

Anthropology of Leadership: An Armenian Perspective

Petros G. Malakyan
Indiana Wesleyan University

This paper explores cultural and socio-environmental influences on leadership processes to be able to understand the impact of cultural characteristics and leadership styles on five historical and contemporary models of Armenian Leadership: Monarchic, Church, National, Communist, and Democratic Leadership. Attempts have been made to assess the above models in light of (a) autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles (Lewin, 1939) and (b) eleven cultural characteristics: individualism vs. collectivism, relationship vs. task behaviors, masculinity vs. femininity, high power vs. low power distance, long- vs. short-term orientation, high uncertainty avoidance vs. low uncertainty avoidance, self-determination vs. fatalism, and the concept of time.

INTRODUCTION

This paper deals with Armenian cultural characteristics and leadership styles in the context of five historical and contemporary leadership models in Armenia from pre-historic times to present: Monarchy (2500 BC–1375 AD); Church Leadership (301 AD–present); National Leadership (1675–present); Communist Leadership (1920–1990); National Leadership (1988–present); Democratic Leadership (1991–present) identified in my previous paper entitled “Leadership Models in Armenia: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives.” The following conclusions have been made as a result of the above study:

1. Monarchic and Communist leadership models seem well present in the attitudes and leadership styles of contemporary leaders in Armenia today. For instance, current leaders seem to behave as autocratic as their monarchic predecessors, and, in their hiring practices, operate from a mindset of family succession. Thus, it can be said that the human behaviors have been the products of persons’ history and past experiences that shape individuals’ personal as well as social identities.
2. Today’s leaders in Armenia seem as paternalistic and gender discriminatory as the former historical models. The gap that exists between male and female is undeniable.
3. The Western attempts to democratize Armenia and its economy through international loans, democratic laws, policies, and democratic institutions produced insufficient results. In other words, despite the efforts and the support of the international community, after two decades, Armenia is still considered a country of transition from totalitarianism to democracy. For instance, a peaceful transition of power, as a result of democratic elections, continues to be a struggle for those leaders who are in power.
4. Education in Armenia historically has made a significant and lasting impact on the formation of the Armenian identity and leadership (Kurkjian, 1964). The Armenian literature, art, schools, and universities connect the nation’s glorious past with its future hope for freedom and independence, continues to inspire the current generation (Koryun, 1962; Elishe, 1982; Parpetsi, 1985;

Gevorgian, 1991; Ghevond, 1982; Bournoutian, 1994). Education seems to venture new visions for the nation's future and prepare a fertile ground for cultural change and worldview transformation.

5. Communist Leadership, by using education as a method of cultural change and transformation, broke the old pattern and habits of gender discrimination in the culture and offered an alternative model of female leadership (Christensen, 1994). The latter began participating in social and political life of the country. As a result, many women today model leadership in Armenia that has been predominately opposed by the Armenian society in the Monarchic, Armenian Church, and the National Leadership eras.
6. The Democratic Leadership model seems to be not the only solution to the complex leadership issues and challenges that Armenia is facing today. For instance, today's National and Democratic leaders were unable to live up to standards set forth by their own political parties or coalitions to pool the country out of poverty and build a truly democratically governed society for equal opportunities to their citizens for a better life (Government of the Republic of Armenia, 2011). For this reason, perhaps an integrative approach to all five leadership models may be necessary to offer solutions to the leadership challenges and problems that exist in Armenia today.

The above research conclusions raise questions that deserve answers. Can the above leadership behaviors be understood through the historical-cultural characteristics of the Armenian people? Does the culture play any role in shaping indigenous leadership styles? Why has Western democracy not been working? Will it ever work? If monarchic mindset and behavior still exists among Armenian leaders, what type of democracy or form of governance is more culturally relevant to the Armenian people? Can one learn leadership lessons from the nation's history in order to face the country's twenty-first century economic, political, social, cultural, and global challenges? Finally, what is the future of Armenian leadership?

To be able to answer the questions raised above and address the leadership issues and challenges in Armenia, an acquisition of further knowledge seems necessary to understand the relationships between cultural characteristics and leadership styles. Thus, to attain new knowledge, perspectives, and answers to the aforementioned questions for a twenty-first century Armenian leadership, I have taken on the task of studying Armenian leadership models, from pre-historic times to the present, in light of the cultural characteristics and leadership styles with an attempt to understand leaders' interpersonal and intrapersonal behaviors.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to assess five historical and contemporary models of indigenous Armenian leadership in view of three leadership styles: *autocratic*, *democratic*, and *laissez-faire* (Lewin, 1939) and eleven Armenian cultural characteristics: *individualism vs. collectivism*, *relationship vs. task behaviors*, *masculinity vs. femininity*, *high power vs. low power distance*, *long- vs. short-term orientation*, *high uncertainty avoidance vs. low uncertainty avoidance*, *self-determination vs. fatalism*, and *linear, multi-active, cyclical, and "back to the future" concepts of time* (Hofstede, 2001; Lewis, 2006), to learn about the relationships between the Armenian leadership behavior in light of the above cultural characteristics and leadership styles.

Objectives

The research objectives are three-fold:

1. Historiographical: To identify Lewin's leadership styles among Armenian leaders in the context of five Armenian leadership models.
2. Anthropological: To understand Armenian leadership styles in light of eleven cultural characteristics.

3. Behavioral: Understand Armenian Leadership behaviors from the perspectives of cultural characteristics and leadership styles.

Hypothetical Presuppositions

This paper follows four hypotheses:

1. History matters in leadership studies. One may observe historical leadership styles in order to understand the current leadership styles and behaviors.
2. Cultures and cultural characteristics play a decisive role in understanding and interpreting leadership behaviors across ethnic and cultural specificities.
3. There are correlations between cultural characteristics and leadership styles in a given cultures.
4. Leadership behaviors can be understood and interpreted through cultural characteristics and leadership styles across cultures.

Research Questions

1. What are the Armenian leadership styles in Armenia observed throughout history?
2. What are the cultural characteristics of the Armenian culture in Armenia?
3. What are the relationships between Armenian cultural characteristics and leadership styles?
4. Can Armenian leadership behaviors be understood and interpreted through the existing cultural characteristics and leadership styles?

Research Design and Method

The qualitative data collection and analysis method has been considered for *historiographical, ethnographic, and social science* quest for (1) historical data for Armenian cultural and leadership styles, (2) cultural characteristics of historical and contemporary Armenian leaders, and (3) their leadership styles throughout history.

First, I have used key historical sources to identify cultural traits and leadership styles that existed in Armenia throughout five historical and contemporary leadership models. Then I sought to discover the role of the culture and its unique contributions to the formation and influence on Armenian leadership styles and its characteristics throughout generations.

Second, I have observed Armenian cultural characteristics through the available anthropological data by using the *emic and etic perspectives* of my own thirty-five years of experience as a native Armenian (an insider to the Armenian culture), as well as an expatriate, (an outsider to the Armenian culture) through ongoing visits, interactions, and observations.

Third, I have assessed Armenian historical and contemporary leaders in light of Lewin's three major leadership styles in leader–follower dynamics: autocratic (directive), democratic (participative), and laissez-faire (delegative) (see *Definition of Terms*).

Delimitation

This study is limited to the eleven cultural characteristics and three leadership styles presented above to observe Armenian leaders both historical and contemporary within five historical and contemporary leadership models. A thorough study of culture, cultural characteristics, leadership styles, and historical and contemporary leadership models in current Armenian Diaspora, is beyond the scope of this study.

FINDINGS

The Armenian culture occupies a unique position within European and Asian cultures. Armenia has been on the crossroads of Eastern and Western civilizations since the pre-historical times (Pawstos, 1989; Soutanian, 2003; Chamchyany's, 2005). Its geographic location as one of the Eurasian countries made Armenians embrace and embody both Asian and European cultural characteristics (Der Nersessian, 1969). Armenia has faced centuries long massive military invasions and cultural influence from

Babylonians, Assyrians, Arabs, and Egyptian Mamluks from the Middle East and North Africa; Greeks and Romans from the West; Persians from the South; Mongolians and Seljuk Turks from the East; Byzantines from Asia Minor; and Russians from the fifth century BC to the present (Nersisian, 1972; Burney & Marshall Lang, 1972; Redgate, 2000; Douglas, 1992; Zimansky, 1998; Douglas, 1992; Bournoutian, 2005). Thus, Armenians had to face and deal with Eastern and Western cultural systems, various religious worldviews such as Zoroastrianism, polytheistic paganism, monotheistic Judaism, Islam, and Christianity.

Armenian Cultural Characteristics

To understand Armenian leadership, both historical and contemporary, it is important to study leadership behavior in the context of its cultural characteristics.

Individualism vs. Collectivism

The Armenian culture is individualistic as well as collectivistic. Self-actualization, achievements, and “I” identity, which includes individual freedom, human rights, etc., have been a part of the Armenian cultural identity since the legendary times of Hayk, who rebelled against the Babylonian king Bel for his and his family’s individual freedom and identity. In fact, most heroic legends, epic stories, and novels, including the heroic deeds of national and religious leaders are expressions of a strong cultural individualism (Pawstos, 1989; Chamchyany’s, 2005; Mnatsakanian & Hagopian, 1991; Raffi, 1955; Terzibashian, 1942). Even today, Armenians value individual freedom and self-actualization between both male and female population. Most Armenians are better at self-actualization than the in-group realization. Such behavior is seen in their individual achievements in sports, science, education, and business.

The Armenian culture is also collectivistic. The “we” identity, belongingness, family relationships, loyalty, and patronage are intrinsic parts of the Armenian cultural identity. On one hand, Armenians seem individualistic and independent thinkers; on the other hand, they stick close together in everyday relationships. In other words, they live collectively but think individualistically. Thus, the Armenian cultural identity is rather complex since it is a mixture of collectivistic and individualistic mindsets or characteristics of the West and the East.

Relationship vs. Task Behaviors

The Armenian culture is slightly more relational than tasks. The relational behavior is often observed in work settings. For example, in a working environment, the task may suffer more than the relationship because the latter, for an average Armenian, is more valuable and important than the task to be completed. Thus, it is not what you do or how well you do your job, but rather it is whom you know and whose protégé you are, that matters more. On the other hand, Armenians outside of their own cultural boundaries, tend to succeed in individual tasks and yet maintain their group identity. William Saroyan, a famous American-Armenian writer born in an Armenian immigrant family, observes about Armenians as being strong relational people. He writes: “For when two of them meet anywhere in the world, see if they will not create a New Armenia.”¹ Thus, it can be said that Armenians seem to be more task-oriented as individuals and more relationship oriented as an ethnic group. Ironically, Armenians have strong and stable families due to the strong relationship behavior but weak, and sometimes even corrupt, government and organizational institutions due to weak task behavior. This characteristic seems typical to Armenians living in Armenia, which makes the society vulnerable to corruption as a societal informal rule (Martirosyan, 2009, p. 14). Thus, it can be said that the Armenian culture is both relational and task.

Masculinity vs. Femininity

The Armenian culture, for the most part, is masculine and the society is more a male-dominated. Wealth and material success are important values for both men and women. Armenians value expensive clothes, cars, houses, weddings, and parties, whereas the quality of their lives (healthy lifestyle) may not be valued. An average Armenian man, for instance, may have health issues, but prefers to drive an

expensive European, Japanese or American car. One may observe such masculine conduct among Armenians not only in Armenia, but also in the Middle East, Europe, and the United States. Masculinity is also seen in the Armenian Church (Nersoyan, 1963).

High Power vs. Low Power Distance

Power distance between various members of Armenian society varies. In some relationships distance is high, in others—low. However, power distance exists nearly in all segments of society due to the preferred culture of masculinity. For instance, power distance between the husband and the wife has been traditionally high while the power distance between parents and children is becoming lower and lower. Power distance between leaders and followers continues to remain high. Leadership is perceived as having high, while followership as having low social status. Leaders, who generally exercise a hierarchical leadership style, seem rude and treat their subordinates with less respect. There is a general perception among people that leaders must be tough and distant. The latter are not expected to consult with their followers or invite them in on decision-making processes due to their lower status.

The situation seems no different among clergymen. The power distance between the clergy and laity and between celibate and married priests remains high. For instance, celibate clergymen are the only successors of church administrative leadership. In other words, married priests are parish priests and are not eligible to become bishops. They seem to be perceived as lower-class clergy, who would always remain submissive to celibate priests and bishops.

Long- vs. Short-Term Orientation

The Armenian culture historically has been more long- (LTO) rather than short-term oriented (STO). For instance, the Armenian Monarchy, which survived for four millennia, is an indication of the nation's LTO tendencies. Additionally, the Armenian Church, with its 1700 years of tradition and the church liturgy that date back to the 4th through the 14th centuries, clearly represents the LTO culture. Moreover, the Church's buildings were built to last for centuries is another historical evidence for the long-term mindset of the Armenian culture. However, Armenian society today is considerably STO. For instance, individuals and families in Armenia do not plan for the long-term. Life seems uncertain and unpredictable to most people.² Thus, for the most part, the Armenian culture today leans toward STO cultural traits.

High Uncertainty Avoidance vs. Low Uncertainty Avoidance

Social life tends to be more low uncertainty avoidance (LUA) in Armenia, which makes people less crisis-oriented. For instance, most people choose not to seek medical help, unless they are desperate. The concept of preventive medicine seems foreign to most Armenians. Even today, people live with a day-to-day concept of life and are not bothered by uncertainties. Alarm systems, fire detectors, life and health insurance policies, retirement plans, investments, and saving programs are new concepts and not widely demanded services in Armenia. The exceptions to the above cultural behavioral rule are found in the Armenian Church and Communist leadership models. The latter seem to be more high uncertainty avoidance (HUA). For instance, the Armenian Church liturgy and ceremonies have all been canonized to avoid any uncertain changes that may have occurred due to personnel or time change. As for the Communist era, the government through centralized social and economic orders has predetermined people's lives and future destinies.

Self-Determination vs. Fatalism

Unlike cultures, which hold Hindu fatalistic worldview, Armenians seem more self-determined. They do not accept life as a fate and want to hold the future in their hands. For instance, revolts against Persian occupants and proselytizers as early as mid 5th century and the Armenian Revolutionary Federation's (*Dashnaktsutiune*) advocacy for Armenian independence as late as the mid 19th century, are evidence of the self-determined spirit of the Armenian people (Libaridian, 1991, 2007). A century later, at the dawn of the Soviet era, marked the new beginning of the self-determined people with its Republic of Armenia. In August 1990, Armenians declared independence from the Soviet Union and elected their first President.

Nonetheless, self-determination is a complex issue for Armenians. Because of their history, particularly living under the Ottoman, Persian, and Russian dominations, Armenians have developed fatalistic tendencies. These past experiences may have created an insecure and dependent mindset among many Armenians. For that reason, Armenians are divided into two main political persuasions: (1) a belief that Armenians cannot survive without the help of world superpowers, (2) a conviction that Armenians can and should be self-reliant and self-determined to be able to attain true national freedom and independence. Thus, it can be said that although Armenians are self-determined by their centuries-long cultural identity, they seem to show signs of fatalism not only in socio-political, but also in personal life.

In contrast to contemporary political leadership, it is noteworthy that the Armenian Church leaders have stayed with people during good and bad times for centuries. Thus, self-determination seems characteristic to the Armenian Church leadership as a result of its enduring past and faith in the future of the Armenian people. The Church, as an institution, not only survived but also persevered the Armenian culture and the church heritage despite centuries-long persecutions and hardships.

Concept of Time

Armenians, among the four concepts of time: linear, multi-active, cyclic, and “back to the future,” mostly represents the multi-active and “back to the future” concept of time. However, during the Communist regime, Armenians seemed to follow the linear time mindset as an imposed new cultural behavior (Mead, 1955). The history of the Armenian monarchy seems to reveal certain elements of a multi-active time mindset among Armenian kings. The same can be said about the Armenian Church, National, and Democratic Leadership. Armenians with a multi-active paradigm tend to value people more than time, and as a result, demonstrate less organization and responsibility in a working environment and show favoritism in organizational settings.

As for the “back to the future” paradigm in relation to Armenians, the latter tend to have a “backward looking” behavior. An average Armenian would talk more about the past than the present or future. The future is unknown and somewhat unreal. Thus, they seem to be people of the past and present. However, it is hard to depict Armenians as fatalistic as mentioned earlier because they tend to take personal initiative in life and do not seem satisfied with the present reality.

Armenian Historical and Contemporary Leadership Models and Leadership Styles

In this section, attempts will be made to understand leadership behaviors of Armenian leaders in all five historical and contemporary models in light of *autocratic*, *democratic*, and *laissez-faire* leadership styles (Lewin, 1939).

Autocratic or Directive Leadership Style

Elements of the autocratic leadership style seem present in all models of Armenian leadership beginning Armenian Monarchy. The period in which the Armenian kings lived and functioned was dictatorial. Thus, it seems no surprise to find a dictatorial leadership style among Armenian kings, who were no different from that of Greek, Roman, and Mongol rulers.

The Armenian Church leadership continues to be predominantly autocratic in its worldview, decision-making, implementation process, and hierarchical structure (Eppler, 1873; Ormanian, 1912, 1955). Ordinary believers and low ranking clergymen seem to have little influence on doctrinal and administrative affairs. Interestingly enough, due to its dual role of spiritual and civil authority in the life of the Armenian people for more than millennia, the Armenian Church’s attitudes and expectations today seem unchanged. Although the current Constitution of the Republic of Armenia guarantees the separation of the Church and State, the Church still anticipates mutual collaboration between spiritual and civil leaders, much like fourth and fifth century Armenia, where the Catholicos (Supreme Patriarch of the Armenian Church) and the King of Armenia represented the supreme authority for the Armenian people (Agatangelos', 1909, 1976; Khorenats'i', 1978, 1990; Thomson, 1999). How much of this can be accepted today, is a question that requires further research and study.

Moreover, the Communist leadership also operated from an autocratic style. The Party made decisions for people's social, economic, and personal lives. There seems to be a small remnant of former Communists in Armenia, but it can be said that, unlike the Armenian Church, Communists in Armenia have lost influence and credibility. It can also be said that the Communist dictatorship lost its direct influence over people; however, this does not suggest that the Communist dictatorial mindset has disappeared from leadership styles among Armenian leaders. Rather, it remains a part of people's worldview and is still alive as a habitual default leadership behavior, especially in the public leadership sector.

Regarding the leadership styles of National leaders, they seem to swing back and forth between autocratic and democratic styles. On one hand, they have been active participants of in people's movements for national independence; on the other hand, their personal leadership styles are autocratic and directive. For instance, the national leaders lacked the unity and collaboration needed to face their enemies for the common cause of liberation and independence both before and after the 1915 Armenian Genocide.

The Armenian Democratic Leadership, in turn, has its own autocratic elements. The reports of electoral frauds during the last three presidential and parliamentary elections and the presence of corruption in the government are both evidence of dictatorial rather than Democratic Leadership styles (Libaridian, 1999).

Democratic or Participative Leadership Style

The democratic style of leadership is a two-way participative way of leading, where the leader and the follower share input and responsibilities in decision making and completing tasks. This leadership style is found in the Armenian Church. Despite its predominantly autocratic style of leadership, democratic elements exist in the leadership selection processes (Ormanian, 1955). For instance, traditionally, the process of ordination for both parish priests and the Catholicoses has been democratic and participatory. The community or council members recommend and vote for their spiritual leaders. However, as soon as they assume their leadership responsibilities, the Church leaders fall back to their default autocratic style of leadership, which comes from generations of previous leadership.

Participatory leadership style elements can be found in the early stages of the Communist leadership. They were able to persuade and motivate masses to follow their ideology. The selfless and self-sacrificial acts of Communist leaders, especially during the World War II, cannot be denied. The community morality motivated many people to believe in Communism and brought them together to try to build a just and equal society for everyone. Some gave their lives for its cause.

Democratic leadership is an emerging leadership style in Armenia. There seems to be a genuine desire among publicly elected leaders to adhere to the principles of democracy and become true representatives of their constituencies (Libaridian, 1991). Nevertheless, the autocratic and totalitarian culture of the past centuries still has influence on the style and behavior of today's leaders.

Laissez-faire or Delegative Leadership Style

The laissez-faire style of leadership is a delegative style of leading, where the leaders give the least possible guidance to followers. As the French phrase suggests, the leader adopts a "hands-off" or "let-things-ride" approach (Northouse, 2004, p. 179). For this research, I will use two types of laissez-faire styles: *willing laissez-faire* and *unwilling laissez-faire* styles. The willing laissez-faire style, which is the same as the definition above, has not been widely observed among Armenian leadership. In other words, the Armenian leaders in general seem to be controlling. Leaders who willingly delegate to their followers and give them freedom in decision-making and implementation are rare among Armenians. This assumption is based on my personal experience combined with the limited data available in this research. Thus, the plausibility of a willing laissez-faire style for all leadership models is scaled low in Table 10 below.

The unwilling laissez-faire style is defined here as an unwilling version of the "hands-off" or "let-things-ride" approach caused by the leader's inability to command and control. This approach, often

called an “absence of leadership,” is widely observed in Armenian leadership during times when the nation lost its independence (beginning with the fall of the Cilicia Kingdom in the fourteenth century). During these periods of national survival, the Armenian leaders were unable to gain control over the political circumstances, thus unwillingly giving their followers freedom to decide what was best for themselves and their personal survival.

Ironically, the unwilling laissez-faire style continued during the democratization of Armenia after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The newly formed government was and still is unable to resolve the enormous economic and political challenges that the country faced after the collapse of the centralized economy of the USSR and the blockades of railroads and roads by neighboring countries over the territorial disputes of Nagorno-Karabakh. Since then, the independence of the nation survived as a result of foreign aid, particularly the support that came from diaspora. The first democratically elected President, Levon Ter-Petrosyan appeared on national television in 1994 informing people about the government’s inability to provide the necessary support people needed to survive the severe, cold winter. He encouraged citizens to find their own means of survival by seeking support from their family members and relatives living outside Armenia. In other words, the President and his cabinet unwillingly adopted a “hands-off ” approach. This was an undesired freedom during one of the most difficult times of the nation’s history.

DISCUSSION

What does the above data tell us about the relationships between (a) Armenian leadership models and cultural characteristics and (b) Armenian leadership models and leadership styles? To be able to answer the above question, let us analyze all five models in light of Hofstede and Lewis’ eleven cultural constructs and Lewin’s three leadership styles.

1. Speaking of individualism vs. collectivism, the historical data indicates that the Armenian Monarchy put the primary value on the individual, in this case the king or the prince, thus seem more individualistic than collectivistic. The Armenian Church Leadership, much like the Armenian Monarchy, has been primarily paternalistic with individualistic mindset. However, the Armenian Church Leadership has also been collectivistic. For instance, individual believers, both clergy and laity form communities with group values such as family ties, parish fellowships, loyalty toward clergymen, and patronage relationships. Furthermore, the Armenian Communist Leadership was collectivistic in its advocacy of group values. However, the Communist collectivism was dictatorial in nature because the Communist Party imposed collectivism on its own people. As a result, people were forced to party loyalty, social belongingness, and group realization, as opposed to individual choice or freedom.

The Armenian National Leadership has been individualistic in its self-actualization and achievements from its inception. Out of necessity, individual freedom and human rights have been their primary motivations to combat against oppressors and occupiers of the Armenian land. Nevertheless, the Armenian National Leadership has also been collectivistic in its core cultural values. Leaders have been committed to the welfare of people at the expense of their own needs and freedom throughout the 19th and the 20th centuries. After the collapse of the Soviet Union and during the last two decades of democratization processes, Armenian Democratic leaders seem to lean more toward individualistic than collectivistic values of the Armenian culture, especially when the individualism serves to the interests of few who control political power and economic resources (Massis Post, 2011). For instance, the last three presidential elections have shown more monarchic and Communist totalitarian leadership behaviors to gain and maintain power and control without letting peaceful transitions of power to those who win elections (US Department of State, 2012). The Armenian culture seems to encompass Western individualism and Eastern collectivism. See Table 1.

TABLE 1
INDIVIDUALISM VS. COLLECTIVISM AND ARMENIAN LEADERSHIP STYLES

<i>Individualism</i>	<i>Collectivism</i>
Armenian Monarchy	
Armenian Church Leadership	Armenian Church Leadership
	Armenian Communist Leadership
Armenian National Leadership	Armenian National Leadership
Armenian Democratic Leadership	

2. The historiographical data shows that that Armenian leadership in general is both task and relationship behavior oriented. During the Communist era, the culture was more task oriented. People were busy working in government factories, and socializations would take place during the weekends. However, currently, people tend to value relationships more than tasks. For instance, people at work, primarily in the public sector jobs, tend to be more careless about their job performances and the tasks to be completed. For instance, coffee drinking and talking about non-job related topics in work environments are not uncommon. Moreover, the university students prefer spending more time in coffee bars than sit in lectures. The capital city of Yerevan is one of the modern cities where coffees and restaurants operate nearly on every street and there seem to have ongoing flow of customers even during the day of the week. See Table 2.

TABLE 2
RELATIONSHIP AND TASK BEHAVIORS AND ARMENIAN LEADERSHIP MODELS

<i>Relationship Behaviors</i>	<i>Task Behaviors</i>
Armenian Monarchy	Armenian Monarchy
Armenian Church Leadership	Armenian Church Leadership
	Armenian Communist Leadership
Armenian National Leadership	
Armenian Democratic Leadership	

3. Regarding gender roles in leadership, most Armenian leaders have been male throughout centuries because the general cultural perception has been that leadership is a male role in society. Nonetheless, the culture has changed in the last century. More women had taken leadership roles in society during the Communist era (1921–1991) and after independence (1991–present). The Armenian Church Leadership has always been masculine in nature as well as male dominated with no exception. See Table 3.

TABLE 3
MASCULINITY VS. FEMININITY AND ARMENIAN LEADERSHIP MODELS

<i>Masculinity</i>	<i>Femininity</i>
Armenian Monarchy	
Armenian Church Leadership	
	Armenian Communist Leadership
Armenian National Leadership	
	Armenian Democratic Leadership

4. In the Armenian society, power distance among the society members has existed for centuries. Table 4 below indicates the level of power distances within each leadership model.

TABLE 4
HIGH VS. LOW POWER DISTANCE AND ARMENIAN LEADERSHIP MODELS

<i>High Power Distance</i>	<i>Low Power Distance</i>
Armenian Monarchy—male–female, leader–follower, parent–child, high class–low class, wealthy–poor.	
The Armenian Church—male–female, leader–follower, celibate clergy–married clergy, clergy–laity.	
Armenian Communist Leadership—leader–follower, teacher–student, government official–factory worker, white collar–blue collar worker, partisan–nonpartisan, educated–uneducated	Armenian Communist Leadership—male–female, wealthy–poor, parent–child, high class–low class, older person–youth
Armenian National Leadership—male–female, parent–child, older person–youth	Armenian National Leadership – leader–follower, high class–low class, wealthy–poor
Armenian Democratic Leadership—leader–follower, government official–factory worker, high class–low class, wealthy–poor	Armenian Democratic Leadership—male–female, parent–child, teacher–student, older person–youth, educated–uneducated

5. Interestingly enough, not only the Armenian monarchy and the Armenian Church leadership, but also the Armenian Communist leadership, had Long-Term Orientation tendencies. Unlike Armenian national and democratic leaders, Communist leaders advocated long-term economic, cultural, and social programs. See Table 5.

TABLE 5
LONG- VS. SHORT-TERM ORIENTATION AND ARMENIAN LEADERSHIP MODELS

<i>Long-Term Orientation</i>	<i>Short-Term Orientation</i>
Armenian Monarchy	
Armenian Church Leadership	
Armenian Communist Leadership	
	Armenian National Leadership
	Armenian Democratic Leadership

6. The Armenian culture is more low uncertainty than high uncertainty oriented. Only the Armenian Church and Communist leadership have shown more high uncertainty avoidance tendencies while the Armenian Monarchy and the Armenian National and Democratic Leadership tend to lean more toward low uncertainty avoidance cultural traits. See Table 6.

TABLE 6
HIGH VS. LOW UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE AND ARMENIAN LEADERSHIP MODELS

<i>High Uncertainty Avoidance</i>	<i>Low Uncertainty Avoidance</i>
	Armenian Monarchy
Armenian Church Leadership	
Armenian Communist Leadership	
	Armenian National Leadership
	Armenian Democratic Leadership

7. Self-determinism has been strong throughout all five leadership models while some showing fatalistic tendencies. Only the Armenian Monarchy and the Armenian Church Leadership demonstrated a consistent attitude of self-determination for the future of the Armenian people and the country of Armenia. Others leaders have shown signs of both self-determination and fatalism in their views of the future of Armenians. See Table 7.

TABLE 7
SELF-DETERMINATION VS. FATALISM AND ARMENIAN LEADERSHIP MODELS

<i>Self-Determination</i>	<i>Fatalism</i>
Armenian Monarchy	
Armenian Church Leadership	
Armenian Communist Leadership	Armenian Communist Leadership
Armenian National Leadership	Armenian National Leadership
Armenian Democratic Leadership	Armenian Democratic Leadership

8. Armenians are predominately multi-active time oriented people. The only linear time orientation has been observed among Communist leaders. The Armenian Church, National, and Democratic leaders, on the other hand, seem to fall under the “back to the future” category of time concept. See Table 8.

TABLE 8
CONCEPT OF TIME AND ARMENIAN LEADERSHIP MODELS

<i>Linear Time</i>	<i>Multi-Active Time</i>	<i>Cyclic Time</i>	<i>Back to the Future</i>
Communist Leadership	Armenian Monarchy		Armenian Church Leadership
	Armenian Church Leadership		Armenian National Leadership
	Armenian National Leadership		Armenian Democratic Leadership
	Armenian Democratic Leadership		

9. As for the relationships between leadership styles and Armenian leadership models, it can be said that all five models demonstrate autocratic leadership style tendencies with no exception. Democratic elements have been observed only in the Armenian Church and Democratic leadership. Willing laissez-faire leadership style is lacking among all five models, whereas the unwilling laissez-faire leadership style has been observed in Armenian Monarchy, National, and Democratic leadership due to the country’s foreign invasions and the loss of national independence. See Table 9.

TABLE 9
DOMINANT LEADERSHIP STYLES IN THE ARMENIAN LEADERSHIP MODELS

<i>Autocratic leadership style</i>	<i>Democratic leadership style</i>	<i>Willing laissez-faire leadership style</i>	<i>Unwilling laissez-faire leadership style</i>
Armenian Monarchy			Armenian Monarchy
Armenian Church Leadership	Armenian Church Leadership		
National Leadership			National Leadership
Communist Leadership			
Democratic Leadership	Democratic Leadership		Democratic Leadership

RESULT

The cultural characteristics and leadership styles identified in the Armenian leadership models, both historical and contemporary, leads to the following results:

- A. Table 10 below provides a comparative scale (high, medium, low, yes, no) between eleven cultural constructs and five historical and contemporary leadership models in Armenia. It is evident that (1) individualism and collectivism have been present in all five leadership models, (2) Armenian leaders have demonstrated high relationship and high task behaviors through the history, (3) leadership has predominately been masculine and low or medium feminine, (4) power distance has been high across leadership models, (5) there seem to be an ongoing cultural shift from long-term orientation to short-term orientation and vice versa throughout history of Armenia, (6) similar cultural shift can be observed in the areas of low and high uncertainty avoidance (today the culture seems to be moving from low to high uncertainty avoidance), (7) self-determinism has been dominant mindset for Armenians for centuries, (8) linear time conscience seems to lack in the Armenian culture, (9) Armenians seem more multi-active time conscience culture, (10) cyclical time concept seems lacking among Armenians, and finally (11) there are evidences in the Armenian cultural behavior toward “back to the future” time concept. See Table 10.

TABLE 10
THE ARMENIAN CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS AND THE LEADERSHIP MODELS

<i>High, Medium, Low, Yes, No</i>	Armenian Monarchy	Armenian Church Leadership	National Leadership	Communist Leadership	Democratic Leadership
Individualism/collectivism	High/low	Medium/high	High/medium	Low/high	High/low
Relationship/task behaviors	High/high	High/high	High/high	High/high	High/high
Masculinity/femininity	High/low	High/low	High/low	High/medium	High/medium
High power/low power distance	High	High	High	High	High
Long-/short-term orientation	High/low	High/low	Low/high	High/low	Low/high
High uncertainty/low uncertainty avoidance	Low/high	High/low	Low/high	High/low	Low/high
Self-determination/fatalism	High/low	High/low	High/medium	High/medium	High/medium
Time: linear	No	No	No	Yes	No
Time: multi-active	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Time: cyclic	No	No	No	No	No
Time: back to the future	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

B. Table 11 below measures the Armenian leadership styles from high to low among the existing Armenian leadership models. It is evident that (1) the autocratic leadership style seems dominant in all leadership models, (2) the democratic leadership style ranges between medium to low while (3) willing laissez-faire leadership style has been lacking in all leadership styles in Armenia, and (4) unwilling laissez-faire leadership style has been primarily high in all five leadership styles in Armenia, except the Communist leadership style, which was low unwilling. Thus, it can be said that historically Armenian leaders have predominately been autocratic–authoritarian. See Table 11.

TABLE 11
A COMPARATIVE SCALE BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES AND ARMENIAN LEADERSHIP MODELS

<i>High, Medium, Low</i>	<i>Autocratic leadership style</i>	<i>Democratic leadership style</i>	<i>Willing laissez-faire leadership style</i>	<i>Unwilling laissez-faire leadership style</i>
Armenian Monarchy	High	Low	Low	High-medium
Armenian Church Leadership	High	Medium-low	Low	High
National Leadership	High	Medium-low	Low	High
Communist Leadership	High	Low	Low	Low
Democratic Leadership	High	Medium-low	Low	High

All five leadership models demonstrate more or less strong relationship and task orientations. They all seem to be masculine, power distant, and self-deterministic. The three out of five leadership models demonstrate more individualistic cultural characteristics. Major cultural differences between the five leadership models fall under the following cultural characteristics: long-/short-term orientation, high/low uncertainty avoidance, and various time orientations.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

From the above historiographical, anthropological, and behavioral analysis, it can be concluded that there seem to be correlations between cultural characteristics and leadership styles and that culture predetermines one's leadership behavior. Without looking into the micro-lessons on how the culture influences leaders' behaviors and styles in their daily activities, let us highlight three major macro-lessons learned in the areas of autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles in light of the Armenian cultural characteristics.

1. As observed above, all five leadership models in Armenia seem to demonstrate autocratic leadership because the Armenian culture has predominately been masculine and power distance. Conversely, this leads to another conclusion that when the culture is more feminine and low power distant, the democratic leadership style becomes dominant. Thus, it can be said that the Armenian indigenous leadership style is more autocratic than democratic. Thus, one of the reasons why the Western democracy has not been fully implemented in Armenia is because the cultural characteristics of masculinity and power distance and autocratic leadership styles have been a part of the nation's identity for centuries. The Western democratic processes seem to have little common with the Armenian experience. As much as imposed monarchic dictatorship was tested by the history and found one of the ineffective styles of leadership across the globe, so may be the democracy, if it is imposed or dictated by external forces.
2. As seen above, the monarchic and Communist authoritarian or dictatorial mindset and behaviors still exist among Armenian leaders, despite the fact that both leadership models have visibly ceased to exist. Both have been around long enough to shape the worldview and cultural identity of the Armenian people. Although these models continue to live in the memories and habitual behaviors of Armenian leaders, to go back to monarchy or totalitarianism is certainly not the solution either to the nation's leadership or the country's economic, political, social, cultural, and global problems. For this very reason, leaders in Armenia must first, experience paradigm shift in their views of leading and governance through alternative leadership styles, and second, find ways in which democratic principles and values can be integrated into their cultural identity and leadership understanding. Moreover, they must be open and willing for cultural change and transformation, both individually and collectively, not at the expense of the Armenian cultural values of course, but for the greater good of the Armenian people.
3. The result of this study also shows that the Democratic Leadership style at its best has scored medium-low among current Church, National, and Democratic leadership models in Armenia. In other words, democratic elements have been present in all three leadership styles, but they have not been the dominant style. It seems obvious that to expect radical democratization in Armenia would be naïve and premature because it has never been a priority for the nation for centuries due to its physical survival and struggle for independence. The change that is experienced in worldview level takes time, but it affects and changes one's behavior and causes personal transformation. Thus, whether or not Western democracies will ever works in Armenia becomes irrelevant. Armenians should find their own version of democracy or a form of governance that is not foreign to their ethnic identity.
4. Lastly, the study showed that laissez-faire leadership style has been lacking from the behaviors of Armenian leaders. Thus, let us be not surprised that the number of empowering and encouraging leaders is few. Thus, a constant struggle for positional power and influence sometimes become a way of life by creating a culture of unhealthy competitions. As an outcome, most leaders trust

less and less people and unwillingness to delegating others to lead. Does the culture have anything to say to the lack of this style among Armenians? Perhaps, cultural characteristics such as strong individualism in most cases, high power distance, clear social distinctions between gender roles due to masculinity, and less participatory style of leadership are the answers to the above question.

Finally, to be able to answer the question about the future of Armenian leadership, one must observe the change-patters within the Armenian culture in the last two decades and its impact on the contemporary leadership styles in Armenia.

RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research is limited to the qualitative method of research and data collection. Due to its historical nature of study, for the most part, the results of this research may not be applicable to today's Armenian cultural context, and all the changes that the country have been going through in the last twenty years. Thus, in order to recommend solutions to the leadership crisis in Armenia today it is necessary to (1) conduct ethnographic research in Armenia and learn about current cultural changes to assess the latter's influence on leadership styles; (2) compare and contrast the results of the historiographical, anthropological, and behavioral findings of this paper with that of current ethnographic research for validation; and (3) by using inductive reasoning (bottom up approach), begin to detect leadership behavioral patterns within other cultures and formulate leadership behavioral hypotheses toward generating a theory on the predictability of leadership behaviors across cultures, and finally, (4) recommend integrative and interculturally relevant leadership styles for the twenty-first century Armenia by using the method of acculturation, differentiation, and original synthesis known as interculturation (Clanet, 1990, p. 70; Berry, Segall & Kagitcibasi, 1997).

ENDNOTES

1. William Saroyan writes:
I should like to see any power of the world destroy this race, this small tribe of unimportant people, whose wars have all been fought and lost, whose structures have crumbled, literature is unread, music is unheard, and prayers are no more answered. Go ahead destroy Armenia. See if you can do it. Send them into the desert without bread or water. Burn their homes and churches. Then see if they will not laugh, sing and pray again. For when, two of them meet anywhere in the world, see if they will not create a New Armenia (1936).
2. While teaching at Yerevan State University in Armenia in early 2000s, I asked my students about their personal plans for the next one through three years. Out of thirty-five university students nearly thirty of them had no plans beyond one year.

REFERENCES

American Psychological Association (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Agathangelos (1909). *History of Armenians*. Tiflis, Georgia: n.p.

Agathangelos (1976). *History of the Armenians*. (Robert W. Thomson, Trans.) London, England: Harvard University Press.

Aghayan, T. P. (1976). *History of the Armenian people: Struggle for independence*. Yerevan, Armenia: ASSR Academy of Science.

- Benedict, R. (1934). *Patterns of Culture*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Benedict, R. (1934) *The Individual and the Pattern of Culture*, in Erickson, Paul and Liam Murphy, Eds. *Readings for a History of Anthropological Theory*, 3rd edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Berry, J.W., Segall, M.H., & Kagitcibasi, C. (Eds.) (1997). *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Social behavior and applications* (Vol. 3). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bournoutian, G. A. (1994). *A history of the Armenian people* (Vol. 2). Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda.
- Bournoutian, G. A. (2005). *A concise history of the Armenian people*. Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda.
- Burney, C., & Lang, D. M. (1972). *The peoples of the hills: Ancient Ararat and Caucasus*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Chamchyants', M. (2005). *History of Armenia* (Vols. 1–2). Elibron classics series. Adamant Media. First published in 1827 by H. Townsend, Calcutta, India.
- Christensen, K. R. (1994). *The politics of character development: A Marxist reappraisal of the moral life*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Clanet, C. (1990). *L' Interculturel: Introduction aux approches interculturelles en éducation et en sciences humaines*. Toulouse, France: Presses Universitaires du Mirail.
- Der Nersessian, S. (1969). *The Armenians*. UK: Thames & Hudson.
- Douglas, J. M. (1992). *The Armenians*. New York, NY: J. J. Winthrop.
- Elishe (1982). *History of Vartan and the Armenian war* (R. W. Thomson, Trans.). Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Eppler, F. C. (1873). *Geschichte der Gründung der Armenisch-Evangelischen Gemeinde in Shamachi*. Basel, Switzerland: Basel Mission Society.
- Erickson, P. and L. Murphy (2008). *A History of Anthropological Theory*, 3rd edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Gevorgian, H. (1991). *Dro* (A. Andranikian, Ed.). Yerevan, Armenia: Azat Khosk.
- Ghevond (1982). *History* (A. Ter-Ghevondian, Ed. & Trans.) Yerevan, Armenia: Sovetakan Grogh.
- Government of the Republic of Armenia (2011). Progress report on implementation of the sustainable development program (Year 2009–2010). IMF Country Report No. 11/191. Washington, D.C.: *International Monetary Fund*.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind, Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Khorenats'i, M. (1978). *History of the Armenians*. (R. W. Thomson, Trans.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Khorenats'i, M. (1990). *History of the Armenians* (G. Sarkisian, Ed. & S. Malkhasian, Trans.). Yerevan, Armenia: Haiyastan.
- Koryun (1962). *Life of Mashtots'*. Translation into Russian and intro by Sh.V.Smbatyan and K.A.Melik-Oghajanyan, Moscow, Russia.
- Kurkjian, V. M. (1964). *A History of Armenia*. New York, NY: AGBU of America.
- Lewin, K., Lippit, R., & White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271–301.
- Lewis, R. (2006). *When cultures collide: Leading across cultures* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Nicholas Brealey.
- Libaridian, G. J. (1991). *Armenia at the crossroads: Democracy and nationhood in the Post-Soviet era*. Watertown, MA: Blue Crane Books.
- Libaridian, G. J. (1999). *The challenge of statehood: Armenian political thinking since independence*. Watertown, MA: Blue Crane Books.
- Libaridian, G. J. (2007). *Modern Armenia: People, nation, state*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction.
- Malakyan, P (2012). Leadership Models in Armenia: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives. Submitted for publication with *Sage Open* in February 2013.
<http://www.sagepub.com/journals/Journal202037?siteId=sage-us&prodTypes=Journals&q=Sage+Open&fs=1>
- Marshall, L. D. (1980). *Armenia: Cradle of civilization* (3rd ed.). London, England: George Allen & Unwin.
- Martirosyan, A. (2009). Institutional sources of corruption in the case of Armenia: Is it rules, blood and culture, or punishment? Retrieved from the Caucasus Research Resource Centers—Armenia website.
http://www.crrc.am/store/files/corruption/fellows/Anna_Martirosyan.pdf
- Massis Post (2011). WikiLeaks on Armenian oligarchs: Who controls what in Armenia. Retrieved from Massis Weekly's Online Newsletter <http://massispost.com/archives/4097>
- Mead, M. (1928). *Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilization*. New York: William Morrow.
- Mead, M. (1955). *Soviet attitudes toward authority*. Great Britain: Tavistock Publications.
- Mnatsakanian, A. N., & Hagopian, H. G. (1991). *Zoravar Andranik* (Vol. 1). Moscow, Russia: Vernatoun.

- Mulder, M. (1977). *The daily power game*. Leiden, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Nersisian, M. G. (1972). *A story of the Armenian people*. Yerevan, Armenia: Yerevan State University.
- Nersoyan, H. (1963). *Stories from the history of the Armenian Church*. New York, NY: Diocese of the Armenian Church of North America.
- Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication.
- Ormanian, M. (1912). *National history*. Constantinople, Turkey: Ter-Nersesian.
- Ormanian, M. (1955). *The Church of Armenia*. London, England: A. R. Mowbray.
- Parpetsi, L. (1985). *History of the Armenians: Letter to Vahan Mamikonian* (D. Kouymjian, Trans.). New York, NY: Caravan Books.
- Pawstos, B. (1989). *The epic histories* (N. G. Garsoian, Ed. & Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Raffi (1955). *Collection* (Vol. 1). Yerevan, Armenia: Haipedhrad.
- Redgate, A. E. (2000). *The Armenians*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Saroyan, W. (1936). The Armenian & the Armenian. In *Inhale & exhale*. New York, NY: Random House. http://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/4095.William_Saroyan
- Soultanian, G. (2003). *The pre-history of the Armenians* (Vol. 1). London, England: Bennett and Bloom.
- Terzibashian, A. (1942). *Andranik*. Paris, France: Der Agopian.
- Thomson, R. W., & Howard-Johnson, J. (1999). *The Armenian history attributed to Sebeos* (Vol. 1–2) (G. Clark & M. Whitby, Eds.). Liverpool, England: Liverpool University Press.
- U.S. Department of State (2012). Background note: Armenia. Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs Retrieved from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5275.htm>
- Zimansky, P. E. (1998). *Ancient Ararat: A handbook of Urartian studies*. Delmar, N.Y: Caravan Books.

APPENDIX I: DEFINITION OF TERMS

Armenian Church. The Armenian Church in this paper refers to the Armenian Apostolic (Orthodox) Church founded by St. Gregory the Illuminator in 301AD.

Autocratic leadership style. An *autocratic*, or directive, *style of leadership* is a one-way or top-down way of leading, where the leader tells his/her followers what, why, how, and when in relation to a task.

Cultural characteristics. Refers to eleven cultural values (listed below) identified by Hofstede (1980; 2001) and Lewis (2006) as a result of their extensive field observations and research on human thinking, social actions, and cultural differences within more than fifty modern nations and seventy countries:

Individualism vs. collectivism. *Individualism* (“I” identity) assumes that the primary value is the individual, while *collectivism* (“we” identity) values the group more than the individual.

Relationship vs. task orientation. Task-oriented people are punctual and time-sensitive, while relationship-oriented people are flexible and sensitive to the emotions of others.

Masculinity vs. femininity. “Masculinity stands for a society in which social gender roles are clearly distinct: Men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on material success; women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life.” “Femininity stands for a society in which social gender roles overlap: Both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life” (Hofstede, 2001, p. 297).

High power vs. low power distance. Power distance is “the degree of inequality in power between a less powerful individual (I) and a more powerful other (O), in which I and O belong to the same social system” (Mulder, 1977, p. 90). The higher the power distance, the greater degree of inequality is.

Long- vs. short-term orientation. *Short-term orientation* (STO) cultures advocate virtues that relate to the past and the present, such as seeking immediate gratification, consumption, and social spending, while *long-term orientation* (LTO) cultures accept deferred gratification of needs and have a strong market position. (Hofstede, 2001, p. 359).

High uncertainty vs. low uncertainty avoidance. *Uncertainty avoidance* is defined as “the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations” (Hofstede, 1997, p. 113). *High uncertainty avoidance* (HUA) cultures tend to minimize the personal and social anxiety that results from uncertain or unknown situations. *Low uncertainty avoidance* (LUA) cultures are comfortable with uncertainties.

Self-determination vs. fatalism. *Self-determination* advocates individual and corporate freedom to determine one’s future: spiritual–religious, economic, political, and cultural. Self-determined people tend to act out of a belief in free will with an understanding that their future is in their hands. *Fatalism* is a belief that all past, present, and future events have already been predetermined and that human will cannot change events. Fatalistic people agree with the status quo and accept life as a fate that cannot be changed. An individual effort to change someone’s future is useless.

Concept of time. In this paper, the concept of time is defined as culture’s attitude toward or response to the concept of past, present, and future. Four different time perspectives are observed below:

Linear time. A person with a *linear time* paradigm focuses on one thing at a time and tends to value time more than people, and thus is perceived as a more task than relationship oriented individual. Thus, being a time conscious person, she/he might be perceived as arrogant and selfish in relationships.

Multi-active time. A person with a *multi-active time* paradigm tends to do many things at the same time and seems to value people more than time. As a result, this person might demonstrate less organization and responsibility in a working environment and, being a relational person, might show favoritism in organizational settings.

Cyclic time. A person with a *cyclic time* paradigm tends to view life as a cycle. The past determines the present the present projects the future. This philosophical worldview revolves around a cyclical concept of life (e.g., the belief in reincarnation).

Back to the future time. A person with a *back to the future* paradigm tends to be more fatalistic and passive in taking initiative and making decisions, because for her/him the future is unknown and somewhat unreal. Thus, people with this mindset seem to be people of the past and present. As a result, they may lack the ability to plan ahead, be proactive, or act strategically.

Democratic leadership style. A participative *style of leadership* involving a two-way or collaborative way of leading, where the leader and the follower share input and responsibilities in decision making and the completion of tasks.

Ethnographic research refers to the study methods of culture both prehistoric and contemporary through participant observations, interviews and/or questionnaires, conversations, etc. Two main approaches are considered: *etic and emic perspectives*.

Etic perspective refers to an anthropological research method that seeks to derive principles and rules to interpret human behavior in a particular culture to compare with other cultures. This method helps a researcher to develop an ability to look into a culture from outside and make a cross-cultural comparison (Benedict, 1934, Mead, 1928, Erikson & Murphy, 2008).

Emic perspective refers to an anthropological research method that seeks to understand the culture from within (“through an insider’s view”) in order to help the researcher think and act as a native. Thus the aim of *emic* research is to enable an outsider to gain a sense of what it means to be an insider.

Historiography. The term “historiography” in this paper refers to the historical method of studying the history through which the historical knowledge is obtained and transmitted about the history of leadership characteristics, traits, and styles in the context of the Armenian culture.

Laissez-faire leadership style. From a French phrase a meaning “allow to act,” a *laissez-faire leadership style* refers to a delegative way of leading, where leaders give the least possible guidance to followers. *Willing laissez-faire leadership style* refers to leaders’ willingness to delegate followers for certain tasks or responsibilities. *Unwilling laissez-faire leadership style* refers to situations when leaders are unwilling to delegate, but have no other choice but delegate followers for certain tasks or responsibilities.

Leadership behavior. Refers to leader’s intrapersonal attitude and interpersonal behavioral response to situational variables such as leaders, followers, and situation in various community and/or organizational contexts.

Leadership styles. For this paper, styles are limited to the University of Iowa’s studies on three major leadership styles: *autocratic* (directive), *democratic* (participative), and *laissez-faire* (delegative) observed by Kurt Lewin (1939). Moreover, the term *leadership style* is defined as leaders’ and followers’ interpersonal and intrapersonal (socio-behavioral) responses to leadership situations in cross-cultural or multi-cultural contexts and time.