highly collectivist, non-trusting, and elitist without a history or framework for wide participation in organizational processes" (Dorfman, Howell, Hibino, Lee, Tate, & Bautista, 1997, p. 242). Mexican charismatic leaders serve as examples to current political leaders (Dorfman et al., 1997). Paternalism, partially rooted in the Catholic Church, is characterized by fathers' influence and guidance (House et al., 2004). In Latin culture, trust is given to those who belong to family or close friends (House et al., 2004). In Mexico, Howell (2007) reported "high family collectivism, prominence of interpersonal relationships, and social individualism may be viewed as a response to the weaknesses of public institutions (the lack of unity at the societal level) as well as a response to the prevalence of high power distance and authoritarianism" (p. 451). Mexicans accept self-protective behaviors by leaders more than most other GLOBE country (Howell, 2007, p. 459).

Characteristics. According to the GLOBE study analysis, people in these countries scored high on in-group collectivism and low on performance orientation, future orientation institutional collectivism and uncertainty avoidance (Northouse, 2013, p. 393). People in this cluster are more likely to be loyal to their families (Northouse, 2013, p. 393). It is very characteristic of these countries to tend to place less interest in overall institutional and societal groups (Northouse, 2013, p. 393).

Leadership profile. Latin American countries value charismatic/value-based, team oriented, and self-protective leadership the most (Northouse, 2013). According to Romero (2004), Mexico seems to be progressively moving to a more modern and participative form of leadership.

2.3   EASTERN EUROPEAN CLUSTER/CROATIA

The Eastern European countries included in the cluster studied by the original GLOBE study (2004) are Greece, Hungary, Albania, Slovenia, Poland, Russia, Georgia, and Kazakhstan. Unfortunately, Croatia was not included in the study. However, a nearby country of Slovenia was included. In fact, Slovenia and Croatia were a part of Yugoslavia until 1992. Therefore, Croatia is examined as one of the countries belonging to the Eastern European cluster. This is an exploratory analysis and the estimates of cultural dimensions for Croatia are based on those for Slovenia, and therefore the Eastern European cluster.

House et al. (2004) reported Eastern European cluster was based on Soviet dominance. Croatia was a part of socialist Yugoslavia until its independence and declaration of independence in 1992. Besides the Soviet hegemony, the GLOBE study lists geography and history as other relevant factors. In regards to geography, mountains and forests enabled groups to create cohesiveness (House et al, 2004). Prior to Soviet reign, in Balkans, Central Europe, Eastern Europe, and Central Asia the "'great war captains' continuously created the 'steppe empire' in the region to pull together separate pastoral groups, and constantly imposed controls over the land, labor, produce, and freedom of movement of the region's peasant families" (House et al., 2004, p. 186).

Characteristics. According to the GLOBE study analysis, the people in this cluster "tend to be forceful and supportive of their coworkers, tend to treat men and women equally and they are less likely to be achievement driven, to emphasize strategic planning, and to stress rules and laws as a way to maintain order" (Northouse, 2013, p. 393). People in this cluster scored high on assertiveness, in-group collectivism, and gender egalitarianism and low on performance orientation, future orientation, and uncertainty avoidance (Northouse, 2013, p. 392).

Leadership profile. There is limited scholarly research available that specifically examines Croatian leadership. Even though Eastern European cluster has not been sampled at the same rate as other clusters, Northouse (2013) summarized GLOBE study leadership profile for Eastern Europe claiming "this culture describes a leader as one who is highly autonomous, makes decisions independently, and is to certain degree inspiring, team oriented, and attentive to human needs" (p. 396). Udovicic, Pozega, and Crnkovic (2014) used the Likert model to examine 205 organizations in Croatia in order to arrive at a unique leadership style. According to Udovicic, Pozega, and Crnkovic (2014), the most effective leadership style is between participative and consultative leadership style. Similarly, Kostic-Bobanovic and Bobanovic (2013) utilized the GLOBE study research project questionnaires to examine leadership styles in Croatia and compare them to the leadership style in Sweden. Croatian managers assigned the highest score to value/based and team oriented dimensions, and the least appreciated were self-protective and participative leadership styles (Kostic-Bobanovic and Bobanovic, 2013).

2.3.1   CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP

Charismatic leadership is based on follower perceptions that the leader is endowed with exceptional qualities (Northouse, 2013). During social crisis, charismatic leader emerges with radical vision and solution to crisis. Followers perceive charismatic leader to posses extraordinary abilities (McLaurin & Buschanain, 2008). Charismatic leaders tend to have "high self-confidence, a clear vision, engage in unconventional behavior, and act as a change agent, while remaining realistic about environmental constraints" (McLaurin & Bushanain, 2008, p. 333). Charismatic leadership traits include role modeling, articulation of goals, showing confidence, image building, and arousing motives of the followers (McLaurin & Bushanain, 2008, p. 333). Fiol (1999) argued charismatic leaders utilize consistent communication strategies to communicate unconventional vision focused on solution rather than on status quo (p. 449). By utilizing these communication strategies, charismatic leaders positively connect emotionally, intellectually and physically with their followers (Yukl, 2013) and effect social-change (Fiol, 1999, p. 449).

Although charismatic leaders share some common behaviors with transformational leaders, charismatic leaders possess inherent differences from transformational leaders (McLaurin & Buschanain, 2008). According to McLaurin & Bushanain (2008) one of the greatest differences between charismatic and transformational leaders is the temptation for the charismatic leader to become self-consumed or self-serving (McLaurin & Buschanain, 2008).

Bass (1990) posited charismatic leaders have an important impact in collectivist cultures. According to Meindl (1995), follower characteristics, and social-organizational contexts need to be the focus for charisma attribution. House at al. (2004) reported Meindl (1995) contended "that for the work-group level the emergence of charismatic leadership would be higher in collectivist than individualistic organizational cultures" (p. 461). Based on the GLOBE study, in terms of cultural and global leadership, charismatic leadership style is the most universally accepted style (House et al., 2004).

Charismatic leadership in Anglo Cluster/United States. Bass (1990) and Meindl (1995) argued countries with high collectivism are more likely to exhibit charismatic leadership, therefore, charismatic leadership is highly impactful in the United States. Dorfman et al. (1997) contended due to U.S. high individual achievement motivation, charismatic leader behavior is highly impactful in the US.

Charismatic leadership in Latin America/Mexico. House et al. (2004) based on Bass' (1990) prediction that charismatic leadership impacts collectivist cultures, and House's et al. (2004) research indicating Mexico having highly collectivist culture, charismatic leadership has a the strongest impact on Mexican leadership. Dorfman et al. (1997) argued "directive, supportive, contingent reward, and charismatic leader behaviors will positively affect mediators and/or outcome measures" and therefore have a strong influence on Mexican followers (p. 242). Howell et al. (2007) argued charismatic leadership in Mexico has been represented by a strongly directive and "macho" leader (p. 459).

Charismatic leadership in Eastern Europe/Croatia. The collectivism score for the Eastern European cluster were moderate, therefore suggesting charismatic leadership as an influence (House et al., 2004). According to House et al. (2004) Eastern European cluster reported desire for even more institutional collectivism than what it currently has. Similarly, based on Kostic-Bobanovic and Bobanovic's (2013), study of GLOBE dimensions reported Croatia scoring highest on charismatic/value based and team oriented, medium on participative and humane oriented, and the lowest on self-protective and autonomous.

2.3.2   TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Originally, Burns (1978) contended transformational leadership theory appeals to follower development and intrinsic motivation. Bass and Avolio (1994) described transformational leadership theory as influence of leaders to motivate followers with a goal to exceed expectations. According to Bono and Judge (2004), extraversion was the strongest correlate of transformational leadership. Northouse (2013) reported transformational leadership should be defined as "the process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower" (p. 186). Therefore, transformational leaders are concerned about the needs of followers, use exceptional form of influence, and help the followers obtain fullest potential (Northouse, 2013, p. 186: Yukl, 2013). People who share the same vision with the leaders are more likely to perceive the qualities of the leaders as attractive (Northouse, 2013; Yukl, 2013). Transformational leaders appeal to moral values of followers and exhibit four personal attributes of: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Northouse, 2013; Yukl, 2013).

According to Bass & Avolio (1994), the first factor of transformational leadership, charisma or idealized influence, describes leadership with a sense of mission and ability to set a clear vision (Northouse, 2013; Yukl, 2013). Idealized influence involves followers in the change process by increasing followers' respect and response to the leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The second factor of transformational leadership, inspirational motivation, describes leaders who inspire and motivate followers to share the vision in the organization. These leaders use symbols and emotional appeals to inspire group members to create team spirit (Northouse, 2013). The third factor of transformational leadership, intellectual simulation, focuses on encouraging followers to develop innovative solutions for solving problems on their own (Yukl, 2013, p. 323). Kahai and Avolio (1998) argued followers led by transformational leaders tend to arrive at more creative and innovative solutions. The fourth factor of transformational leadership, individualized consideration, recognizes leaders with this factor are responsible for creating supportive environments in which they assist group members to achieve their goals (Northouse, 2013; Yukl, 2013). Leaders with individualized consideration provide support, encouragement and coaching (Yukl, 2013). McColl-Kennedy and Anderson (2002) argued individualized consideration results in increased self and team efficacy. Jung, Bass, and Sosik (1995) examined correlation between transformational leadership, specifically goal accomplishment and emphasizing mutual interdependence, and collectivist cultures. According to Jung, Bass, and Sosik (1995), four characteristics of transformational leadership, as proposed by Bass and Avolio (1994), are linked to collectivism.

Transformational leadership in Anglo Cluster/United States. According to Jung, Bass, and Sosik (1995), the United States, a highly collectivistic country, should serve as a model for further studies on linkage between collectivism and transformational leadership.

Transformational leadership in Latin America/Mexico. Conceptual findings by Jung, Bass and Sosik (1995) linked collectivism with emergence of transformational leadership. Due to the focus on group orientation, respect for authority, and work centrality, collectivist cultures were linked with the transformational leadership (Jung, Bass, & Sosik, 1995). According to the GLOBE study, Mexico has high in-group collectivism, and therefore is associated with transformational leadership (House et al., 2004, Jung, Bass, & Sosik, 1995).

Transformational leadership in Eastern Europe/Croatia. According to the GLOBE study, Eastern European cluster is moderately team oriented (House et al., 2004). Based on the research by Jung, Bass, and Sosik (1995) and the collectivism scores (House et al., 2004), Eastern Europe could be associated with transformational leadership. According to Kostic-Bobanovic and Bobanovic (2013), Croatia scored the highest on charismatic/value based and team oriented dimension.

2.3.3   SERVANT LEADERSHIP

Servant leadership originated with Greenleaf (1970). At first, Northouse (2013) argued, it was generally accepted as a leadership approach and later analyzed in an effort to build a theory. Since then, many studies have focused on developing and measuring servant leadership, without an agreement on the conceptualization of behaviors that identified a servant leader. Northouse (2013) argued the focus of servant leadership is on the behaviors leaders should possess to put followers first. It is concerned with how leaders treat and listen to subordinates (Northouse, 2013; Yukl, 2013). Linden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson (2008) contended a servant leadership culture is created when many leaders in an organization practice servant leadership. Servant leaders are altruistic and attentive to the concerns of the followers, nurture and empathize with followers, and help followers develop full potential (Sendjava and Sarros, 2002). Servant leadership behaviors are: conceptualization, emotional healing, putting followers first, helping followers grow and succeed, behaving ethically, empowering, and creating value for the community (Northouse, 2013). Servant leadership has follower-focused service as a primary responsibility and is usually classified under ethical leadership emphasizing values (Yukl, 2013, p. 348). Bass (2000) argued servant leadership's focus is on followers in order to have the followers benefit the organization, whereas servant leadership's focus is on the well-being of the followers even if it harms the organization. While transformational leadership includes an ethical dimension, servant leadership is unique because altruism is the central component of the process (Northouse, 2013).

vanDierendonck (2011) reported researches have still not reached a consensus on a unified definition or theoretical framework for servant leadership. Greenleaf's (1977) operational definition of servant leadership proposed placing the needs and concerns of followers as the essence of ethical leadership and therefore greatest priority. Patterson (2003) created a value-based model of servant leadership focusing on virtues that shape the servant leader: love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service. According to Patterson (2003) servant leaders develop a sense of humility through a moral love toward followers, a sense of vision, and a sense of trust in the followers due to altruistic reasons.

Hale and Fields (2007) argued "while there are many aspects of servant leadership that are similar to leader attributes that may be endorsed across cultures such as motive arousing, confidence building, team building and foresight, some differences among cultures may limit the extent to which the servant leadership approach is viewed as effective" (Hale & Fields, 2007, p. 398). Little empirical evidence exists regarding the applicability of servant leadership cross-culturally (Hale & Fields, 2007). According to Hale and Fields (2007) servant leaders may not be acceptable or desirable in a high power distance culture. Also, "the emphasis of servant leadership to build community among followers who are also members of distinct in-groups may not be acceptable or viewed as effective" (2007, p. 403).

Mittal and Dorfman's study (2012) examined five aspects of servant leadership: humility, empathy, empowering, moral integrity, and egalitarianism. Egalitarianism and empowering were favored in Nordic/European cultures, and empathy and humility were more strongly endorsed in Asian cultures

(Mittal & Dorfman, 2012, p. 555). Winston and Ryan (2008) built upon Dorfman's et al. (2004) work on ranking the 10 regions of the GLOBE study. According to Dorfman et al. (2004), all clusters, except Latin Europe and Nordic Europe, demonstrated higher scores for humane orientation. Therefore, Winston and Ryan (2008) proposed servant leadership should be acceptable in the same clusters and "that a practical model of how to lead with a humane orientation is lacking and that using servant leadership in leadership development programs may inform leaders how to practice a humane oriented leadership style" (p. 214). According to Winston and Ryan (2008), servant leadership is not preferred in right wing and socialist countries.

Servant leadership in Anglo Cluster/United States. According to Winston and Ryan (2008), and based on the overall similarities between the GLOBE study humane orientation scores, servant leadership can be viable in the United States. Anglo cluster, and therefore the United States, scored high in humane oriented score (Northouse, 2013). Therefore, based on the GLOBE study scores on humane-oriented leadership, this culture tends to prefer servant leadership.

Servant leadership in Latin America/Mexico. Serrano (2005), through an exploratory study, examined Patterson's (2003) theory and constructs of servant leadership in Panama. While Panama was not one of the original countries studied by GLOBE, given the cultural similarities and based on the classification matrix proposed by House et al. (2004), Panama is part of the Latin American cluster. Therefore, Serrano's (2005) findings that the "theory is acceptable, valid, and even visible within the Panamanian culture" (p. 157) could inform viability of servant leadership in Latin American cluster, and therefore Mexico. Howell et al. (2007) reported humane and participative leadership rated slightly above the midpoint in terms of humane orientation's importance for outstanding leadership (p. 457). Latin American cluster indicated slight viability of servant leadership among Latin American leaders.

Servant leadership in Eastern Europe/Croatia. House et al. (2004) reported Eastern Europe's moderate scores in humane orientation and according to Kostic-Bobanovic and Bobanovic (2013), Croatia scored the highest on charismatic/value-based dimension and team oriented dimension. Therefore, Croatians exhibit a moderate tendency to prefer servant leadership.

3.0   SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The GLOBE study identified and used the global cultural leadership behaviors to determine what leadership view each culture had (Northouse, 2013; Yukl, 2013). Bass (1990) argues numerous types of evaluations confirm people of the same culture share similar beliefs about desirable leadership qualities (p. 22). Cultures in the United States, Mexico, and Croatia have different ideas about what is expected from their leaders. The current analysis of those three cultures can help inform those wishing to effectively communicate in the United States, Mexico, and Croatia. While the GLOBE project (2004) has been used to select the cultures and to guide this study, numerous studies on the three cultures reviewed did not compare the same cultural dimensions and leadership behaviors. Another significant limitation is that the GLOBE study "frames leadership from an information-processing perspective, as the implicit beliefs and convictions that individuals have about leaders" (Northouse, 2013, p. 406). House et al (2004) derived some of the conceptual model from Lord and Maher's (1999) study on linking perceptions and performance, implicit leadership theory. According to House et al. (2004), "there is a high and significant within-society agreement with respect to questions concerning the effectiveness of leader attributes and behavior" (p. 17). Therefore, the focus of the study was on how leaders are viewed by others, instead of what leaders do. However, the models on charismatic, transformational, and servant leadership mostly focus on what leaders do. While the GLOBE study does not identify transformational, servant, and charismatic leadership, the study of charismatic/value-based, team oriented, participative, humane oriented, autonomous, and self-protective leadership dimensions informs leadership in the Latin America, the Anglo, and the Eastern European cluster (pp. 679-697). The Anglo cluster, and therefore the United States, scored the highest in the charismatic/value-based and participative dimensions (House et al., 2004, p. 691). The Latin American cluster scored the highest in the charismatic/value-based and team

oriented dimensions (House et al., 2004, p. 684). The Eastern European cluster scored the highest in the charismatic/value-based, team-oriented, and humane-oriented dimension (House et al., 2004, p. 685). The GLOBE study identified a list of leadership attributes that universally endorsed characteristics others recognize as outstanding leadership (Northouse, 2013). Dorfman et al. (2004) argued based on these attributes, it was possible to identify a universally accepted leadership profile. According to Dorfman et al. (2004), an identification of a cross-cultural view of an exceptional leader includes a leader high in integrity, charismatic/value-based behavior, and interpersonal skills. Outstanding leaders should possess the following universally desirable characteristics: trustworthiness, fairness, honesty, optimism, dynamism, dependability, intelligence, decisiveness administration skill, having foresight, planning ahead, being encouraging, building confidence, being motivational, being effective at bargaining, being a win-win problem solver, having communication skills, being informed, coordinating, being a team builder, and being excellence oriented (House et al., 2004). The GLOBE project also identified a list of leadership attributes viewed as obstacles to effective leadership: being a loner, asocial, inexplicit, egocentric, and dictatorial, and having non-cooperativeness and irritability (House et al., 2004).

The importance of considering cultural leadership and the increased interdependence with people from other cultures is going to continue to grow due to globalization (Northouse, 2013; Yukl, 2013). Leaders who understand culture and its impact can adjust their leadership styles to be more effective cross-culturally (Northouse, 2013; Yukl, 2013). Data from the GLOBE study and the review of the available research on studies in the United States, Mexico, and Croatia, highlight the need to expend ethnocentric tendencies and instead focus on viewing leadership in term of the diversity from these different regions around the world.

Further research should examine how leadership functions in the United States, Mexico, and Croatia and whether charismatic, transformational, and servant leadership is practiced in those cultures. Another area of further research should focus on examining models useful for teaching organizational leadership in these three countries. Some research might examine the influence of English language and situational effects on leadership in the United States, Mexico, and Croatia. Finally, development of an instrument that assesses culture and leadership simultaneously would inform future research in the United States, Mexico, and Croatia.

REFERENCES

Adler, N. J., & Bartholomew, S. (1992). Managing globally competent people. *Academy of Management Executive*, 6, 52-65.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies,* 7(3), 18-40.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 89(5), 901-910.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Dorfman, P. W., Hanges, P. J., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2004). Leadership and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed leadership profiles. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidian, P. W. Dorfman, V. Gupta, & Associates (Eds), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 669-722). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dorfman, P. W., Howell, J. P., Hibino, S., Lee, J. K., Tate, U., & Bautista, A. (1997). Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8(3), 233-274.

Fiol, C. (1999). Charismatic leadership: Strategies for effecting social change. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3), 449.

Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership.* New York: Paulist Press.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture.* New York: Doubleday.

Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership, 3*, 397-417.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

House, J. R., Hanges, J. P., Javidian, M., Dorfman, P. W., Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Howell, J. P., DelaCerda, J., Martinez, S. M., Prieto, L., Bautista, J. A., Ortiz, J., Dorfman, P., Mendez, M. J. (2007). Leadership and culture in Mexico. *Science Direct, 42*, 449-462.

Jung, D., Bass, B. & Sosik, J. (1995). Bridging leadership and culture: A theoretical consideration of transformational leadership and collectivistic cultures. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 2*, 3-18.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly.* 19, 161-177.

Lord, R., and Maher, K. J. (1999). Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance. Boston: Unwin-Everyman.

McColl-Kennedy, J. R., & Anderson, R. D. (2002). Impact of leadership style and emotions on subordinate performance. *Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 545-559.

McLaurin, J., & Bushanain, M., (2008). Developing an understanding of charismatic and transformational leadership. Allied Academies International Conference. Academy of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict. *Proceedings of the Allied Academies,* 15(2), 333-337.

Meindl, J. R. (1995). The romance of leadership as a follower-centric theory: A social constructionist approach. Leadership Quarterly, 6(3), 329-341.

Mittal, R., & Dorfman, P. W. (2012). Servant leadership across cultures. *Journal of World Business, 47*(4), 555-570.

Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership theory and practice, 6th ed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Romero, E. J. (2004). Latin American leadership: El Patron & El Lider Moderno. Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal, 11, 25-37.

Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies.* 45:2, 402-444.

Serrano, M. (2005). Servant leadership: A viable model for the Latin American context? Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Regent University School of Leadership Studies, Virginia Beach, VA.

Udovicic, A., Pozega, Z., and Crnkovic, B. (2014). Analysis of leadership styles in Croatia. *Ekonomski Vjesnik/Econviews, 1*, 71-80.

vanDierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. Journal of Management, 37(4), 1228-1261.

Winston, B. E., & Ryan, B. (2008). Servant leadership as a humane orientation: Using the GLOBE study construct of humane orientation to show that servant leadership is more global than Western. *International Journal of Leadership Studies, 3*(2), 212-222.

Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations, 8th ed.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.