Blyznyuk Tetiana
Doctor of sciences (Economics), Associate Professor,
Professor of Management and Business Department
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

Близнюк Т.П.
доктор економічних наук, доцент,
професор кафедри менеджменту та бізнесу
Харківського національного економічного університету
імені Семена Кузнеця

LEADERSHIP TYPES: CROSS-CULTURAL ASPECTS

ТИПИ ЛІДЕРСТВА: КРОС-КУЛЬТУРНІ АСПЕКТИ

ANOTATION

This study identifies the influence of national culture on national leadership style based on such cultural factors as: power distance as a cultural factor that characterizes the attitude to leadership in national culture, determining the degree of leaders' encouragement to use their power; individualism versus collectivism as a cultural factor characterizes social orientation as an idea of the relative importance of the individual's interests in relation to the interests of the group to which he belongs, and which indicates the involvement of workers in individual or collective action; masculinity versus femininity as a cultural factor that characterizes the goal orientation, revealing the ways to motivate people to perform a particular job to achieve certain goals; uncertainty avoidance as a cultural factor characterizing the level of uncertainty, social instability, ambiguity, which is normal and in which members of the society feel comfortable.

Keywords: leadership, leadership type, power distance, individualism versus collectivism, masculinity versus femininity, uncertainty avoidance.

АНОТАЦІЯ

Процеси інтернаціоналізації виробництва і глобалізації ринків призвели до необхідності дослідження проблем в управлінні персоналом, що характеризуються культурними і національними протиріччями. Особливу увагу в періоди нестабільного розвитку світової економіки викликає проблема лідерства в управлінні персоналом на стику різних культур. Культура кожної країни має свої провідні цінності, які зумовлюють поведінку носіїв цих цінностей, тому лідерство в кожній країні несе свою культурну обґрунтованість і різне розуміння сутності влади та ієрархії в керівництві і лідерство. Лідерство є специфічним видом взаємодії, яке засноване на ефективному поєднанні різних джерел влади і спрямований на заохочення людей до досягнення загальних цілей. Урахування впливу культурних чинників на персонал підприємства, яке функціонує в умовах взаємодії національних культур, є одним зі складників ефективності управління персоналом. Ці чинники впливають на особливості ділової та соціальної культури різних країн, формують певні відмінності в якості робочої сили з погляду її підготовки, здатності сприймати запропоновані зміни та інноваційні рішення. Саме під впливом культурних чинників формується національний стиль лідерства. У дослідженні визначено вплив національної культури на національний стиль лідерства на основі впливу таких культурних чинників, як дистанція влади як культурний чинник, що характеризує ставлення до лідерства в національній культурі і визначає ступінь заохочення лідерів до використання ними своєї влади; співвідношення індивідуалізму і колективізму як культурний чинник, що характеризує соціальну орієнтацію як уявлення про відносну значимість інтересів індивіда по відношенню до інтересів групи, до якої він належить і в якому зазначено на притягання працівників до індивідуальних або колективних дій; співвідношення мужності і жіночності як культурний чинник, що характеризує цільову орієнтацію і розкриває способи мотивації людей до виконання тієї чи іншої роботи на шляху досягнення певних цілей; ставлення до невизначеності як культурний чинник, що характеризує рівень невизначеності, соціальної нестабільності, двозначності, який є нормальним і за якого члени суспільства відчувають себе комфортно.

Ключові слова: лідерство, тип лідерства, дистанція влади, індивідуалізм проти колективізму, маскулінність проти жіночності, уникнення невизначеності.

Formulation of the problem. Modern theories of leadership recognize that a leader cannot succeed by following the same pattern of behavior under all circumstances because he must clearly assess the situation in which the company found itself and choose a particular course of action based on the conditions. The leaders – managers at enterprises that do not operate in their own country or whose staff interact with representatives of other national cultures must have clear understanding and be aware of cultural limitations of a particular leadership style.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Cross-cultural models of leadership and their features are studied by such scientists as Adler N., Doktor R., Redding G.[4], Laurent A. [6] and Trompenaars F., Hampden-Turner Ch. [8]. Adler N., Doktor R., Redding G.[4]focused only on the features of European leadership models, without considering in detail the features of other national models.The results of cross-cultural research conducted by A. Laurent [6] show that there are huge differences between the best leadership styles in different countries. However, in all these surveys there was no analysis of influence of cultural factors of national culture on national leadership style.

Formulation of the purposes of the article. The purpose of the article is identification the influence of national culture on national leadership style based on cultural factors (Hofstede classification).

The main research material.A leader who wants to work as efficiently as possible cannot

afford to use one style of leadership throughout his career. On the contrary, he must learn to use all styles of leadership and choose the style that best suits the specific situation and specific staff. The flexibility of a leadership style is an important requirement for effective leadership in any country in the world.

Leadership styles, when used at enterprises operating in the international business and whose staff is represented by different national cultures, acquire features associated with cross-cultural leadership. Therefore, there are three main leadership styles most characteristic of such enterprises [3, 7]:

1) autocratic leadership (authoritarian leadership) – a task-oriented style with a rigid vertical relationship between the leader and individual subordinates, which ensures clarity of functioning in simple processes. It is most often used in personnel management of foreign offices located in countries with economies in transition and underdeveloped countries.

2) paternalistic leadership – a style of leadership, which is a variant of autocratic leadership, based on the participation of individual subordinates in decision-making and partnership of the leader with each subordinate. It is used by the vast majority of Western companies both at headquarters and in foreign offices located in the developed countries.

3) participatory leadership – a relationship-oriented style based on numerous partnerships between all members of the group, including leaders. It is used mainly by Japanese corporations, as well as self-taught organizations, and in the case of teamwork.

N. Todorova [2, p. 186] notes that the benefits of choosing a leadership style depend on the characteristics of national culture at the enterprises operating in different national cultures. The democratic style is the most preferred by the leaders, while some subordinates do not like the need to participate in all kinds of decision -making. There are also some cross-cultural differences in the response to this leadership style by people from different national cultures. In cultures with a considerable distance of power (according to Hofstede's classification of national cultures), democratic (participatory) leadership style is perceived as incompetence of the leadership [5]. According to G. Hofstede [5], authoritarian and paternalistic leadership characterize such cultures, while cultures with a short power distance prefer the democratic (participatory) style of leadership.

R. Griffin and M. Pastey [1, p. 761] note that leadership is one of the most important behavioral and interpersonal aspects of international companies. Modern theories of leadership recognize that a leader cannot succeed by following the same pattern of behavior under all circumstances. Instead, he/she must carefully assess the situation in which the company found itself, and develop a course of action taking into account the prevailing conditions. Among the most common situational factors influencing the leader's behavior, are the following: individual differences between subordinates; characteristics of the group, organization and leader; willingness of subordinates to share the goals set before them by the leader. It is obvious that cultural factors have an impact on the leaders behavior [1, p. 763].

The processes of business globalization have led to the need to study the phenomenon of leadership in terms of cross-cultural management. The culture of each country has its own leading values, determining the behavior of the bearers of these values, so leadership in each country has its own cultural validity and different understanding of the nature of power and hierarchy in leadership. No two cultures have exactly the same approach to power and hierarchy. That is why there is a need to form a unified approach to personnel management, taking into account the cross-cultural aspects of leadership.

Thus, when it comes to managing a multicultural team, the leader has to assess his subordinates and their cultural needs as leaders must meet the expectations of their subordinates.

Different countries have different leadership practices and styles due to historical and national characteristics. Scientists in their work [1,p. 763] note that representatives of various cultures react differently to different behaviors of leaders, which is partly due to cultural factors, partly – the individual characteristics of the employees. That is why, if we take into account these cross-cultural features in personnel management, we can create an effective management system, as cultural differences form different motivational attitudes of employees and determine the nature of their behavior. At the same time, one of the main tasks of leaders is to identify these differences, understand them and consider them in their practice.

Let us see how national cultures influence the staff of enterprises, using cultural factors identified in the theory of G. Hofstede [5]. Of the six cultural factors considered by G. Hofstede, the managerial aspects of the enterprise, and especially personnel management, are under direct influence of the following cultural factors of national culture [5]:

1) power distance is a cultural factor that characterizes the attitude to leadership in national culture and determines the degree of leaders' encouragement to use their power.

2) individualism versus collectivism is a cultural factor that characterizes social orientation as an idea of the relative importance of the individual's interests in relation to the interests of the group to which he belongs, and which indicates the attitude and cooperation of employees in individual or collective actions.

3) masculinity versus femininity is a cultural factor that characterizes the goal orientation,

revealing ways of people's motivation to achieve certain goals by performing a particular job.

4) uncertainty avoidance is a cultural factor that characterizes the level of uncertainty, social instability, ambiguity, which is normal and in which members of the society feel comfortable.

Scientists R. Griffin and M. Pastei in their work [1, p. 763] note that if a culture is characterized by respect for power (long distance power), the employees expect that the leader will take control, responsibility for decision-making and will direct their actions. He should follow a line of behavior focused on obtaining results (direct, structured, purposeful behavior), avoiding targeting subordinates (i.e., providing assistance, caring for them, and forming personal relationships with them), not caring much about the subordinates' participation in decision-making.

A group of scientists led by P. Yukhymenko [3, p. 168] also notes that culture with a great distance of power encourages demonstration of power. It is perceived by subordinates as appropriate because a leader, who does not demonstrate power, can be perceived as weak and listless. Attempts to erase the differences between leaders and followers may not be accepted because culture is characterized by authoritarian, hierarchical social order [1, p. 763]. In such a culture, the leader demonstrates the maximum power that corresponds to reality, and leadership is based on co-optation.

Scientists R. Griffin and M. Pastey [1, p. 763] note in their work that if tolerance to power (short distance of power) is highly valued in the national culture, the leader should pay less attention to the actual process of achieving goals. In this case, we can achieve efficiency by focusing behavior on interaction with subordinates and their involvement in the decision-making and other processes related to enterprise management.

A group of scientists led by P. Yukhymenko [3, p. 168] also notes that in a culture with a short distance of power, demonstration of power is considered ethically unacceptable.Relations between employees are formed on emphasized social equality and partnership, while the leader uses his power in exceptional cases. In such a culture, the leader gives the impression that he has less power than in reality, and leadership is based on the choice of the majority.

According to R. Griffin and M. Paste [1, p. 764] in individualistic cultures, leaders should focus their behavior on individual employees rather than on the team as a whole.

A group of scientists led by P. Yukhymenko [3, p. 168] also notes that individualistic cultures involve the achievement and protection of individual goals and interests. In such a culture, leadership is based on the management of the individual in the group, with considerable attention to the management structure.

Scientists R. Griffin and M. Pastey [1, p. 764] note that in collectivist cultures, leaders should prefer to focus on the team rather than on individual members of the team. In a culture focused on a group approach to doing business (such as Japanese culture), an effective leader must lead subordinates while ensuring agreement between team members.

A group of scientists led by P. Yukhymenko [3, p. 168] also notes that a collectivist culture focuses on achieving and upholding collective goals. In such a culture, leadership is based on the management of an individual in the group with considerable attention to the relationship in the management structure.

Scientists R. Griffin and M. Pastey [1, p. 765] note that the behavior of the leader also depends on the target orientation.

Thus, a group of scientists led by P. Yukhymenko [3, p. 168] notes that if culture is characterized by the dominance of masculine culture and active target orientation, its representatives focus on achieving material or career success. Representatives of feminine culture also prefer money and other types of material rewards.

A masculine culture values strength, speed of decision, scale of approaches, determination, toughness and expertise in the leader. Actions of the leader, focused on obtaining results or increasing participation of employees in management, can get the approval of the representatives of such cultures, if in their perception, these actions can lead to increased earnings [1, p. 765].

If culture is feminine–dominated and passive in goal orientation, its bearers especially value quality of life, attention to the environment, the culture focuses more on humanistic and social values [3, p. 168]. In this case, the actions of the leader, which result in improved quality of life, are acceptable in this feminine culture [1, p. 765].

In the feminine culture, the leader values the ability to organize conflict-free group work, reach consensus, develop a fair motivation, build relationships.

Another important aspect is that scientists R. Griffin and M. Pastey [1, p. 765] note that the leader's actions aimed at building relationships with subordinates can be effective in cultures with both active and passive targeting to the extent that these actions can make the employees feel satisfied with their work and the organization's activities in general.

According to scientists R. Griffin and M. Paste [1, p. 766], in enterprises operating in a national culture, whose representatives seek to avoid uncertainty, employees prefer order when they are set specific goals and objectives.

In a culture with a high level of uncertainty avoidance, results-oriented behavior is more effective, and interaction with subordinates may be less productive. It is in this culture that the leader is loved or hated, and the leader strives to do the right things.

R. Griffin and M. Pastey [1, p. 766] also note that the employees, who feel uncertain at

the enterprises operating in the conditions of national culture, can have a positive attitude to participating in different processes in the company.

Actions of the leadership to engage the employees in the management of the company may receive the approval of representatives of cultures with a high level of uncertainty acceptance. However, leadership focused on getting the result may be undesirable or needless. On the other hand, when the leader's behavior is directed to the formation of relationships with subordinates, it may be ineffective. In this case, employees may have a very strong desire to participate in management and independently address issues related to their job responsibilities. Then, the actions of senior executives directed to achieving the company's goals or interacting with employees, may be regarded by them as redundant actions affecting the possibility of employee participation in management, or even as actions that significantly limit these opportunities. In such a culture, the leader is respected or valued, and the leader strives to do the right thing.

Conclusions. Thus, the author has analyzed the influence of national cultures on the staff of enterprises using the cultural factors of Hofstede's theory of national cultures classification. These factors are: power distance as a cultural factor that characterizes the attitude to leadership in national culture and determines the degree of encouragement of leaders to use their power; individualism versus collectivism as a cultural factor that characterizes social orientation as an idea of the relative importance of the individual's interests in relation to the interests of the group to which he belongs and which indicates the involvement of workers in individual or collective action; masculinity versus femininity as a cultural factor that characterizes the goal orientation and reveals ways to motivate people to perform a particular job to achieve certain goals; uncertainty avoidance as a cultural factor that characterizes the level of uncertainty, social instability, ambiguity, which is normal and in which members of the society feel comfortable. One of such conditions for enterprises that are participants in international relations is the influence of cultural factors. This is the influence of national culture, represented by the staff of the enterprise. That is why the leader needs to adhere to the leadership style that is most effective in a particular situation and for specific staff.

REFERENCES:

1. Griffin R., Pastey M. (2006). *Mezhdunarodnyybiznes* [InternationalBusiness]. Saint Petersburg: Peter. (in Russian).
2. Todorova N.Ju. (2009). *Kroskuljturnyj menedzhment* [Cross-cultural management]. Available at: http://ea.donntu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/2021/1/CCM_Todorova.pdf. (accessed 5 February 2022). (in Ukranian).
3. Jukhymenko P.I., Ghacjka L.P., Pivtorak M.V. (2011). *Mizhnarodnyj menedzhment* [International management]. Kyiv: Center for Educational Literature. (in Ukranian)
4. Adler N.J., Doktor R., Redding G. (1986). From the Atlantic to the Pacific century: Cross-cultural management Reviewed. *Journal of Management,* vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 295–318.
5. Hofstede G. (2014). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*. Unit 2. Available at: http://lse2010.narod.ru/olderfiles/LSE2014pdf/LSE2014Hofstede.pdf. (accessed 5 February 2022).
6. Laurent A. (1983). The Cultural diversity of western conception of management. *International Studies of Management and Organization,* vol. 13, no. 1–2, pp. 75–96.
7. Lewis R.D. (2006). *When cultures collide: leading across cultures.* Boston, London: Nicholas Brealey International. 625 p.
8. Trompenaars F., Hampden-Turner Ch. (1997). *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business.* New York: McGraw-Hill Trade. 265 p.

БІБЛІОГРАФІЧНИЙ СПИСОК:

1. Гриффин Р., Пастей М. Международный бизнес. Санкт-Петербург : Питер, 2006. 1088 с.
2. Тодорова Н.Ю. Крос-культурний менеджмент. 2009. 330 с. URL: http://ea.donntu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/2021/1/CCM_Todorova.pdf (дата звернення: 05.02.2022).
3. Юхименко П.І., Гацька Л.П., Півторак М.В. Міжнародний менеджмент. Київ : Центр учбової літератури, 2011. 488 с.
4. Adler N.J., Doktor R., Redding G. From the Atlantic to the Pacific century: Cross-cultural management Reviewed. *Journal of Management.* 1986. Vol. 12. № 2. P. 295–318.
5. Hofstede G. Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture. Unit 2. URL: http://lse2010.narod.ru/olderfiles/LSE2014pdf/LSE2014Hofstede.pdf (дата звернення: 05.02.2022).
6. Laurent A. The Cultural diversity of western conception of management. *International Studies of Management and Organization.* 1983. Vol. 13. № 1–2. P. 75–96.
7. Lewis R.D. When cultures collide: leading across cultures. Boston ; London : Nicholas Brealey International, 2006. 625 p.
8. Trompenaars F., Hampden-Turner Ch. Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business. New York : McGraw-Hill Trade, 1997. 265 p.