

Humane Orientation as a Moral Construct in Ethical Leadership Theories: A Comparative Analysis of Transformational, Servant, and Authentic Leadership in the United States, Mexico, and China

Elizabeth Kathrina Hunt*

Abstract

The present paper presents the GLOBE leadership behaviour of humane orientation as a moral construct within the ethical leadership theories of transformational leadership, servant leadership, and authentic leadership. A discussion of the country cultures of the United States, China, and Mexico and an articulation of how each of these theories is received and practiced in response to the leadership behaviour of humane orientation support the use of these theories in all three countries' cultures. In particular, the use of these theories may be advantageous in increasing the use of humane-oriented behaviours in these country cultures, which supports an expressed humane orientation value in the United States, China, and Mexico.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership, Servant Leadership, Authentic Leadership, Humane Orientation, Ethical Leadership

Introduction

The study of leadership theory includes assessing and understanding how culture affects practice, effectiveness, and support of specific leadership behaviours within each leadership theory. The GLOBE study (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorman, & Gupta, 2004) assessed a variety of cultural values in relation to leadership behaviours, providing a plethora of significant data regarding cultural leadership practices, values, and effectiveness.

The present paper focuses on the GLOBE leadership behaviour humane orientation. Humane orientation is presented as a moral construct within ethical leadership theories, including transformational leadership, servant leadership, and authentic leadership. Finally, in a review of transformational leadership, servant leadership, and authentic leadership in relation to cultural values and practices in the United States, China, and Mexico, it will be shown that the humane orientation behaviours as represented in the ethical leadership theories discussed can enhance and support current humane orientation practices and support efforts to increase humane orientation within those countries.

Culture and Leadership

Schein (1984) defined organisational culture as a “pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid, and therefore taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (p. 3). Cortes and Wilkinson (2009) supported this definition as applicable to cultures overall by indicating that cultures add to personal belief systems and worldviews, group-based tendencies, values, and perceptions. Cultures include geographic, national, transnational, racial, and ethnic groups, as well as, age, gender, religion, sexual orientation, language, and differential abilities groups (Cortes & Wilkinson, 2009, p. 19).

* Assistant Professor and Co-Chair of Communication and Director of Character in Leadership, University of Jamestown, United States. Email: elizhun@mail.regent.edu

Culture changes constantly and members of a particular culture transmit those changes to other members (Northouse, 2016). Schein (1984) indicated that culture is “invented, discovered, or developed” on the basis of external adaptation or a group’s need to survive in the outside environment, and internal integration, or a group’s need to manage itself (Schein, 1984, p. 9). A culture strives to understand and put into perspective the very nature of humanity, relationships, time and space, and reality and truth (Schein, 1984, p. 14).

Yukl (2013) noted that cultural values and traditions influence leaders, but situational variables are mediators in how a leader’s behaviour is actually enacted. Situational variables can include the type of organisation or industry and the specific leadership role. Schein (1984) supported this premise by reporting that the content of culture and the situation may be more critical than overall culture and traditions. As well, he posited that organisations may have more than one culture simultaneously (Schein, 1984). Finally, House *et al.* (2004) presented both cultural values and cultural practices for the leadership constructs assessed in the GLOBE study. Values and practice may not align due to a variety of moderating reasons, supporting the idea that leadership attributes can be culturally sensitive (House *et al.*, 2004).

The GLOBE study identified 22 leadership attributes which were assessed to formulate six overall global leadership behaviours. The initial 22 leadership attributes included being trustworthy, intelligent, just, decisive, encouraging, informed, administratively skilled, communicative, a motive arouser, a team builder, positive, excellence-oriented, dynamic, a coordinator, dependable, a confidence builder, a win-win problem solver, motivational, honest, effective bargainer, planning ahead, and having foresight (Hyatt, Evans, & Haque, 2009). These leadership attributes resulted in the global leadership behaviours of charismatic/value-based leadership, team-oriented leadership, participative leadership, humane-oriented leadership, autonomous leadership, and self-protective leadership (House *et al.*, 2004). Charismatic/value-based leadership includes behaviours that inspire and motivate followers through being visionary, inspirational, self-sacrificial, having integrity, being decisive, and being performance-oriented (p. 14). Team-oriented leadership supports a common goal using collaboration, integration, diplomacy, administrative competence, and malevolence (reverse scored) (p. 14). Participative leadership

encourages participation of followers in decision-making and planning (p. 14). Humane-oriented leadership focuses on supporting and showing compassion towards followers (p. 14). Autonomous leadership refers to very independent and individualistic leadership behaviours (p. 14). Finally, self-protective leadership focuses on ensuring safety for the leader and group through face-saving and status conscious behaviours (p. 14).

The cultural dimensions used in the GLOBE study included uncertainty avoidance, power distance, institutional collectivism, in-group collectivism, gender egalitarianism, assertiveness, and future-orientation (House *et al.*, 2004). Power distance describes the degree that members of a group believe power should be distributed equally (House *et al.*, 2004, p. 30). Uncertainty avoidance concerns the way that a culture relies on social norms and rules to lessen the uncertainty of the future (p. 30). Humane orientation refers to the degree to which a culture rewards people for being fair, caring, and altruistic (p. 30). Institutional collectivism concerns the extent to which cultures encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action (p. 30). In-group collectivism focuses on the extent to which people are proud of and loyal to their culture or group (p. 30). Assertiveness includes how assertive, confrontational, and aggressive individuals behave (p. 30). Gender egalitarianism represents the extent that gender inequality is minimised (p. 30). Future orientation reflects the degree that people look toward and plan for the future and delay immediate pleasures (p. 30). Finally, performance orientation relates to how groups support and encourage meeting goals and performance standards (p. 30).

The cultural dimensions and leadership behaviours can be utilised to understand, predict, and assess leadership theories within various cultures. However, as both Schein (1984) and House *et al.* (2004) noted, particular situational variables and specific organisational culture and design can affect the use or effectiveness of specific leader behaviours regardless of cultural values or practices.

Humane Orientation and Morality

Definition of Humane Orientation

House *et al.* (2004) presented cultural humane orientation as the extent to which a culture rewards individuals for being kind, caring, and altruistic (p. 30). Humane

leadership behaviour is described as being supportive and compassionate toward followers (p. 14). Within the conception of humane leadership behaviour are values of altruism, benevolence, kindness, love, and generosity (p. 565). Humane-oriented leaders are expected to be “unpretentious, show humility, and do not boast. They are empathetic and likely to help and support team members in a humane manner by offering resources and other forms of assistance” (House, Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, & Sully de Luque, 2013). House *et al.* (2004) indicated that within humane orientation there is a quest for self-transcendence and practice of universalism and benevolence (p. 565). Universalism includes understanding, tolerance, and protectiveness. Benevolence includes social and financial support. Both practices encourage a more humane orientation to others.

Humane Orientation as a Moral Construct

Societies that value humane orientation have a general concern for improving the “human condition” (House *et al.*, 2004, p. 165). House *et al.* (2004) presented historical and societal influences on humane orientation, including the moral philosophies of Aristotle and Plato indicating that friendship and love, with or without affection, support the construct of humane orientation. As well, world religions such as Judaism, Christianity, and Islam support humane orientation by associating behaviours and duties with goodness and humanitarianism (House *et al.*, 2004). Eastern religions such as Buddhism and Taoism also support humane orientation through belief in harmony with the universe and restraint of base behaviours (House *et al.*, 2004).

The morality of behaviour implicitly underlies these perspectives. The word moral means “of or relating to principles of right conduct or the distinction between right and wrong” (n.d.). House *et al.*, (2004) discussed the construct of humane orientation as supported by a strong sense of public morality. Public morality supports congruence with the traditions, rules, and laws of a particular group or culture, indicating that humane orientation’s expression of moral behaviour may be culturally different. Regardless of specific culture, moral behaviour is associated with choosing right and good behaviour over wrong and bad based on the moral standards prescribed by that culture’s laws, traditions, and basic regard for human life.

Altruism presents itself as one of the supporting ideas presented in conceptions of humane orientation. Altruism or “principle or practice of unselfish concern for or devotion to the welfare of others” (n.d.) derives from a moral perspective. Determining which principles and practices should be deemed unselfish must come from a basic understanding of what is right and wrong behaviour, or a moral foundation.

Humane orientation’s concern with right and wrong conduct, its concern with ethical behaviour, and its practice of altruistic behaviours make it a moral construct. Kohlberg (as cited in Northouse, 2016) presented six stages of moral development which are divided into three levels, pre-conventional morality, conventional morality, and post-conventional morality. Pre-conventional morality includes the stages of obedience and punishment and individualism and exchange (Northouse, 2016). The pre-conventional morality level bases reasoning on the self, avoiding punishment and gaining rewards. Conventional morality includes the stages of interpersonal accord and conformity and maintaining social order (Northouse, 2016). The conventional morality level bases reasoning on what society thinks and expects. Post-conventional morality includes the stages of social contract and individual rights and universal principles (Northouse, 2016). The post-conventional morality level bases reasoning on personal conscience and a just society. Humane orientation calls for level three post-conventional morality, which includes ethical and altruistic behaviour despite societal expectations and without seeking reward or credit. Humane-oriented leaders are interested in doing what is right for others despite consequences and because it will improve the “human condition” (House *et al.*, 2004). Leaders that exhibit a humane orientation practice ethical leadership and engage in altruistic behaviours that are supported by post-conventional morality. The foundation of moral principles and behaviour and the practice of altruistic behaviour are key in understanding how the construct of humane orientation presents itself in various ethical leadership theories.

Ethical Leadership Theories and Humane Orientation

Northouse (2016) indicated that ethics are central to leadership. Resick, Hanges, Dickson, and Mitchelson (2006) defined ethical leadership as “leading in a manner

that respects the rights and dignity of others” (p. 346). A number of scholars, including Eisenbeiss and Brodbeck (2014) and Ciulla (1995) supported ethical leadership as including a deep respect and concern for human dignity. Ethics are concerned with the “common good” and civility and a consideration of how personal actions affect others (Resick *et al.*, 2006, p. 347). The particular acts of “humility, loyalty, virtue, generosity, and forgiveness” (p. 346), exemplify ethical leadership characteristics. Central to ethical leader character is integrity, which includes determining and engaging in correct moral behaviour (Resick *et al.*, 2006). A keen ethical awareness or an ability to perceive and understand moral issues that affect decisions supports the construct of integrity (Resick *et al.*, 2006).

Resick *et al.*, (2006) noted four culturally universal attributes of ethical leadership, which include character and integrity, altruism, collective motivation, and encouragement. Eisenbeiss and Brodbeck (2014) and Ciulla (1995) supported altruism as a key characteristic of ethical leadership. Eisenbeiss and Brodbeck (2014) indicated that ethical leaders show people orientation, see the interconnectedness of humans, and are concerned with the well-being of others. Resick *et al.* (2006) also supported the connection between altruism and community/people-orientation.

Eisenbeiss (2012), in an interdisciplinary analysis of Western and Eastern conceptions of ethical behaviour, formulated four central components of ethical leadership including humane orientation, justice orientation, responsibility and sustainability orientation, and moderation orientation. Justice orientation refers to “making fair and consistent decisions and not discriminating against others” (Eisenbeiss, 2012, p. 796). Responsibility and sustainability orientation refers to a “leader’s long-term views on success and their concern for the welfare of society and the environment” (Eisenbeiss, 2012, p. 796). Moderation orientation includes “temperance and humility and balanced leader behaviour” (Eisenbeiss, 2012, p. 797). Finally, human orientation includes treating others with “dignity and respect and to see them as ends not as means”, compassion, charity and altruism (Eisenbeiss, 2012, p. 795). Current ethical leadership theory discusses aspects of humane orientation in regards to leader altruism, leader respect for others, and

leader people orientation (Eisenbeiss, 2012). Moral action and behaviour create a foundation for ethical leadership. Altruism and people oriented behaviours that result in good for others are examples of those moral actions and behaviours expected of ethical leaders. Altruistic and people oriented behaviours support the construct of humane orientation, making humane orientation a moral construct present in ethical leadership theories.

Eisenbeiss (2012) noted that “a leader’s morality and ethical conduct have been - more or less explicitly—addressed as an element in well-established leadership theories: particularly in transformational leadership, authentic leadership, spiritual leadership, and servant leadership” (p. 792). Specifically, transformational leadership supports high ethical standards for leaders, servant leadership articulates service and responsibility, and authentic leadership engages in ethical consideration of consequences (Eisenbeiss, 2012). The discussion of humane orientation as it relates to transformational leadership, servant leadership, and authentic leadership that follows supports humane orientation as a construct within these ethical leadership theories.

Servant Leadership

Servant leadership theory traces its roots back to the writings of Greenleaf (2008) who articulated servant leadership as stemming from a natural inclination to want to serve others. Greenleaf (2008) indicated that the test of servant leadership is found in assessing the following questions, “Do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?” (p. 15). Since Greenleaf’s conception of servant leadership, a variety of conceptual models have been developed and tested.

Patterson (2003) articulated servant leadership in the form of virtuous behaviours which include love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service. Winston (2003) extended Patterson’s (2003) model to include a circular relationship of follower love, commitment to the leader, self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, altruism toward the leader, and finally, follower service (p. 6). Finally, Winston and Fields (2015) indicated that servant leadership included ten specific behaviours: 1)

practicing what you preach; 2) serving people regardless of differences; 3) serving as a mission and responsibility to others; 4) showing interest in followers as people; 5) serving others as most important; 6) making sacrifices for others; 7) seeking to instill trust over fear; 8) honesty; 9) being driven by a higher calling; and 10) promoting values that transcend self-interest and material success (p. 424). Keys to Greenleaf (2008), Patterson (2003), Winston (2003), and Winston and Fields (2009) are ethical and altruistic consideration of others.

Northouse (2016) described servant leadership as a paradox. Servant leadership puts the follower first, empowering them to meet their full potential (Northouse, 2016). Putting follower's needs first may include nurturing, defending, empowering, and standing up for justice (Yukl, 2013). Servant leadership theory focuses on behaviours used by leaders to support follower development (Northouse, 2016; Winston & Fields, 2015). By using these particular behaviours, a servant leader puts followers first, supports their development, and eventually followers will mimic and reciprocate these behaviours (Winston & Fields, 2015). In essence, a servant leader acts as a steward of both the organisation and the members of the organisation through service to followers first (Winston & Fields, 2015). Winston and Ryan (2008) presented servant leadership as a humane orientation based on the models of servant leadership presented by Patterson (2003) and Winston (2003), particularly with regards to the characteristics of "humility, care, concern, benevolence, altruism, service, fairness, and a friendship related definition of love" (p. 220). Most servant leadership theories focus on humility, the needs of others, and duty and social responsibility (Winston & Ryan, 2008), making it compatible with the humane orientation concept as presented in the GLOBE study.

Transformational Leadership

James McGregor Burns first developed a conceptualisation of transformational leadership in 1978 (Yukl, 2013). Burns' conception of leadership contrasted transactional leadership, or leadership associated with the exchange of goods, with transformational leadership which aims to use the moral values of followers to mobilise them to reform organisations and institutions in which they live and work. The idea of transformational leadership has evolved over the years, and now most theories include the attainment of organisational goals and tasks rather than elevating moral

awareness. Regardless of these fundamental changes, transformational leadership remains linked to trust in the leader, inspirational and motivating behaviours, and an engagement of new ideas (Yukl, 2013).

Yukl (2013) presented Bass's articulation of transformational leadership as the most widely used. Bass identified four leadership behaviours central to transformational leadership: idealised influence, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and inspirational motivation. Idealised influence includes behaviour that will increase a follower's ability to identify with the leader. Intellectual stimulation includes behaviours that encourage followers to see problems and situations from a new perspective. Individual consideration is engaged by providing support, encouragement, and coaching or mentoring. Finally, inspirational motivation is a leader's ability to articulate a clear and appealing vision (Yukl, 2013).

Eisenbeiss and Brodbeck (2014) presented moral and ethical conduct as core dimensions of charismatic and transformational leadership theories. Brown and Trevino (2006) identified the idealised influence dimension as the most ethically supported dimension of transformational leadership. Idealised influence as an ethical dimension supports the dimension of individual consideration and guides the morality of all dimensions within transformational leadership. Individual consideration engages the leader in altruistic behaviours such as supporting, encouraging, and mentoring. Therefore, individual consideration expresses humane orientation within transformational leadership.

Authentic Leadership

Authentic leadership currently exists in a formative stage (Northouse, 2016). Authentic leadership focuses on whether or not the leader is "real" (Northouse, 2016). Avolio and Gardner (2005) stressed authenticity as "owning one's personal experiences, be they thoughts, emotions, needs, wants, preferences, or beliefs, processes captured by the injunction to 'know oneself' and further implies that one acts in accord with the true self, expressing oneself in ways that are consistent with inner thoughts and feelings" (p. 319). Authenticity, therefore, is not seen as a quality that one arrives at, but rather a process in which an individual achieves different levels of authenticity (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). This understanding of

authenticity implies a strong ethical or moral foundation. Yukl (2013) noted that authentic leadership theories are based on positive psychology and psychological theories of self-regulation. As a result, authentic leadership places emphasis on consistency in behaviour and values, self-awareness, trusting relationships, positive core values, and self-acceptance (Yukl, 2013, pg. 351-352). In addition, Northouse (2016) noted that authentic leadership can be approached from three perspectives: intrapersonal or a focus on the internal processes that a leader undergoes, interpersonal or a focus on the relationships between the leader and followers, and developmental which focuses on leadership as something that can be developed within a leader over time.

Bill George originally presented five basic authentic leadership characteristics which include understanding purpose, having strong values and ethics, establishing trusting relationships with followers, practicing self-discipline, and having heart (Northouse, 2016). As a process, there are four components including self-awareness, internalised moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency (Northouse, 2016). Self-awareness includes processes the leader undergoes in order to understand who they are, what their values are, and why they do what they do (Northouse, 2016). Internalised moral perspective is a self-regulation process that individual's use to guide their behaviour on the basis of their values and morals (Northouse, 2016). Balanced processing includes a leader's ability to be objective and empathetic (Northouse, 2016). Finally, relational transparency includes being open and honest with others (Northouse, 2016). In conjunction with these processes, several factors influence authentic leadership including individual confidence, moral reasoning, and critical life events (Northouse, 2016). Avolio and Gardner (2005) also discussed the promotion of follower self-awareness and regulation and follower overall development as a result of authentic leadership. Brown and Trevino (2006) discussed the authentic leadership characteristics of social motivation and consideration as supporting ethical leadership components in authentic leadership.

Northouse (2016) noted a similarity to servant and transformational leadership in the inclusion of a moral component and the emphasis of moral values and behaviours. Combined values with the characteristics of social motivation and consideration, and the emphasis on moral behaviours create a component of humane orientation within authentic leadership.

Cultural Response to Leadership Theories Based on Humane Orientation

United States

General Cultural Discussion

Individualistic and performance-oriented, Americans prize individual accomplishment and results (Northouse, 2016). In addition, low power distance, low long-term orientation, and moderate uncertainty avoidance indicate preferences for participative engagements, short-term organisational goals, and a contextual sensitivity towards the unknown (Hofstede, 2001). Americans rank fairly high in the indulgence category (Hofstede, 2001). However, a strong performance orientation that demands individual and organisational performance moderates the indulgence preference.

The GLOBE study placed the United States in the Anglo culture cluster (House *et al.*, 2004). The GLOBE study ranked leadership behaviour preferences for the Anglo cluster as follows: 1) charismatic/value-based; 2) participative; 3) humane-oriented; 4) team-oriented; 5) autonomous; and 6) self-protective (Northouse, 2016). Countries within the Anglo cluster prefer leaders who are visionary and inspiring and have a consideration and sensitivity for others (Northouse, 2016).

Traditional mechanistic views of organisational structure continue to greatly influence American organisational culture (Miller, 2012; House *et al.*, 2004). While advanced technology moves many organisations away from Taylorist and Fordist organisational processes to more humane-oriented structures, the remnants of the traditional approaches still present themselves in many American organisations (House *et al.*, 2004).

Humane Orientation Values

House *et al.* (2004) reported that the United States has higher preferences for valuing humane orientation and perceives it as being effective. In spite of this value, American culture does not see humane orientation regularly in practice (House *et al.*, 2004). The cultural preferences of individualism and masculinity directly influence the practice of humane orientation. Countries that exhibit a preference for individualism and

masculinity tend to support behaviours that encourage employees to be responsible for themselves, seek individual accomplishment over organisational goals, use competitive engagement, and have an ego orientation (Hofstede, 2001), all practices that moderate or oppose a more humane orientation. However, House *et al.* (2004) indicated that countries with a lower practice of humane orientation aspire to a higher humane orientation as indicated by the United States preference for humane orientation as a value.

Based upon the general understanding of societal preferences associated with humane orientation, the United States does not readily support in practice humane orientation in leaders. In part, GLOBE indicated that humane orientation is more prevalent in collectivist and non-assertive practicing countries. As well, more economically advanced and urban countries report less humane orientation practices (House *et al.*, 2004). Despite these factors, it must be stressed that the United States does rank high in valuing humane orientation as an important leadership behaviour.

Response to Ethical Leadership Theories

The culture of the United States as presented by the GLOBE study does not highly encourage humane orientation (House *et al.*, 2004). However, ethical leadership has been shown to be universally accepted, particularly the universal attributes of “honesty, integrity, a coherent set of moral values, fairness, and transparency” (Hanges, et al., 2016). As previously shown, the constructs of transformational, servant, and authentic leadership theory include an ethical and moral component.

American culture, while it does not regularly practice humane orientation, places a high value on it and sees it as an effective leadership style. The support and use of servant leadership, transformational leadership, and authentic leadership theories highlighting humane orientation as a construct within the moral component already present in these theories could be an avenue to put humane orientation into greater practice within American culture. Specific to American culture, House *et al.*, (2004) indicated that mentorship is an expression of the humane orientation. Transformational leadership expresses mentorship in the form of individual consideration. Servant

leadership expresses mentorship in the acts of service toward followers by leaders. Finally, authentic leadership expresses mentorship in the emphasis on interpersonal relationships between the leader and followers.

Overall, the United States expresses a desire and support of leaders who engage in ethical and morally sound leadership. While cultural norms and organisational design traditions create some obstacles for implementing humane orientation leadership behaviours, the desire for and value placed on humane-oriented leadership behaviours presents a significant opportunity for the growth and use of ethical leadership theories within the American culture.

China

General Cultural Discussion

A collectivist culture, China respects cooperation, affiliation, and subordination (Whitehead & Brown, 2011). In addition, the Chinese have a high power distance, strong class divisions, and limited tolerance for risk and uncertainty (p. 165). Overall, the Chinese value faithfulness, morality, loyalty and service (p. 167).

Whitehead and Brown (2011) indicated orality as one of the primary factors in Chinese leadership, along with integrity, fairness, truth-seeking, consistency, and being service-oriented (p. 168). The Chinese believe leadership should reflect simultaneously the principles of self, others, and community (Whitehead & Brown, 2011). Specifically, Chinese managers take interest and engage in relationship issues, have interest in the holistic development of followers, encourage a high degree of self-directed activity, and use participatory relationships (p. 165). Chinese managers can be both authoritarian, which relates to the paternalistic traditions of the culture, and benevolent at the same time. That Chinese culture can be both authoritarian and participatory and humane-oriented at the same time, seems paradoxical. The collectivist and paternalistic cultural values support a more authoritarian practice in leadership. However, Liden (2012) indicated that leaders in China are known for their “paternalistic benevolence” (p. 206), indicating that the authoritarian enactment of leadership may be engaged from a stance of benevolence rather than autocratic dictatorship. In addition, Whitehead and Brown (2011) presented support

for participative leadership behaviours in Chinese managers.

The GLOBE study presented Chinese preferences for leadership style, as part of Confucian Asia, in the following order: 1) charismatic/value-based; 2) team-oriented; 3) humane-oriented; 4) participative; 5) autonomous; and 6) self-protective (House *et al.*, 2004, p. 688). Preferences for charismatic leadership are a result of cultural preferences for stronger, guiding, authoritarian leadership. Preferences for team-oriented and humane-oriented leadership support benevolence within the leader as a result of paternalistic traditions.

Humane Orientation Values

Winston and Ryan (2008) discussed the conception of the Confucian concept of *jen* as representative of humane orientation within Confucian Asia. A complex ideal within Confucian philosophy, *jen* includes behaviours and attributes such as benevolence, love, altruism, kindness, charity, compassion, virtue, goodness, human-heartedness, humaneness, and humanity (Hirschy, Gomez, Patterson, & Winston, 2014, p. 100). *Jen* is generally considered the “general virtue of all moral behaviour and the foundation of a comprehensive ethical doctrine” (p. 100).

The concept of *jen*, the importance of morality, humaneness, and the concern for others expressed in the collectivist cultural norms in China all point to valuing humane orientation both as a societal value and as a leadership behaviour. However, Hirschy *et al.*, (2014) indicated that while the Chinese do value humane orientation in leadership, they don’t always experience it in practice. Humane orientation societal values for all countries ranked high, however, China’s overall ranking among countries was moderate (House *et al.*, 2004). The moderate high score in humane orientation practice stems from China’s collectivist tradition and societal and religious norms, such as the concept of *jen*.

Response to Ethical Leadership Theories

As Winston and Ryan (2008) indicated, a preference for a leadership value that is not experienced regularly may be impetus enough for the acceptance of certain leadership practices. In general, Chinese culture

supports a more humane orientation both in society and within organisations. The Chinese culture preference of collectivism and patriarchal structures express humane orientation as “paternalistic benevolence” (Liden, 2012).

At the base of these cultural preferences and expressions lies a firm moral and ethical foundation. Transformational leadership may appeal to Chinese culture due to the charismatic leader expressing benevolent leadership in a more authoritative way. As well, the construct of individual consideration meets the Chinese desire for paternalistic benevolence. Servant leadership meets the service-oriented nature of Chinese leadership expressed by Whitehead and Brown (2011) and leader interest in the “holistic development of followers” (Whitehead & Brown, 2011, p. 165). As well, the Chinese preference for meeting self, others and community is expressed in the overall goals of servant leadership, in particular acting as a steward for followers and organisations (Winston & Field, 2015). Authentic leadership meets the preferences for virtue and goodness expressed in the societal value placed on integrity and the concepts expressed within the philosophy of *jen*, particularly goodness, virtue, and altruism.

All three theories meet the moral and ethical demand for integrity and can be expressed in a way that supports both the collectivist and paternalistic traditions within Chinese culture. Similar to the United States, the use of these theories to address the Chinese expressed value of humane orientation could result in creating more humane-oriented practices within Chinese organisations and society as a whole.

Mexico

General Cultural Discussion

Mexican cultural traditions emphasize family, class, reverence for the past, and status (Howell, DelaCarda, Martinez, Prieto, Bautista, Ortiz, Dorfman, & Mendez, 2007). A patriarchal society that gives higher status to masculinity, Mexico mimics the close family structure in many of its organisations. Deference to those in positions of authority is expected. However, Mexican culture supports creating close interpersonal relationships as a way of accomplishing goals. While Mexicans show strong in-group collectivism within their family groups,

they tend to behave individualistically outside these groups (p. 450).

Howell *et al.* (2007) noted that supportive and relationship-oriented leadership behaviours are important in Mexican culture. Mexicans value caring, listening, and understanding as well (p. 451). Directive leadership behaviours have been effective, reflecting the authoritarian patron model of elite and powerful military and political leaders in Mexican history. Charismatic leadership behaviours support the historical conception of leaders as “spiritual advisors” in Mexican culture. While the participative leadership style has been found to be fairly ineffective due to the high power distance preference, more industrialised areas of Mexico show an emerging preference for more participative leadership (Howell *et al.*, 2007). In an analysis of media sources, Howell *et al.* (2007) reported that Mexicans support socially-oriented leadership, directive and performance-oriented leadership, negotiating and bargaining, representative leadership, and implementing participation.

House *et al.* (2004) ranked the leadership behaviour preferences of the Latin American culture clusters, which includes Mexico, as follows: 1) charismatic/value-based; 2) team-oriented; 3) participative; 4) humane-oriented; 5) autonomous; and 6) self-protective. Support for this preference order stems from high in-group collectivism, low performance-orientation, low future-orientation, low institutional collectivism, and low uncertainty avoidance (Northouse, 2016).

Humane Orientation Values

Despite a moderate ranking of preferences for humane oriented social values and leadership behaviours (House *et al.*, 2004), Mexicans have expressed a desire for additional self-development and control of their lives, which has led to an emphasis on follower development (Howell *et al.*, 2007). In particular, the cultural ideal of *simpatico* or the “acute sensitivity to the dignity and worth of the individual” expressed through empathy and respect exemplifies humane orientation leadership behaviour practiced in Mexican culture. As well, a media analysis conducted by Howell *et al.* (2007) revealed preferences for socially-oriented leadership, supportive behaviours that engage leaders in helping followers, and creating harmony and belongingness. These behaviours also represent humane-oriented leadership behaviours.

Mexicans support more humane-oriented values and leadership behaviour within the tradition of importance placed on interpersonal relationships (Howell *et al.*, 2007), however, it is most likely to be expressed in relation to the paternalistic tradition of Mexico, viewing the leaders a benevolent patron to followers (House *et al.*, 2004).

Response to Ethical Leadership Theories

The GLOBE study does not indicate that Mexico prefers humane-oriented leadership (House *et al.*, 2004). However, many of the expressed leadership behaviour indicate a strong desire for more ethically and morally based leadership that puts follower development and needs first. In particular, the desire for close relationships, supportive and relationship-oriented leadership, caring, listening, understanding and socially-oriented leaders all support an expressed need for more humane-oriented leadership that is supported by firm and clear ethics and morals.

Specifically, transformational leadership meets the Mexican preference for a charismatic, strong, elite leader as represented by many of the country’s historical leaders. As well, the transformational leadership construct of individual consideration and providing support and encouragement meet this preference. Servant leadership supports Mexican preferences for socially-oriented leaders and close interpersonal relationships. In addition, the expressed desire for leaders who are caring, who listen, and who seek to understand meet several of the expressed behaviours of servant leadership theory. Finally, authentic leadership meets the preference for Mexican leaders to be seen as “spiritual advisors” and the preference for close and supportive relationships. In particular, authentic leadership’s focus on the “real” leader and creating trusting relationships with followers support its use in Mexican culture.

Conclusion

Humane orientation as a moral construct present within the ethical leadership theories of transformational leadership, servant leadership, and authentic leadership supports the moral and ethical foundations existing in each. Each theory expresses humane orientation with altruistic and moral behaviours that focus on relationships with the follower, development of the follower, and concern for the follower.

The United States, China, and Mexico all support and value humane-oriented leadership behaviours. However, these countries do not necessarily experience humane-oriented leadership practices. Humane-oriented leadership behaviours within these cultures are affected by a variety of moderating variables including paternalistic traditions, individualism, power distance, collectivism, religion, and traditional organisational cultures.

Transformational leadership, servant leadership, and authentic leadership possess within their constructs humane-oriented leadership behaviours. Each of these leadership approaches bears a possibility in being applicable to each of the various cultures discussed in this paper. However, as noted within the cultural discussions, how these specific leadership approaches are expressed and understood within each culture is dependent upon cultural norms and traditions. Practice of these ethical leadership approaches creates an avenue or mechanism through which leadership practice can meet the expressed values of humane orientation within the United States, China, and Mexico.

References

- Altruism [Def. 1]. (n.d.). In *Dictionary*, Retrieved August 1, 2016, from <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/altruism?s=ts>
- Avolio, B., & Gardner, W. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 315-338.
- Brown, M., & Trevino, L. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future direction. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 595-616. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004
- Ciulla, J. B. (1995). Leadership ethics: Mapping the territory. *Ethics Quarterly*, 5(1), 5-24.
- Cortes, C., & Wilkinson, L. (2009). Developing and implementing a multicultural vision. In M. Moodian (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations* (pp. 17-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eisenbeiss, S. (2012). Re-thinking ethical leadership: An interdisciplinary integrative approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 791-808. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua/2012.03.001
- Eisenbeiss, S., & Brodbeck, F. (2014). Ethical and unethical leadership: A cross-cultural and cross-sectional analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 22, 343-359. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1740-0
- Greenleaf, R. (2008). *The servant as leader*. Westfield, In The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
- Hanges, P., Aiken, J., Park, J., & Su, J. (2016). Cross-cultural leadership: Leading around the world. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 8, 64-69.
- Hirschy, M., Gomez, D., Patterson, K., & Winston, B. (2014). Servant leadership, humane orientation, and the Confucian doctrine of jen. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 13(1), 97-111.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorman, P., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- House, R. J., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., & Sully de Luque, M. F. (2013). *Strategic Leadership Across Cultures: The GLOBE Study of CEO Leadership Behavior and Effectiveness in 24 Countries*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Howell, J., DelaCarda, J., Martinez, S., Prieto, L., Bautista, J., Ortiz, J., Dorfman, P., & Mendez, M. (2007). Leadership and culture in Mexico. *Journal of World Business*, 42, 449-462. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2007.06.006
- Hyatt, L., Evans, L., & Haque, M. M. (2009). Leading across cultures: Designing a learning agenda for global praxis. In M. Moodian (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Liden, R. (2012). Leadership research in Asia: A brief assessment and suggestions for the future. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29, 205-212. doi:10.1007/s10490-011-9276-2
- Miller, K. (2012). *Organizational communication: Approaches and processes* (7 ed.). United States: Cengage Learning.
- Moral [Def. 1]. (n.d.). In *Dictionary*, Retrieved August 1, 2016, from <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/moral?s=ts>
- Northouse, P. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7 ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* (Order No. 3082719). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ Regent University.

- (305234239). Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.regent.edu/docview/305234239?accountid=13479>
- Resick, C., Hanges, P., Dickson, M., & Mitchelson, J. (2006). A cross-cultural examination of the endorsement of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63, 345-350. doi:10.1007/s10551-005-3242-1
- Schein, E. H. (1984). Coming to a new awareness of organizational culture. *Sloan Management Review*, 25(2), 3-16.
- Whitehead, G., & Brown, M. (2011). Authenticity in Chinese leadership: A quantitative study comparing Western notions of authentic constructs with Chinese, responses to an authenticity instrument. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(2), 162-188.
- Winston, B. (2003). *Extending Patterson's servant leadership model: Coming full circle*. Paper presented at the University School of Leadership Studies Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Virginia Beach, VA. Retrieved from <http://www.regent.edu/acad/cls/2003ServantLeadershipRoundtable>
- Winston, B., & Fields, D. (2015). Seeking and measuring the essential behaviors of servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(4), 413-434. doi:10.1108/LODJ-10-2013-0135
- Winston, B., & Ryan, B. (2008). Servant leadership as a humane orientation: Using the GLOBE study construct of humane orientation to show that servant leadership is more global than Western. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(2), 212-222.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.