Anthropology of Leadership: An Integrative Approach to Intercultural Leadership in Armenia

Petros G. Malakyan
Indiana Wesleyan University

Cultural Anthropology provides a framework for delineating, understanding, and interpreting leadership behaviors across the great cultural divides. Since cultural variations endorse different leadership behaviors (House, 2004), attempts have been made to understand the contemporary Armenian leadership behavior, whether or not a co-relation exists between the Armenian cultural characteristics and leadership styles. To test this anthropological premise, first, I have studied current cultural characteristics and leadership styles and their relationships in the Armenian cultural context. Second, in light of the research findings, I have tried to predict leadership behaviors as a result of shifts of cultural characteristics and leadership styles for current Church, National, and Democratic leadership models in Armenia. Third, I made recommendations for culturally relevant and integrative approaches to intercultural leadership, known as interculturation, for the country to face the challenges of the 21st century globalized world.

INTRODUCTION

The anthropological knowledge is believed to be an important factor in understanding and interpreting leadership behaviors across cultures. To know how the culture affects one's behavior would be constructive to all parties involved (House, 2004: 7). For this paper, the independent conceptual variables are (1) leadership styles (2) cultural characteristics and (3) leadership models to be observed and studied in the context of the Armenian culture in the Republic of Armenia.

Five historical and contemporary leadership models have been acknowledged in Armenia in the preceding research: Monarchic, Church, National, Communist, and Democratic Leadership models (Malakyan, 2012a). Since Armenian Monarchy and the Communist Leadership models have no place in today's Armenian society, this paper will focus primarily on Church, National, and Democratic Leadership.

The Anthropological findings on current Armenian cultural characteristics have been studied with Lewin's leadership styles in order (1) to understand and perhaps predict leadership behaviors for current Armenian Church, National, and Democratic leaders and (2) recommend an integrative and interculturally relevant leadership style for the 21st century Armenia.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to understand and interpret the contemporary Armenian leadership behaviors in the context of the Armenian cultural characteristics and leadership styles and recommend contextually relevant intercultural leadership styles for the 21st century Armenia. The result of this study

may lay a ground for similar studies of cultures to understand, interpret, and perhaps be able to predict the leadership and followership behaviors and styles in a given cultural context. Thus, if the leadership behaviors are the byproduct of cultural characteristics and leadership styles, then by studying cultures one may be able to pre-determine leadership behaviors and be able to recommend culturally most relevant and effective leadership styles.

Objectives

The research objectives are four-fold:
1. Anthropological: To understand current Armenian leadership styles in light of eleven cultural characteristics and learn about current cultural changes in Armenia.
2. Leadership Studies: To assess the leadership behaviors of contemporary Armenian leaders in light of Lewin's three leadership styles.
3. Leadership Behavior: First, to understand and interpret Armenian Leadership behaviors from the perspectives of cultural characteristics and leadership styles, whether or not contain cultural characteristics endorse certain leadership styles in Armenia. Second, compare and contrast the results of the historiographical, anthropological, and behavioral findings of the previous study (Malakyan, 2012b) with that of current ethnographic research for validation.
4. Intercultural: Based on current Armenian cultural characteristics and leadership models, recommend integrative and interculturally competent leadership styles for Armenia to face the challenges of the 21st century by applying acculturation, differentiation, and original synthesis known as interculturation (Clanet, 1990, p. 70; Berry, Segall & Kagitcibasi, 1997).

Conceptual Frameworks

For this paper, three independent variables are used as conceptual frameworks:
1. Anthropological: Common intercultural themes and cultural characteristics, observed among 60+ nations and ethnic groups, that distinguish one culture from another, are used as an anthropological conceptual framework (Doob, 1988; Hofstede, 2001, 2002, 2010; Lewis, 2006): *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.*
2. Leadership styles: The University of Iowa Studies' (Kurt Lewin, 1939) three major leadership styles are used (autocratic or directive, democratic or participative, and laissez-faire or delegative) to assess current leadership styles among Armenian leaders.
3. Leadership models in Armenia: Anthropological and historiographical findings from the previous studies entitled "Leadership Models in Armenia: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives" (Malakyan, 2012a) and "Anthropology of Leadership: An Armenian Perspective" (Malakyan, 2012b) on historical and contemporary leadership models in Armenia (Armenian Monarchy, Church, National, Communist, and Democratic Leadership) in the context of the Armenian culture are used to compare and contrast them with the findings of this study.
4. Interculturation: To be able to offer a culturally relevant and yet interculturally applicable integrative leadership style for the 21st century Armenia, the theory of interculturation is used in Recommendation (Clanet, 1990; Berry, Segall & Kagitcibasi, 1997).

Research Questions

One of the unanswered research questions posed by the GLOBE research project, will serve as an overarching research question for leadership in Armenia: "To what extent will leadership styles vary in accordance with culturally specific values and expectations?" (House, 2004: 9). To be able to answer the above question, the following sub-questions are raised for this study:
1. What are the current cultural characteristics of the Armenian culture in Armenia?
2. What are the current Armenian leadership styles in Armenia?
3. What are the relationships between Armenian cultural characteristics and leadership styles?

4. Can leadership behaviors be predicted as a result of shifts of cultural characteristics and leadership styles for current Church, National, and Democratic leadership in Armenia?
5. What are the most culturally relevant and intercultural applicable leadership styles in Armenia for the country to face the challenges of the 21st century globalized world?

Research Design and Method

The qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis method is used to learn about Armenian cultural characteristics and current leadership styles. The anthropological method of ethnographic research is employed to distinguish Armenian cultural characteristics, by utilizing two approaches: emic and etic. With the emic approach, I tried to observe the Armenian cultural characteristics and leadership styles through my own thirty-five years of experience as a native Armenian, an insider to the Armenian culture. With the etic approach, I tried to understand and interpret the Armenian cultural characteristics and leadership styles as an expatriate, an outsider to the Armenian culture, through ongoing visits, interactions, participant observations, interviews, and survey questionnaire.

Sample

The sample size for the cultural context of the Republic of Armenia, for nearly three million populations, was 484 participants:
*   351 participants of online survey
*   Eleven in-depth face-to-face interviews of positional leaders in Armenia
*   Five focus group observations with total participation of 122.

Procedure

A) An online questionnaire has been distributed among Armenians born in Armenia, who either currently live or have lived in Armenia. 351 randomly selected volunteer individuals responded to the survey questionnaire ages from 18 to 60 or older.

B) 11 volunteer leaders, who occupy leadership positions in the government, public, and church, sectors.

C) By using the etic approach of participant observation, I have observed five different groups in different cultural contexts on how members interacted, communicated, discussed, made decisions, worked, studied, traveled, ate and socialized during the course of two hours up to three-day time observation time-frame: (a) recreation, travels, meals, and socializing (25 participants), (b) classroom (7 participants), (c) discussion groups (15 participants), (d) organizational board meetings (5 participants), and (e) formal gathering (70 participants) with total participation of 122.

Instrument

For the online survey, the questionnaire in Appendix I was used. The instrument, particularly the composed questions, follows Doob, Hofstede, and Lewis' cultural construct and research categories for cultural differences as well as Lewin's three classifications of leadership styles. In-depth interviews were conducted around the same themes of eleven cultural characteristics and three leadership styles used in the questionnaire. During the participant observation sessions with five focus groups, the same themes served as a mental guide for assessment of relationships and leadership and/or followership situations.

Method

To understand current Armenian cultural characteristics, I have employed three methods of data collection: quantitative, qualitative, and focus group observations. The etic perspective was used for gathering the data from all three methods, while emic approach served as an interpretation instrument for data analysis.

Quantitative data. By using the etic approach, I conducted a survey for the population in the Republic of Armenia. 351 participants took the online survey from May to July 2012. Participants who responded to the survey 75.8% were female and 24.2% male. More than half of the participants were ages between

18-29, and ages 30-40 were nearly 30%. Less than 10% were mid-age adults from ages 50-60. Only 5% respondents were ages 60 and above.

Qualitative data. Eleven positional leaders in Armenia participated in in-depth face-to-face interviews. 54.5% were female and 45.5% - male. More than half of the participants were ages between 50-60 and the remaining were ages 30-40s.

Focus group Observations. Out of 122 participants observed, more than 60% were ages 18-30. Nearly 30% were ages 30 and higher, while ages 50 and higher were not more than 10%. Nearly 60% participants were female. [1]

By using the emic approach to data analysis and interpretation, I have compared and contrasted the current data with that of historiographical data observed in the previous study (Malakyan, 2012a).

Delimitation

This study is limited to the eleven cultural characteristics and three leadership styles presented above to observe the behaviors of current Armenian leaders. The studies are limited to Armenians living or have lived in the Republic of Armenia. The Diaspora Armenians are not included in the study. Furthermore, a thorough study of the Armenian culture, other cultural characteristics and leadership styles not listed above and yet identified in literature, is beyond the scope of this study.

EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

In this section, I report the results of my findings about the Armenian culture. I also summarize below the results of the previous studies on the leadership models and styles among historical and contemporary leaders in Armenia.

Current Armenian Cultural Characteristics

The data below under each cultural characteristic signifies the outcomes of quantitative, qualitative, and focus group observation methods.

Individualism vs. Collectivism

The quantitative data shows that 52.5% participants observe the Armenian culture to be collectivistic. 26.2% believe Armenians are individualistic, while 21.3% were not sure. The qualitative data shows that 81.8% participants consider the Armenian culture to be individualistic, while only 18.2% thought that Armenians were collectivistic. Through the focus group observations, I have observed the Armenians to be independent thinkers with strong family and kinship ties. They seemed more collectivistic in social activities while demonstrating strong individualistic tendencies in work and school settings. My observations seem to align with the findings of the quantitative data among young adults.

Relationship vs. Task Orientation

The quantitative data indicates that 36.9% participants perceive the Armenian cultural behavior to be relational, while 39.5% believe that Armenians are more task-oriented culture. On the other hand, 23.6% participants were not sure. The qualitative data shows that 63.6% vs. 36.4% believe that the Armenian culture is more relationship-oriented. Through the focus group observations, it seems convincing that the Armenian young adults are more task-oriented (quantitative data), while the older generation (ages 50 and higher) seem more relationship-oriented (qualitative data).

Masculinity vs. Femininity

The quantitative data reports that the Armenian culture is predominately masculine (54.2% vs. 26.8%). Only 19% were not sure. The qualitative data reports similar results. Majority believes that the Armenian culture is masculine (81.8% vs. 18.2%). From the focus group observations, I have witnessed clear distinctions and separations between male and female roles in the society in teacher-students

interactions, leader-follower relationships, during socialization processes such as female preparing the food, while male taking upon themselves more physically hard tasks.

High Power vs. Low Power Distance

According to both quantitative and qualitative data findings, the survey participants with 52.4% along with 72.7% interviewees agree that the Armenian culture is a high power distance. 25.4% survey participants chose low power distance and 22.2% were undecided. On the other hand, only 18% interviewees thought that they were low power distance culture. Less than 1% participants were undecided. Moreover, during my focus group interactions, I have observed high power distance behavior nearly in all sectors of the society.

Long- vs. Short-Term Orientation

The quantitative data shows that 38.7% participants consider the Armenian culture a long-term oriented (LTO), while 36.3 believe they are short-term oriented (STO) culture. The 25% of participants are not sure. On the other hand, according to the qualitative data, Armenians are less LTO (27.3%) and more STO (36.6%). Interestingly enough, those who believed that they are both LTO and STO were 36.1%. As for the focus group observation results, from my numerous conversations and interactions, it was evident that both the younger and older generations seemed quite balanced in their approach to life between STO (immediate gratifications, consumption, and social spending) and LTO (valuing cultural virtues such as respecting the tradition, and loving education, and being persistent in life goals or career pursuits).

High Uncertainty Avoidance vs. Low Uncertainty Avoidance

The quantitative and quantitative data are in agreement that the Armenian culture is more low uncertainty avoidance culture (HUA). For instance, 42.3% vs. 35.2% survey participants indicate people's inclinations toward HUA behavior. The undecided participants were 21.6%. Moreover, the qualitative data showed that 85% vs. 15% participants confirm their inclinations toward HUA. However, my focus group observations revealed quite conflicting data as opposed to the above quantitative and qualitative findings. I have learned that the everyday life tends to be more low uncertainty avoidance (LUA) in Armenia (e.g. lack of preventive measures toward illness, accidents, and natural disasters), which is the characteristics of cultures with LUA behavior.

Self-Determination vs. Fatalism

According to the quantitative data, 59.4% participants believe that Armenians are self-deterministic. Only 19.5% see themselves as fatalistic, while 21.1% are not sure. Along with the above findings, the qualitative data reports similar results. 55% participants see themselves self-deterministic, while 45% - fatalistic. As for focus group observations, although Armenians use many fatalistic expressions and seem to acknowledge fate as a part of their history and everyday life, the culture, for the most part continues to remain self-deterministic. The latter shows evidence in people's decision-making patterns and response to socio-political and economic issues and their constant struggle for personal success.

Concept of Time

The quantitative data indicates that 62% participants consider themselves linear, 38.8% - multi-active, 60.5% cyclic, and 52% back to the future time oriented. Contrary to the above in most counts, the qualitative data indicates that participants perceive themselves as more multi-active (54%) and very less linear (9%). Back to the future view reached to 37%. From the perspective of the focus group observations, I have observed a shift from multi-active to linear time concept among young adults. The latter seem more task-oriented, as seen above, than their previous generations.

Current Armenian Leadership Models

This section represents the summary of findings on the existing Armenian leadership models and styles from the previous studies (Malakyan, 2012a, 2012b). The first historiographical study showed that "Monarchic and Communist continue to exist invisibly in the memories as well as in the behaviors of Armenian leaders today" (Malakyan, 2012a: 27). It also reveals the following:

- The Armenian Church Leadership has been medium individualistic, highly collectivistic, masculine, high power distance.
- The National Leadership has been highly individualistic, masculine, high power distance.
- The Democratic Leadership has been highly individualistic, masculine and somewhat feminine, high power distance.

Current Armenian Leadership Styles

Table 1 below shows the dominant leadership styles observed in three contemporary leadership models in Armenia.

TABLE 1
DOMINANT LEADERSHIP STYLES IN THE ARMENIAN LEADERSHIP MODELS

Armenian leadership models	*Autocratic leadership style*	*Democratic leadership style*	*Willing laissez-faire leadership style*	*Unwilling laissez-faire leadership style*
Armenian Church Leadership	√	√		
National Leadership	√			√
Democratic Leadership	√	√		√

It is evident that the autocratic leadership style is the dominant style in current models of Armenian leadership, including the most recent model of Democratic Leadership (Libaridian, 1999). Moreover, democratic leadership style has been observed only in the Armenian Church and Democratic Leadership models. The willing laissez-faire leadership style has not been recognized among all three leadership models, while the unwilling laissez-faire leadership style is seen in Armenian National and Democratic Leadership models.

DISCUSSION

This section represents (a) the historical findings of cultural characteristics of the Armenian culture (see Malakyan, 2012b: pp. 13-18), (b) literature on the relationships between cultural constructs and leadership behaviors, and (c) the empirical findings of this research on cultural shifts observed in Armenia, which may result shifts in leadership styles.

Individualism and Collectivism

The historical findings indicate that the Armenian cultural identity is rather complex, since it is a mixture of collectivistic and individualistic mindsets. Nonetheless, the culture seems to have inclination toward individualism when it comes to one's choice of job or education. In social settings, on the other hand, they demonstrate strong collectivistic tendencies. The empirical research findings show that young adults tend to view themselves as more collectivistic, while the older generation believes that they are individualistic. Both research results indicate that individualistic and collectivistic cultural traits are present in the Armenian culture. Thus, it can be concluded that the Armenian culture is shifting from individualistic to collectivistic mindset.

The literature indicates that collectivism is associated with team-oriented, charismatic/value-based, and humane-oriented leadership (House, 2004: 503). Despite the fact that the Armenian culture is both collectivistic (family structure and group loyalty) and individualistic (strong "I" identity and independent thinking), the younger generation is slightly collectivistic in organizational settings. Subsequently, it can be expected that the future Armenian leaders may become less autocratic and more democratic in organizational contexts.

Relationship and Task Orientations

The historical findings indicate that the Armenian culture is slightly more relational than tasks. Nonetheless, both relational and task behaviors are present in the Armenian culture. The current research findings, on the other hand, indicate that the Armenian young adults are more task-oriented, while the previous generation showed more relationship-oriented behavior. Thus, it can be concluded that the Armenian culture is shifting from relationship to task behavior.

The literature indicates that in paternalistic cultures, such as Armenia, relationship or humane oriented leaders act as patrons and the society tends to grant higher influence and allows leaders to exercise power and task orientation at work. Furthermore, the research also shows that in relationship-oriented societies leaders' generosity, compassion, and concern for followers are valued as opposed to self-protective leadership behavior (House, 2004: 596-597). Subsequently, team-oriented, charismatic/value-based leadership behaviors are welcomed. Thus, due to the cultural shift from relationship to task orientation in organizational level among the younger generation, it is expected that the Armenian leadership style may be less humane-oriented and impersonal.

Masculinity and Femininity

The historical findings indicate that the Armenian culture, for the most part, has been masculine, despite the fact that feminine traits were introduced and implemented during the Communist era. The current research findings (the quantitative, qualitative, as well as focus group observations) indicate the same outcome, that the Armenian culture has been and continues to be predominately masculine. However, feminine signs are emerging and a minor shift from masculine to feminine behavior has been detected. Thus, it can be concluded that despite the fact that no significant cultural shift is detected in this area, women are becoming more active in today's social and political life of Armenia than previous generations.

The Armenian social structures and roles of male and female have been shaped and influenced by the masculine theology and ecclesiology of the Armenian Church (e.g. the fatherhood of God, Trinitarian subordination between the Father and the Son, and male priesthood with no exception). In such instances, according to the GLOBE research project, societies manifest gender egalitarianism and develop certain attitude toward social roles of women and men (House, 2004: 386). In case of Armenia, as shown in the historical findings, the culture has been predominately masculine, while the contemporary empirical findings indicate a slight cultural shift from masculinity to femininity. Thus, it can be foreseen more and more overlap and less distinctions between male and female social gender roles. Also, more female leaders are emerging among the future autocratic leaders, which may also lead to a shift from autocratic to more laissez-faire leadership style (House, 2004: 387-388).

High and Low Power Distances

The historical findings indicate that, although the Armenian culture went through significant changes during the last two centuries, power distance has been observed nearly in all segments of society beginning Monarchic to Democratic era. The current research findings indicate too that power distance is present nearly in all sectors of the society today. Thus, it can be concluded that no considerable cultural shift can be detected or witnessed in this area.

The Armenian culture is knows as a high power distance (HPD) culture for centuries. Both historical and empirical data indicates that the Armenian culture continues to remain HPD culture and no cultural shift is expected. The literature indicates that this dimension is relevant to both Western and Easter

societies. In Western societies, where the Protestantism is more influential than Catholicism, are more low power distance (LPD), while in organizational level the latter continues to be HPD. Moreover, the literature also affirms that societies with male dominations are more HPD and thus positively correlated with self-protective/humane as opposed to charismatic/value-based and participative leadership (House, 2004: 559). Therefore, it can be said that no significant shift from autocratic to democratic or laissez-faire leadership style is anticipated in Armenia in the near future.

Long- and Short-Term Orientations

The historical findings indicate that the Armenian culture historically has been more long- term (LTO) than short-term oriented (STO). However, the Armenian culture went through changes and became more STO in the last 150 years. The current research findings, on the other hand, shows evidence in slight preference toward LTO behavior among young adults as well as a strong tendency to balance LTO and STO behaviors among older generation. Thus, it can be concluded that the Armenian culture shows signs of shift from STO to LTO behavior.

The GLOBE research, on the other hand, asserts that low-income countries with their emerging economies, which show little evidence for Future Orientation practices, have stronger aspiration for Future Orientation due to their consciousness for the need for long-term societal solution (House, 2004: 332). Thus, the empirical evidence for a slight shift from STO to LTO behavior in the Armenian culture may provide reasons or a need for change from autocrat-oligarchic to more autocrat-democratic style of leadership among the future generation of Armenian leaders as being most effective leadership style. [2] Moreover, due to the Armenian Church's long lasting legacy of being LTO orientated, it is more likely that the church leadership will become more active and more influential in the Armenian society, especially among the younger generation.

High and Low Uncertainty Avoidances

The historical findings indicate that Armenians tend to be more low uncertainty avoidance (LUA) for centuries, which made them less crisis-oriented and unprepared to face political, social, and economic challenges. However, certain institutions, such as the Armenian Church and some social structures during the Communist era, have been high uncertainty avoidance (HUA). The current research findings, however, report quite conflicting data. On the one hand, the quantitative and qualitative data shows that both the younger and older generation see themselves mostly as HUA, while the results of the focus group observations clearly point out LUA tendencies in everyday life of the Armenian society (e.g. lack of preventive measures toward illness, accidents, and natural disasters). Moreover, the younger generation see themselves more LUA than the older generation (35.2% vs. 15%) Thus, it can be concluded that, although both traits have been and are present in the Armenian culture, the influence of Western HUA cultural values seems evident in the Armenian culture.

It has been observed by the GLOBE research program that HUA cultures (e.g. China, Singapore, German-speaking and Scandinavian countries) tend to be more formal and orderly, who formalize processes and procedure, turn the verbal communication into writing. They like to plan and strategize in order to minimize risks. Latin American cultures, on the other hand, demonstrate LUA cultural behavior and have a tendency to be informal and enter into contractual agreements based on the word of trust. They are less concerned for formalized policies or rules (House, 2004: 6). The Armenian culture as indicated earlier contains both elements within different leadership models. Interestingly enough, neither of these cultural behaviors suggests that the leadership style of the above cultures will be democratic. There seem to be no correlation between the high and low uncertainty avoidance and Lewin's leadership styles. Nevertheless, it is also evident that all three leadership styles can be present or developed among HUA and LUA cultures. Since the Armenian culture is experiencing a cultural shift from LUA to HUA, there seem to be a possibility of developing laissez-faire in combination with autocratic leadership style. For instance, societies who are involved in entrepreneurship and free enterprise are less autocratic or controlling. Instead, they seem to operate from decentralized or laissez-faire leadership style (House, 2004: 645). Thus, it can be said that the laissez-faire style has a potential to be developed and used by the

younger generation of Armenians, who are more HUA than the previous generations. Additionally, due to the Armenian Church's HUA orientation, the younger generation may lean more toward Church leadership than Democratic leadership. The former possesses more moral authority and respect among followers, than the latter.

Self-Determination and Fatalism

The historical findings indicate that, unlike cultures with Hindu fatalistic worldviews, Armenians are more self-determined due to their strive for better life and hope for the future. However, Armenians also show signs of fatalism in socio-political as well as personal life due to dramatic experienced the nation went through in the last two centuries (e.g. Ottoman and Russian dominations, the 1915 Genocide, and the totalitarian Soviet regime). The current research findings, however, indicate that Armenians today, both younger and older generation, continue to remain self-deterministic. Thus, it can be concluded that no substantial cultural shift has been reported or is anticipated in the future in this area.

The Concept of Time

The historical findings indicate that Armenians, among the four concepts of time: linear, multi-active, cyclic, and "back to the future," mostly identify themselves with multi-active and "back to the future" time concept. The current research findings, however, indicate a significant change in the culture. For instance, the data shows a shift from multi-active among older generation (54%) to linear (62%), cyclic (60.5%), and "back to the future" (52%) time concept among young adults. Thus, it can be concluded that the Armenian culture is experiencing a significant shift from multi-active to linear, cyclic, and 'back to the future." Armenia's geographical location in Eurasia seems to make the culture balanced between Western and Eastern worldviews and cultural behaviors.

According the adopted definition of multi-active time, cultures with this orientation tend to be more relationship-oriented as opposed to task and result orientation. People are also highly family and tradition oriented with less time conscious and punctuality (Lewis, 2006: 30, 55; House, 2004: 276). The empirical data for the Armenian culture shows that the multi-actives are less than 40% among the research participants. Thus, due to the cultural shift from multi-active to linear and cyclical time orientation, the relationship-oriented leaders in Armenia may shrink in the future.

According the adopted definition of linear time, cultures with this orientation tend to be more task than relationship-oriented. It is evident from the data that the Armenian culture is shifting from multi-active to linear time orientation. The 62% respondents of the quantitative survey view themselves linear oriented. Thus, a leadership behavioral change is expected among Armenian leader, who demonstrate task oriented behaviors such as valuing education, emphasizing results, taking initiatives, and somewhat less loyal to tradition and seniority (House, 2004: 276). Moreover, according to the GLOBE research project, cultures that are performance oriented may endorse charismatic or value-based and participatory leadership (House, 2004: 278). In other words, by using Lewin's language of leadership styles, it is expected that the Armenian leaders in the future may continue endorse autocratic leadership style with a strong emphasis on democratic or participatory style of leadership.

Cyclic cultures tend to produce high uncertainty avoidance (HUA) leaders, who view task and relationships in a cyclical paradigm with abundant time for making decisions and taking actions. People with cyclical time orientation are more considerate, and according to the adopted definition, hold a philosophical worldview that revolves around a cyclical concept of life (Lewis, 2006: 57-58). Since the Armenian culture is experiencing a significant shift toward cyclic time orientation (Asian cultural patterns), it can be assumed that future leaders in Armenia may be interculturally more competent than current leaders in their 50s and 60s.

"Back to the future" cultures tend to produce leaders with a sense of past and present with no consideration of future for planning and strategizing. Leaders in those cultures tend to demonstrate fatalistic tendencies, and according to the adopted definition, they may be passive in taking initiative and making decisions (Lewis, 2006: 60-61). Since the empirical data shows that 52% of respondents indicate "back to the future" time orientation, which shows no significant cultural shift, it can be assumed that

future leaders among young adults may continue to demonstrate passive and fatalistic behaviors. At the same time, they may well fit in multicultural contexts of linear, cyclic, and "back to the future" orientations.

Summary

From the historical and contemporary empirical data above, it is evident that (1) the culture is shifting from individualism to collectivism and (2) from relationship to task behaviors, (3) although the culture is predominately masculine, feminine elements are emerging as a sign of a slow move from masculine to feminine behavior, (4) power distance continues to remain high across leadership models, (5) the culture seems shifting from short-term to long-term orientation, and (6) from low LUA to high uncertainty avoidance (HUA), (7) self-determinism continues to remain dominant mindset for Armenians, (8) the culture is less multi-active today than in the past, (9) there seem to be a shift from multi-active to linear time conscience, (10) the cyclical time concept is emerging among Armenians, and finally (11) the culture continues exhibit "back to the future" behavior.

Table 2 below provides a plausibility scale of cultural shift (high, medium, low, yes, no) observed from historical (Malakyan, 2012a) and contemporary empirical findings in light of eleven cultural constructs in the context of contemporary leadership models in Armenia.

TABLE 2
A PLAUSIBILITY SCALE OF CULTURAL SHIFT IN ARMENIA

Plausibility for Cultural Shifts: High, Medium, Low, Yes, No, Less, More	Armenian Church Leadership	National Leadership	Democratic Leadership
1. Individualism/collectivism (I/C)	*H: C CS: from I to C	H: I CS: from I to C	H: I CS: from I to C
2. Relationship/Task behaviors (R/T)	H: R-T CS: from R to T	H: R-T CS: from R to T	H: R-T CS: from R to T
3. Masculinity/femininity (M/F)	H: M CS: from M to medium F	H: M CS: from M to med. F	H: M CS: from M to high F
4. High power/low power distance (HPD/LPD)	H: HPD CS: no shift	H: HPD CS: no shift	H: HPD CS: no shift
5. Long-/short-term orientation (LTO/STO)	H: LTO CS: from STO to LTO	H: STO CS: from STO to LTO	H: STO CS: from STO to LTO
6. High uncertainty/low uncertainty avoidance (HUA/LUA)	H: HUA CS: from LUA to HUA	H: LUA CS: from LUA to HUA	H: LUA CS: from LUA to HUA
7. Self-determination/ fatalism (SD/FA)	H: SD CS: no shift	H: high SD CS: no shift	H: high SD CS: no shift

8. Time: multi-active (MA)	H: yes CS: from MA to L	H: yes CS: from MA to L	H: yes CS: from MA to L
9. Time: linear (L)	H: less CS: more	H: less CS: more	H: less CS: more
10. Time: cyclic (C)	H: no CS: from MA to C	H: no CS: from MA to C	H: no CS: from MA to C
11. Time: back to the future (BTF)	H: yes CS: no shift	H: yes CS: no shift	H: yes CS: no shift

*H – Historical findings from previous research (Malakyan, 2012b)
*CS – Cultural shift

Table 3 below provides a plausibility scale of leadership style shift (high, medium, low, yes, no) between *autocratic, democratic, willing laissez-faire* and *unwilling laissez-faire* leadership styles among leaders in Armenia as a result of cultural shifts:

1. Since the Armenian culture is shifting from individualistic to collectivistic mindset, it is highly plausible that the autocratic leadership style may shift to democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles.
2. Since the Armenian culture is shifting from relational to task behavior, it is highly plausible that the autocratic leadership style may shift to democratic and democratic to laissez-faire leadership style.
3. Although the Armenian culture continues to be masculine, feminine elements are emerging in the culture. Thus, it is plausible that the autocratic leadership style may gradually shift to democratic leadership style by tolerating more role shifts between men and women from masculine to feminine.
4. Since power distance continues to remain high across leadership models in Armenia, no leadership style shifts are expected. The autocratic style of leadership most likely will prevail among current generation.
5. Due to cultural shift from short- to log-term orientation (STO to LTO behavior), it is highly plausible that leadership style shift between autocratic and democratic leadership styles, while the laissez-faire leadership style may go through insignificant changes. The Church Leadership, that is the embodiment of LTO behavior, may take a leading role in society.
6. Due to cultural shift from low to high uncertainty avoidance (LUA to HUA behavior), it is highly plausible that leadership styles shift between autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire to enhance strategic planning, and national developmental plan.
7. Since self-determinism continues to remain dominant mindset for Armenians, no substantial shifts of leadership styles are expected. The self-deterministic mindset will most likely thrive among current generation leaders by fostering the democratization process in Armenia.
8. Due to a significant shifting from multi-active to linear, cyclic, and 'back to the future" time concept, it is highly plausible that that leadership styles shift between autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire to embrace intercultural dialogue, global exchange and multiculturalism.

TABLE 3
A PLAUSIBILITY SCALE OF LEADERSHIP STYLE SHIFT IN ARMENIA

Plausibility Leadership Style Shifts as a result of the cultural shift: High, Medium, Low, Yes, No, Less, More	Armenian autocratic leadership	Armenian democratic leadership	Armenian willing laissez-faire leadership	Armenian unwilling laissez-faire leadership
1. Individualism/collectivism (I/C)	CS: from I to C LSS: high	CS: from I to C LSS: high	CS: from I to C LSS: high	CS: from I to C LSS: high
2. Relationship/Task behaviors (R/T)	*CS: from R to T *LSS: high	CS: from R to T LSS: high	CS: from R to T LSS: high	CS: from R to T LSS: high
3. Masculinity/femininity (M/F)	CS: slow from M to F LSS: low	CS: slow from M to F LSS: medium	CS: slow from M to F LSS: medium	CS: slow from M to F LSS: medium
4. High power/low power distance (HPD/LPD)	CS: no shift LSS: no	CS: no shift LSS: no	CS: no shift LSS: no	CS: no shift LSS: no
5. Long-/short-term orientation (LTO/STO)	CS: from STO to LTO LSS: high	CS: from STO to LTO LSS: high	CS: from STO to LTO LSS: low	CS: from STO to LTO LSS: low
6. High uncertainty/low uncertainty avoidance (HUA/LUA)	CS: from LUA to HUA LSS: high	CS: from LUA to HUA LSS: high	CS: from LUA to HUA LSS: high	CS: from LUA to HUA LSS: high
7. Self-determination/ fatalism (SD/FA)	CS: no shift LSS: no	CS: no shift LSS: no	CS: no shift LSS: no	CS: no shift LSS: no
8. Time: multi-active (MA)	CS: from MA to L LSS: high	CS: from MA to L LSS: high	CS: from MA to L LSS: high	CS: from MA to L LSS: high
9. Time: linear (L)	CS: more LSS: yes	CS: more LSS: yes	CS: more LSS: yes	CS: more LSS: yes
10. Time: cyclic (C)	CS: from MA to C LSS: yes	CS: from MA to C LSS: yes	CS: from MA to C LSS: yes	CS: from MA to C LSS: yes
11. Time: back to the future (BTF)	CS: no shift LSS: no	CS: no shift LSS: no	CS: no shift LSS: no	CS: no shift LSS: no

*CS – Cultural shift
*LSS – Leadership style shift

Table 4 below provides a summary for the Armenian leadership styles from high to low within the existing Armenian leadership models as a result of historical research findings (Malakyan, 2012b):

1. The leadership style of Armenian Church leadership historically has shown high autocratic, medium democratic, no willing laissez-faire, and high unwilling laissez-faire leadership styles.
2. The leadership style of National leadership has shown predominately high autocratic, medium-low democratic, no willing laissez-faire, and high unwilling laissez-faire leadership styles.
3. The leadership style of Democratic leadership has been high autocratic medium democratic, no willing laissez-faire, and high unwilling laissez-faire.

In conclusion, it is evident that the autocratic leadership style has been dominant in all leadership models in Armenia. The average of democratic leadership style in Armenia has been medium-low. The willing laissez-faire leadership style has been lacking in all leadership styles in Armenia. The unwilling laissez-faire leadership style has been primarily high in all three contemporary leadership styles in Armenia.

TABLE 4
HISTORICAL LEADERSHIP STYLES WITHIN CURRENT LEADERSHIP MODELS

Historical Leadership Styles: High, Medium, Low, Yes, No	Autocratic leadership style	Democratic leadership style	Willing laissez-faire leadership style	Unwilling laissez-faire leadership style
Armenian Church Leadership	*H: high	H: medium	H: no	H: high
National Leadership	H: high	H: medium-low	H: no	H: high
Democratic Leadership	H: high	H: medium	H: no	H: high

*H – Historical findings from previous research (Malakyan, 2012b)

CONCLUSION

In this paper, attempts have been made to identify and report about the relationships between current cultural characteristics and leadership styles in Armenia. The literature and the result of this research clearly indicates that culture influences leadership behavior in various ways (House, 2004: 711; Harris, 2004: 21). Moreover, the empirical data of this research showed cultural shift in certain areas of the Armenian culture, and as a result, shifts of leadership styles were forecasted for current Church, National, and Democratic leadership in Armenia. It is evident that culture counts, which affects the behaviors of leaders (Harriss, 2004: 3).

Armenian Church Leadership

Historically, the Armenian Church has been primarily collectivistic, both relationship and task oriented, masculine, high power distance, long-term oriented, high uncertainty avoidance, predominately self-deterministic, multi-active and "back to the future" time oriented. In terms of leadership style, it has been autocratic, medium democratic, no willing laissez-faire, and high unwilling laissez-faire throughout history. Although the Armenian culture is shifting from individualism to collectivism, from masculinity to femininity, from STO to LTO, from LUA to HUA, from multi-active to linear and cyclic time, while maintaining strong "back to the future" time orientation, it is unlikely that the leadership style of the Armenian Church will experience a significant shift from autocratic to laissez-faire as a result of the cultural shift. However, the cultural shift, specifically a move toward femininity, may cause a slight shift from autocratic to democratic style of leadership among Armenian Church leaders. Thus, due to the cultural shift, it is more likely that the Armenian Church Leadership will demonstrate the following leadership behaviors:

- Collectivism: Hierarchical and less participatory behavior with nearly no delegative empowerment approach.
- Task orientation: Mostly demanding submissiveness and less results oriented behavior. Followers are not trusted to be more self-directive.
- Masculinity: mostly patronizing and assertive behaviors with minimum common achievements.
- High power distance: Superiority, more one-way and less two-way influence. Self-regulating lone-rangers are rear.
- Long- term orientation: Demanding respect for experience but fewer advocacies for long-term benefits. Creative strategizing behaviors are not valued.
- High uncertainty avoidance: Confidence in wisdom and experience, but less effective in minimizing social anxiety. Free and independent prevention behavior is not encouraged.
- Self-determinism: Charismatic leadership and yet lacks advocacy for collective free initiatives. Liberal thinking is somewhat suppressed.
- Time orientation: Dogmatic, organized and structured, playing by rules, and somewhat impractical and fatalistic with less contribution through reflection. Potential for multiculturalism and yet not fully utilized.

Armenian National Leadership

Historically, the Armenian National leadership has been primarily individualistic, both relationship and task oriented, masculine, high power distance, short-term oriented, low uncertainty avoidance, self-deterministic, multi-active, less linear, and "back to the future" time oriented. In terms of leadership style, it has been autocratic, medium-low democratic, no willing laissez-faire, and high unwilling laissez-faire. Since the Armenian culture is shifting from individualism to collectivism, from masculinity to femininity, from STO to LTO, from LUA to HUA, from multi-active to linear and cyclic time, while maintaining strong "back to the future" time orientation, it is more likely that the leadership style of the Armenian National Leadership will experience a significant shift from autocratic to democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles. Thus, due to the cultural shift, it is more likely that the Armenian National Leadership will demonstrate the following leadership behaviors:
- Collectivism: More tribal chieftaincy and less participatory approach to leadership with nearly no delegative and empowerment approach.
- Task orientation: Commanding subordinates and less results oriented behavior for common good. An unwillingness to share tasks and responsibilities. Followers are not trusted to be more self-directive.
- Masculinity: Discriminatory toward women and assertive behaviors with minimum common achievements.
- High power distance: Elitism and show off behavior with less mutuality in influence and relationships. Self-regulating lone-ranger are thread to the status quo.
- Long- term orientation: Totalitarian idealism with advocacy for short-term as opposed to long-term benefits. Creative strategizing behavior is an entitled privilege for the elite.
- High uncertainty avoidance: Pragmatic and yet less effective in minimizing social anxiety. Free and independent prevention behavior is an individual rather than collective phenomena.
- Self-determinism: Prideful directive with somewhat intimidating leadership behavior. Lacking advocacy for collective free enterprises. Liberal thinking is somewhat suppressed.
- Time orientation: Imposing ideas and structures, walking and dancing around the pool, impractical and fatalistic with less contribution through reflection and playing by rules. Potential for multiculturalism and yet not fully utilized.

Armenian Democratic Leadership

Historically, the Armenian National leadership has been primarily individualistic, both relationship and task oriented, primarily masculine, high power distance, short-term oriented, low uncertainty avoidance, self-deterministic and yet somewhat fatalistic, and being more multi-active and "back to the

future" time oriented. In terms of leadership style, it has been medium autocratic, medium democratic, no willing laissez-faire, and high unwilling laissez-faire.

Since the Armenian culture is shifting from individualism to collectivism, from masculinity to femininity, from STO to LTO, from LUA to HUA, from multi-active to linear and cyclic time, while maintaining strong "back to the future" time orientation, it is more likely that the leadership style of the Armenian Democratic Leadership will experience a significant shift from autocratic to democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles. Thus, due to the cultural shift, it is more likely that the Armenian Democratic Leadership will demonstrate the following leadership behaviors:

- Collectivism: More oligarchic and less participatory approach to leadership with hardly delegative or empowerment approach.
- Task orientation: Authoritarian executive with less results oriented behavior for common good. An unwillingness to allow followers be more self-directive.
- Masculinity: Authoritarian assertiveness as opposed to mutual collaboration across genders with minimum common achievements.
- High power distance: Top-down influence with less mutuality in influence and relationships. Self-regulating lone-ranger are thread to the established oligarchy.
- Long- term orientation: Pragmatic totalitarian with no concern for long-term benefits. Creative strategizing behavior is an oligarchic privilege.
- High uncertainty avoidance: Lone-ranger strategist and yet less effective in minimizing social anxiety. Free and independent prevention behavior is an individual rather than collective phenomena.
- Self-determinism: Self-imposed popularity with somewhat indifference toward public opinion. Lacking advocacy for collective free enterprises. Liberal thinking is somewhat ignored.
- Time orientation: Bureaucratic, imposed structures, walking and dancing around the pool, impractical and fatalistic with less contribution through reflection and playing by rules. Potential for multiculturalism and yet not fully utilized.

Table 5 below provides a predictability scale for leadership behavior among contemporary Armenian Church, National, and Democratic leaders in light of eight cultural themes. It is evident that (a) the autocratic leadership style is the dominant style among all three leadership models, (b) the democratic leadership style falls under medium-low range, (c) while the laissez-faire leadership style is non-existence.

TABLE 5
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR PREDICTABILITY SCALE FOR ARMENIAN CHURCH, NATIONAL, AND DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP MODELS

Predictable leadership behavior for Church, National, and Democratic Leadership		Autocratic leadership style DOMINANT	Democratic leadership style MEDIUM-LOW	Laissez-faire leadership style NON-EXISTENCE
C U L T U R A L S H I F T S	Collectivistic	*C: Hierarchical *N: Tribal chieftaincy *D: Oligarchic	Participatory	Delegative empowerment
	Task orientation	C: Demanding obedience N: Commanding subordinates D: Authoritarian executive	Result oriented for common good	Self-directive
	Masculinity	C: Patronizing N: Discriminatory D: Authoritarian assertive	Mutual collaboration	Common achievements
	High power distance	C: Superiority N: Elitism D: Top-down influence	Two-way influence	Self-regulating lone-ranger
	Long- term orientation	C: Demanding respect N: Totalitarian idealism D: Pragmatic totalitarian	Advocating for long-term benefits	Creative strategizing
	High uncertainty avoidance	C: Confident wisdom N: Pragmatic D: Lone-ranger strategist	Minimizing social anxiety	Free and independent prevention
	Self-determinism	C: Charismatic leadership N: Prideful directive D: Self-imposed popularity	Advocating for collective free initiatives	Liberal thinking
	Time orientation: linear, cyclical, & back to the future	C: Dogmatic • L - organized and structured • B to F - Impractical fatalist N: Imposing • L - organized and structured • C - Dancing politician • B to F - Impractical fatalist D: Bureaucratic • L - organized and structured • C - Dancing politician • B to F - Impractical fatalist	Linear: playing by rules Cyclic: Holistic thinking Back to the future: contributing through reflection	Existing multicultural skills

*C – Church Leadership behavior
*N – National Leadership behavior
*D – Democratic Leadership behavior

RECOMMENDATION

This paper has addressed historical and contemporary cultural characteristics, and leadership styles among current leadership models in Armenia. Attempts have been made to assess and interpret the relationships between Armenian cultural characteristics and leadership styles and how the latter has been influenced and shaped by the former. Furthermore, the Armenian leadership behavior was predicted on the basis of the empirical finding of this study and how the cultural shifts may influence and cause shifts in leadership styles in the future. The remaining question to be addressed is: "What are the most culturally relevant and intercultural applicable leadership styles for Armenia to face the challenges of the 21st century globalized world?" To be able to answer this question, let us turn to the theory of interculturation as an integrative approach to intercultural leadership in Armenia.

The theory of interculturation entails three processes: (1) acculturation or assimilation of values other than one's own, (2) differentiation through the recognition of one's unique specificities, and (3) original synthesis, which assumes creation of a new and encompassing reality (Sam & Berry, 2006: 360). In other words, interculturation in all three levels deals with identity orientation, in this case, Armenian identity orientation. As most minority groups, Armenians seem most concerned for identity loss or total assimilation under the influence of westernization, often referred to globalization. Interculturation, however, addresses that concern by operating from both identity inclusive and identity security perspective. Both inclusivity and security of one's identity provides greater capacity to engage in cooperative intercultural relationships (Deardorff, 2009: 58-59). [3] In other words, the theory of interculturation provides a theoretical framework for leaders in the Armenian culture to be more inclusive and engaging with the world without a fear of assimilation due to its strong and secure cultural identity. The outcome of such relationship should be new integrative realities for both Armenians and the world.

Acculturation

As much as the Armenian culture is experiencing change and cultural shifts from individualism to collectivist, from relationship to task orientation, from STO to LTO, from LUA to HUA, from multi-active to linear and cyclic time, while maintaining strong "back to the future" time orientation, so do the Armenian leadership styles. They are shaped and influenced by the culture and change is inevitable. Thus, leaders must learn to adapt to new leadership styles practiced and utilized by other cultures and countries. In other words, Armenian leaders must learn how to be acculturated into global culture and the demands of the 21st century globalization economically through the exchange of information, experience, and ideas "to become more alike through trade" (Sam & Berry, 2006: 20) for the benefit of the Armenian people and the prosperity of the country. Such acculturation, according to the *interculturation* theory, does not assume a full assimilation to foreign cultural values or a way of life and the denial of ones' own cultural identity and values.

Differentiation

Differentiation anticipates that Armenians maintain their unique cultural specificities and its effective leadership tradition by (1) sustaining what has been working and useful in the past for generations that preserved Armenia and its national identity, and (2) utilizing its potential to face future challenges. In other words, Armenian leaders in Armenia must preserve their national and cultural identity without becoming fully "westernized" often referred to "cultural homogenization of the world" (Schultz & Lavenda, 2012: 381) at the expense of their own ethnic, cultural, religious, and national identity.

Original Synthesis

As stated earlier, instead of completely rejecting what is non-Armenian way of life and becoming an isolated nation, Armenian leaders must absorb global challenges in political, religious, economic, and social levels. Nor do they need to fully be assimilated with what is completely foreign or non-Armenian. Rather, by embracing what is non-Armenian for the benefit of the Armenian people and by keeping what is Armenian for the benefit of the Armenian people, to form a new culture (Sam & Berry, 2006: 19) and

create new and encompassing realities that are culturally relevant and interculturally applicable approaches for mutual dialog and co-existence (Harris, 2004: 26). Within this paradoxical dynamic, where, in one hand, transformation takes place in the system due to the interaction between Armenian and global cultures, on the other hand, both systems maintain their own identities. As a result, interculturation provides transformation and coexistence while both sides go though the processes of acculturation, differentiation, and original synthesis (Sam & Berry, 2006: 360). Below, I offer specific integrative approaches to intercultural leadership Armenian by employing the theory of interculturation.

Integrative Approach to Intercultural Leadership in Armenia

Since Armenian leadership, as seen above, has been autocratic from pre-historic times to the present, it would be premature to expect a Western-type democracy to flourish and prosper in Armenia. First, the Western democracy cannot be exported in of itself, without a conscious acculturation and adaptation of its values by the Armenian people. Historically, the latter has not been a part of people's worldview, understanding, and experience. Second, Armenians, as one of the ancient civilizations, has had its own democratic principles and practices that must be acknowledged and preserved even today as a part of their cultural heritage (Libaridian, 1999: 126). For instance, the Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church, one of the oldest hierarchical religious institutions in the world, has had a centuries-long tradition for democratic election of their Supreme Patriarch, the Catholicos, by two-third of laity and one-third of clergy votes (Ormanian, 1955, pp. 136-137). Thus, Armenia must create its own version of democracy (original synthesis) by integrating its traditional autocratic democracy and cultural values with Western democratic values that encourages human creativity, unleashes human potential, and gives equal opportunities to the members of society to participate in democratic processes. As Hofstede puts it: "Structure should follow culture" (1997: 229).

As seen above, all three leadership models, Armenian Church, National, and Democratic, demonstrate autocratic leadership style and lack lassez-faire style. As a result, new oligarchs, a handful of businessmen-politicians (oxymoron in of itself) have emerged in Armenia during the post-Soviet era, who keep Armenia's economy hostage today. As a result, the gap between wealthy and poor is most high since the country's independence. [4] Ironically, Armenians outside Armenia live relatively prosperous life (e.g. Europe, Middle East, America, Russia), but most Armenians in Armenia are poor. The leaders of Armenia have been unable to pull the country out of poverty and reduce the brain drain.

Therefore, current Armenian leaders must make a conscious decision to unleash the creative and entrepreneur spirit of the ordinary citizens by integrating the traditional autocratic with lassez-faire leadership style, or adapt to more deligative style of leadership. Since the Armenian people is capable and willing to engage in the democratization processes, according to the situational leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1996: 208), they must be delegated and released for building their own and the country's destiny. The Democratic Leadership is as autocratic and non-lassez-faire as Church and National leadership. Hence, the traditional models of democratic leadership may be integrated with lassez-faire style to enhance individual freedom and hands-off self-actualization. Thus, the government leaders of Armenia today must be less controlling and more delegating by allowing their citizens to act, produce, invent, and innovate for the common good of the Armenian society (Crosby & Bryson, 2005: 187-192).

RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research indicates that the Armenian culture influences leadership behavior and the cultural shift in certain areas of the Armenian culture causes shifts of leadership styles. If leaders' behaviors are contingent upon the cultural characteristics and leadership styles, as seen in the case of Armenia, then by studying cultural characteristics and leadership styles one may predict leadership behaviors. If the above hypothesis is true for the Armenian culture, it may also be true for other cultures. Thus, further research is needed to detect leadership behavioral patterns in other cultures and whether or not leadership behaviors may be predicted across cultures.

ENDNOTES

1. The majority population in Armenia is female (53.46%), according to World Bank report published in 2012. http://www.tradingeconomics.com/armenia/population-female-percent-of-total-wb-data.html
2. The GLOBE research project findings affirm that in countries where leaders are more autocratic and less visionary (e.g. Middle East, France) the autocratic leadership style is more effective (House, 2004: 334). Thus, the Armenian leadership style being characterized predominately as autocratic in all leadership models for centuries, will most likely prevail and continue being viewed as a dominant and effective leadership style, much like in Middle East.
3. Young Yun Kim, in "The Identity Factor in Intercultural Competence" argues for inclusive and security identity orientation as two facets of intercultural competence:
   Theorem 1: The more inclusive an individual's identity orientation, the greater his or her capacity to engage in cooperative intercultural relationships.
   Theorem 2: The more secure an individual's identity orientation of an individual, the greater his or her capacity to engage in cooperative intercultural relationships.
   See Deardorff's *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence*, Sage Publications, Inc. (2009: 53-65).
4. See the following links:
   - Massis Post (2011). WikiLeaks on Armenian oligarchs: Who controls what in Armenia. Retrieved from Massis Weekly's Online Newsletter http://massispost.com/archives/4097
   - 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.

REFERENCES

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*, 3rdedition. 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.

Clanet, C. (1990). *L' Interculturel: Introduction aux approches interculturelles en éducation et en sciences humaines*. Toulouse, France: Presses Universitaires du Mirail.

Crosby, B. C. & J. M. Bryson (2005). *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World*. San Francisco, CA: Josse-Bass.

Deardorff, D. (2009). *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence*, Sage Publications, Inc.

Doob, L. W. (1988). *Inevitability: Determinism, Fatalism, and Destiny*. Praeger Publishers.

Erickson, P. and L. Murphy (2008). *A History of Anthropological Theory*, 3rd edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

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.

Harris, P.R., Moran, R.T. & Virgilia Moran, S. (2004). *Managing Cultural Differences: Global Leadership Strategies for the 21st Century*. Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hersey, P. K H. Blanchard & D. E. Johnson (1996). *Management of Organizational Behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 7th edition.

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 Publication.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W. & V. Gupta (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

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. (1999). *The challenge of statehood: Armenian political thinking since independence*. Watertown, MA: Blue Crane Books.

Malakyan, P (2012a). 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

Malakyan, P (2012b). Anthropology of Leadership: An Armenian Perspective. Submitted for publication in *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics* in March, 2013 with North American Business Press, Inc. www.na-businesspress.com

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*. New York: William Morrow.

Mulder, M. (1977). *The Daily Power Game*. Leiden, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.

Ormanian, M. (1955). *The Church of Armenia*. London, England: A. R. Mowbray.

Sam, D. L. & J. W. Berry (2006). *Acculturation Psychology*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Schultz, E. & R. H. Lavenda (2012). *Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
ANTHROPOLOGY OF LEADERSHIP: A CASE STUDY IN ARMENIA

1. What is more important cultural value for you? ☐ Values of the individual; ☐ Values of the group or community; ☐ Both
2. I am concerned with the needs, goals, and interests of ☐ individuals, ☐ groups, ☐ both

Questions 3-72, likened scale: Strongly agree / Agree / Not sure / Disagree / Strongly disagree

3 (C). The individuals' opinion is not as important as the society's. Therefore, leaders in the Armenian culture tend to focus more on the needs of the society than the individuals'.
4 (C). Leaders in the Armenian culture tend to make group decisions. Therefore, they usually respect the opinions of their followers.
5 (C). I believe leaders must be more altruistic (selfless) than narcissistic (selfish), because my culture teaches us to be less selfish.
6 (I). I make independent decisions in life and at work and the opinions of other do not matter much to me.
7 (I). I believe the society should serve the needs of the individual instead of the individual serving the needs of the society.
8 (I). Individual values are higher priority for me. Therefore I advocate more for individual rights than group.
9 (C). I am ready to sacrifice anything for my siblings, friends, and family, because they are part of my life. Therefore, I take care of my family and friends first before I do anything for myself.
10 (C). Values such as respecting elders, patronage loyalty, and belongingness are a part of my cultural identity. Therefore, I follow the advice of those who are older and more experienced than me.
11 (I). In my culture, the privacy of the individual is respected and protected.
12. The relationships are more important than tasks in my culture. Therefore, I tend to maintain good relationships with people than get more things done.
13. When my friend suddenly shows up at work, I gladly put aside my tasks or work-plans and spend time with my friend.
14. At work, I get irritated when people interrupt me in the middle of a task. Therefore, I do not allow people, even my friends, get in the way between my work and me.
15. In my culture, people tend to be more task-oriented. Therefore we prefer to get more things done at work than socializing with people.
16. I like to set concrete goals and deadlines for myself and for people who work for me or with me.
17. At work, people are a high priority for me than business transactions. Therefore, in my culture, it may seem disrespectful to 'talk business' upon first arrival.
18. For me, efficiency and excellence at work are high priorities. Therefore, I do not sacrifice my work for the sake of relationships.
19. In my culture, material success is more valued than healthy lifestyle (e.g. exercise, healthy diet). Therefore, I tend to spend more time on making money than exercising.
20. Men and women have very distinct roles in our culture. Therefore, I do not do certain tasks due to my gender.
21. Social gender roles are not strictly distinguished in my culture. Therefore both men and women may engage in similar activities such as doing laundry, house cleaning, baby-sitting, etc.
22. In general, there are certain roles, such as leadership, that women would not pursue in my culture.
23. Men in my culture do not expose to vulnerability, such as admitting or showing their weaknesses or emotions.
24. In my culture, females are expected to be modest and tender, while men should demonstrate toughness and assertiveness.

25. Most females in my culture tend to choose to follow a strong man rather than being a strong female leader.

26. The distance between leadership and followership roles in my society is big.

27. Leaders are approachable in my culture.

28. In my culture, both leadership and followership are equally valuable human functions.

29. Leadership in my culture is associated with power, while followership – powerlessness.

30. In my culture, I observe power distances between men and women.

31. In my culture, I observe power distances between husband and wife.

32. In my culture, I observe power distances between parents and children.

33. In my culture, I observe power distances between teachers and students.

34. In my culture, I observe power distances between leaders and followers.

35. In my culture, I observe power distances between clergymen and laity.

36. In my culture, I observe power distances between economically Rich and Poor.

37. In my culture, I observe power distances between those who hold university diplomas and those who have secondary education.

38. In my culture, I observe power distances between younger and older generations.

39. If "A" is true then "non-A" (the opposite of A) must be false. For instance, in my culture, we operate from true-false, right-wrong, and good-bad mindset.

40. If "A' is true then "non-A" may also be true and together they may produce superior wisdom. For instance, in my culture, we operate from relativistic mindset that values all aspects of reality to be virtuous.

41. In my culture, people tend to seek immediate gratifications, consumption, spending, and enjoyment of life. For instance, I prefer to spend what I have today than save things for tomorrow.

42. I value planning, persistence, perseverance, and saving. Therefore, I live with a sense of delayed gratification and anticipations what the future might unfold.

43. I tend to show hospitality and generosity to people by spending more than I have, because I feel socially obligated.

44. In my cultural tradition, people tend to focuses on their immediate needs without having long-term plans. For instance, families share with others what they have to preserve 'face" and fulfill family and kinship responsibilities.

45. People in my culture tend to strategize the future and seem to know what their plans are for the next three or five years.

46. I defend myself against life uncertainties by being proactive and preventive.

47. I accept uncertainties as a reality of life, because there is not much I can do to prevent things from happening. Therefore, I do not feel anxious or threatened by unknown situations.

48. I consciously avoid all possible uncertainties that the future might bring in various circumstances.

49. I deal with problems as they arrive, because the future is uncertain and events cannot be predicted.

50. I tend to go to the doctor whenever I have pain.

51. When something is uncertain or do not understand I tend to get anxious.

52. I usually deal with the past and present realities and tend not to worry about the future.

53. I am confident that I can have control over my life and determine my own future with my own plans and actions.

54. It is not fate but personal choices that determine one's destiny. Therefore, I tend to act out of free will with an understanding that my future is in my hands.

55. The personal freedom is an illusion. It is fate that governs people's destinies.

56. Human free will cannot change anything in life, because past, present, and future events have already been determined.

57. An effort to prevent something from happening or changing one's future is useless.

58. I agree with the status quo and accept life as a fate that cannot be changed.

59. Social class and status are not static realities, but subject for change if one is determined to change them.

60. I cannot change anything in life, because it has already been predetermined.

61. Life is a lineal progression through the past, present, and the future (linear). Therefore, I believe in human progression.

62. I focus on one thing at a time and do things one at a time. For instance, I do not jump from one conversation or task to the next. Rather, I tend to complete one conversation or task before moving to the next.

63. People in my culture tend to be punctual and time conscious. Therefore, we like to work under fixed hours.

64. I do many things at the same time and not interested in schedules and punctuality. Therefore, I like working under flexible hours.

65. For me, people matter more than tasks. Therefore I tend to be less organized person at work.

66. My relational personality makes me more people pleasing and less organized person in working environments.

67. There is nothing new under the sun. Each day rises and sets with the son. Therefore, life is a cycle.

68. The past determines the present, and the present projects the future in a cyclical rather than lineal fashion. Therefore, life is like a wheel that rotates constantly.

69. It is not easy for me to make quick decisions, because I must have enough time to assess, reflect, and evaluate.

70. The future is unknowable, the present is uncertain or vaguely understood, but the past is visible and influential.

71. In my culture, buses leave when it is full and shelves or gas-tanks are re-filled when they become empty.

72. I tend to talk more about the past than about the future.