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In the field of management studies, leadership has always been a hot topic to argue and discuss. Apart from the main five types of leadership styles, Coercive leaders, Authoritative leaders, Affiliative leaders, Democratic leaders, and Pacesetting leaders, which are categorized by leaders’ traits and attributes, concerning about the long-term short-term influence that leader can have on its followers, researches on transformational and transactional leaderships became popular since last 1980s. Charismatic leadership was attributed to transformational leadership even though the concept of charismatic leadership originated nearly 30 years ahead.

Quantities of scholars and researchers have been conducting experiments on the relationships between charismatic leaders and their followers. Among all of those relationships, follower’s satisfaction such as life satisfaction, job satisfaction, and work satisfaction is the main topic of this paper. Base on the conclusions from previous researches that follower’s satisfaction can empower followers to sacrifice more for
organizations, we intend to explore how would the cross-cultural influence affect follower’s satisfaction in terms of individualism and collectivism.

This paper is mainly divided into six parts. Chapter 1 will briefly introduce the reason and meaning of creating a framework to explore how would the cross-cultural influence affect follower’s satisfaction. Chapter 2 will initially discuss the origination and development of charismatic leadership. Next, chapter 2 will introduce different types of relationships between charismatic leadership and followers, previous discussions on one of the relationships which is follower’s satisfaction, and review the cross-cultural researches on charismatic leadership to connect cultural influence and follower’s satisfaction on charismatic leaders. Following chapter 3 will mainly discuss contributions made by western culture analysis on charismatic leadership and follower’s satisfaction. Chapter 4 will mainly discuss contributions made by eastern culture analysis on charismatic leadership and follower’s satisfaction. Chapter 5 will present the framework that will be utilized to compare the cross-cultural influence on charismatic leadership and follower’s satisfaction. Chapter 6 will briefly introduce the hypotheses remain to be examined in future researches and several procedures about conducting future experiments such as introducing countries that are selected to distribute questionnaire and methods to encourage employees to finish questionnaire. In the end, Chapter 7 will discuss the remaining work and limitation of this thesis.
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1. **Background**

Charismatic leadership, with special characteristic of idealized influence, is the extent to which that leader behaves in administrable ways to make followers to identify with the leader, falls within the four dimensions of transformational leadership (Timothy A. Judge, 2004), has been discussing widely not only in social domain but also in management domain, especially in leadership area for a long time. Quantities of scholars and researchers have been conducting experiments and corroborating hypotheses they came up with on this topic.

Bass and Avolio (Bass & Avolio, 1993) initially argued that charismatic leadership alone was insufficient to be categorized into transformational leadership “Charisma is a necessary ingredient of transformational leadership, but by itself it is not sufficient to account for the transformational process” (p.31), later Bryman (Bryman, 1992) proved Bass and Avolio wrong by noting that Bass’s perception of leader who expressed a vision that makes followers excited with intense loyalty and trust is overlapping extremely with those dimensions postulated by charismatic leadership theories. Robert House(1977) published a book not only outlined the leader behaviors that were possibly associated with

---


charismatic leadership but also certain personal traits and situational variables.

Both in western and eastern culture, charismatic leadership and follower’s relationship can make a difference within an organization while follower’s satisfaction serves as an indispensable role.

Currently a framework that can directly compare the cross-cultural difference that impact charismatic leadership and follower’s satisfaction remained to be constructed. By introducing charismatic leadership, from relationship between charismatic leader and follower to charismatic leader and follower’s satisfaction, such as workplace satisfaction, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction, by discussing the importance of analyzing cross-cultural difference, individually discussing the study of charismatic leader and follower’s satisfaction, in western and eastern culture, this paper is intended to establish the conceptual framework to compare cross-cultural difference on charismatic leader and follower’s satisfaction and to lay a steady foundation for following experiments and research.
2. Charismatic Leadership

2.1 Introduction
Throughout the history that countless scholars and researcher have been discussing the topic of leadership. Recent definition of leadership comes from Richard Bolden “Leadership is a complex phenomenon that touches on many other important organizational, social and personal processes. It depends on a process of influence, whereby people are inspired to work towards group goals, not through coercion, but through personal motivation” (Bolden, 2004)\(^5\).

For the beginning of 1900s to the middle of 1950s, it was assumed that defining and isolating a set of traits or characteristics would be helpful to divide leadership into different styles, while leadership styles was defined as “the patterns of behavior a leader adopts to plan, organize, motivate and control; it is the extent to which he or she: listens, sets goals and standards, develops action plans, directs others, gives feedback, rewards and punishes” (Bolden, 2004)\(^6\).

Later on, a substitutional trait method was to take what leaders actually do into account rather than characteristics of their own. Blake and Moulton (Blake, 1964)\(^7\) developed the Managerial Grid which concentrates on task and employee orientations of managers, along with mixture between the two extremes (Blake, 1964). After that, Daniel Goleman brought up six leadership styles: Coercive leaders demand followers with

---


instantaneous compliance. *Authoritative leaders* mobilize followers to a big vision. *Affiliative leaders* create emotional bonds and harmony with followers. *Democratic leaders* build consensus through participation with followers’ routine work. *Pacesetting leaders* expect excellence and self-direction with himself or herself. And *coaching leaders* help follower to develop the future image (Goleman, 2005)\(^8\).

Another classification of leadership was between transformational and transactional. Burns (Burns, 1978)\(^9\) first introduced the concepts of transformational and transactional leadership in his treatment of political leadership.

“Transformational leaders provide a purpose that transcends short-term goals and focuses on higher order intrinsic needs. Transactional leaders, in contrast, focus more on the proper exchange of resources” (Timothy A. Judge, 2004)\(^10\).

If transformational leadership leads followers to identify with the needs of the leader, the transactional leader gives back followers something they want in exchange for something the leader wants (Kuhnert, 1987)\(^11\).

Charismatic leadership, although introduced earlier, was considered a type of transformational leadership.

---


The charismatic leadership theory that originated in 1900’s went to Max Weber (Weber, 1964) who borrowed the term ‘charisma’ from the New Testament, referred to as an impartation of the Holy Spirit as a gift from God as individuals committed their lives to Jesus (Bryman, 1992).

Initially, the word ‘charisma’ was utilized by St. Paul to describe the gifts of divine grace which manifest themselves in forms such as prophecy and healing (Eatwell, 2006). Later on in nineteenth century, in order to analyze the way by which illuminated individuals to transform Christianity into the charismatic Catholic Church while enduring the mission of redemption, Rudolf Sohm carried ‘charisma’ into his historical research study. Decades later, it was not until a German sociologist, Max Weber, who in many ways anticipated the challenges to liberal democracy which were to emerge from new forms of political movement and dictatorial regime in the post-1918 era, mainly was determined to establish the study of charismatic leadership (Eatwell, 2006).

In accordance with Max Weber’s study, he developed insights drawn from his exceptional extensive studies into threefold ‘idea typical’ classification of legitimacy and power (Eatwell, 2006).


The first type he named ‘traditional’, which was associated with systems such as monarchies. The second type he named ‘bureaucratic’, which was associated with systems such as democracy and political parties. The third type he named ‘charismatic’, which was mainly related to the appearance of exceptional, remarkable, and radical leaders while confronted with crisis.

Although Weber elaborated his perceptions and acknowledgements on Charismatic Leadership in varieties studies and researches, inevitably criticisms and controversies arouses concerning about the basis of Charismatic Leadership is supported by religious background.

Loewenstein (Loewenstein, 1966)\(^{16}\) contends that it is the world of religion lay out the foundation of charisma so that when applying charismatic leadership theory in the situation of Eastern countries where Christian is not predominant, Weber’s theory is comparably open to attack (Tucker, 1968)\(^{17}\).

Another critic Carl Friedrich argues that the interpretation of Charismatic Leadership from Weber is restrictive by pointing out that Charismatic Leadership should be understood as leadership based on a transcendent call by a divine being that both parties should believe in.

Among the others, doubts are cast on the fact that Weber did not provide the specific catalogue of the personal qualities in Charismatic Leadership.


From Weber’s point of view, obviously Charismatic Leadership appears in the settings of a social movement of some kind of creatures in such a movement (Tucker, 1968)\(^{18}\).

“Charismatic leader was not simply any leader idolized and freely followed for his or her extraordinary leadership qualities, but one who demonstrates such qualities in the process of summoning people to join in a movement for change and in leading such a movement” (Tucker, 1968)\(^{19}\).

Henceforth, the performance of followers can be an objective and conspicuous deliverable to assess the influence of Charismatic Leadership.

### 2.2 Satisfaction within Charismatic Leader and Followers

Before starting to analyze the relationships between Charismatic leader and followers, it is essential to interpret the definition of follower. We view the follower as "a person who acknowledges the focal leader as a continuing source of guidance and inspiration, regardless of whether there is any formal reporting relationship" (Yukl, 1998)\(^{20}\).

In accordance with House, charismatic behaviors can obtain higher performance ratings, have more satisfaction-orientated and more motivation-orientated followers, and are recognized as more influential leaders either by their superiors or inferiors than others.

---


in the positions of leadership. (House, Persobality and Charismatic Leadership, 1992)\textsuperscript{21}

Different from traditional leadership theories which depict leader behavioral actions regarding to leader-follower relationships, offering direction and support, and reinforcement behaviors, charismatic leadership theory places great emphasis on symbolic leader behavior, visionary, intellectual stimulation of followers by the leader, and leader expectations for followers’ self-sacrifice and for performance beyond expectations (House, Persobality and Charismatic Leadership, 1992)\textsuperscript{22}.

Many other scholars have reiterated that traditional leader-follower relationship can be differentiated from charismatic leader-follower relationship (Bass B. M., 1998)\textsuperscript{23}.

Conger stated that relationship between leaders and followers was special that when subordinates recognized that leaders or managers are exhibiting leadership behaviors, they would not only attribute charisma to leaders but also change their attitudes, values, and behaviors consistent with what the leaders or managers want from them (Jay A. Conger R. N., 2000)\textsuperscript{24}. Doubtlessly the importance of follower’s satisfaction deserves deep exploration.

“Followers who share a charismatic relationship with a leader are willing to transcend

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\end{thebibliography}
self-interests for the sake of the collective (team or organization), to engage in self-sacrifice in the interest of the mission, to identify with the vision articulated by the leader, to show strong emotional attachment to the leader, to internalize the leader's values and goals, and to demonstrate strong personal or moral (as opposed to calculative) commitment to those values or goals” (Bass B., 1985)25.

Charismatic leader-follower relationships were based on the follower effects such as trust, motivation, and satisfaction (Jay A. Conger R. N., 2000)26. Leaders needed to be trusted by followers because trust was the ordnance that connects followers to the leader (B., 1989)27. Trust within the leader are positively correlated with various consequences such as organizational citizenship behaviors, performance, and satisfaction (Avolio B. J., 2004)28.

To be more specific in charismatic leaders and followers’ s relationship (Jay A. Conger R. N., 2000)29, under charismatic leadership, Conger proposed and examined follower effects of heightened reverence, trust, and satisfaction with the leader. In Conger’


s discussion, leader reverence has a strong relationship with charismatic leadership, however, what makes Conger surprised was that trust with the leader and the satisfaction with the leader were mediated by the reverence instead of being directly related to charismatic leadership.

Current theory states that charisma in leadership increases follower satisfaction within the leader through the leaders’ offering of purposeful goals, their admirable behaviors, and their methods of empowerment (Jay A. Conger R. N., 2000)\textsuperscript{30}.

For instance, charismatic leaders provides their followers with soaring and encouraging visions that are extremely worthwhile to followers and encompass significant rewards for them (Bass B., 1985)\textsuperscript{31}.

Since the leader was perceived as the first-hand origin of the vision, he or she was associated with his or her followers as bringing meaning into their lives and as offering them goals that transcended their own limited existence (Jahoda, 1981)\textsuperscript{32} and that allowed them to achieve higher order rewards (Burns, 1978)\textsuperscript{33}.

This profound sense of expressiveness and reward was greatly satisfying for followers. Leader behavior that was perceived by followers as satisfying for them in exchange

\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
increased follower satisfaction with the leader himself or herself (House RJ, 1974)\(^34\).

Secondary, the leader's excellent acted involving personal risk and self-sacrifice construct follower’s satisfaction with leader by enhancing perceptions of the leader's commitment to realizing their mutually shared vision and the mutually shared rewards that will accompany the consequences of the mission. The leader's authenticated professionalism and creative insight also construct follower’s satisfaction that is associated with the leader by maintaining followers' perceptions that their interpersonal and appreciable investments in the cause had a promising probability of repeating forward-looking rewards (Jay A. Conger R. N., 2000)\(^35\).

Thirdly, through the active use of empowerment strategies, leaders associated with charisma enhanced the sense of self-adequacy of followers in the relationship to task achievement which in exchange enhanced satisfaction with the leader (Jay A. Conger R. N., 2000)\(^36\).

Although Conger and Kanungo examined the satisfaction between charismatic leader and follower was not directly related through their hypothetical model recommended by Joreskog and Sorbom (Joreskog KG, 1989)\(^37\), they established the foundation that they

---


classified follower’s satisfaction to leader focus variables, where lots of scholars believe that required further corroborations and studies.

According to previous research, followers’ satisfaction to charismatic leader should be the reflection that demonstrates whether charismatic leader pushed well while leading followers to cope with tasks existed in specific crisis or contingent situations. In continuing that follower’s satisfaction can not only lead to the willingness, but also the empowerment to perform beyond the minimum levels of specified by the organization (Philip M. podsakoff, 1990)38 (Gasimir, 2007)39.

2.3 Research of Cross-Cultural Domain
Cultural factors influence the fundamental processes pinpointing leadership and follower relationships (Markus, 1991)40.

One of the most famous studies, GLOBE study found that charismatic or value based factors are differentiating leaderships cross-culturally (Den Hartog, 1999)41. The cross-cultural utilization of charismatic and transformational leadership equipped with


conclusions of specific behavioral differentiations are best summarized by Smith who writes, ‘‘Charisma may be best thought of as a quality that is global but impute to leaders on the basis of behaviors that are culture-specific’’ (Smith, 1997)\(^\text{42}\).

Cross-cultural leadership, which has been perceived as a specific topic of study, has been pushed forward by several specific events that include the two-issue special issue of *The Leadership Quarterly*, the advent of *Advances in Global Leadership*, and several large multi-investigator, multinational studies of culture and leadership (Marcus W. Dickson, 2003)\(^\text{43}\).

Historical researches has showed considerable interest in cross-cultural research on leadership and follower relationships. Cultural-different groups prefer extinctive ways of being led (Hofstede, 1993)\(^\text{44}\).

Jung has set out to compare how transformational (such as charismatic leadership) and transactional leadership can have effect on the performance of ad hoc work groups which consisted of either individualism or collectivism (Jung, 2000)\(^\text{45}\). Results showed that, in terms of transformational(Charismatic) leadership influence, same leadership style can


be perceived differently and can have different effect on motivating and performing for followers from culturally different groups, whereas Jung did not include followers’ satisfaction as a variable (Jung, 2000)\textsuperscript{46}.

Bontis (Karen Boehnke, 2003)\textsuperscript{47} realized that questions such as: “are there universal behaviors which are consistent around the world?” and “are there subtle differences of emphasis which vary across different nationalities or corporate environments?” were still needed to answer so that accompanying with his colleagues, an examination of cross-national difference and similarities of transformational leadership (such as charismatic leadership) has been conducted and the results were remarkable. However, this research only took performance of managers who worked within a multi-national company into account, performance of followers remained to be examined.

Javidan (Mansour Javidan, 2003)\textsuperscript{48} initiated a study which compares charismatic leadership among Iranian and Canadian executives by using conformational factor analysis, choosing variables such as vision, credibility, tenacity, intellectual challenge, self-sacrifice, and eloquence.

Obviously Javidan and his colleagues were concentrated on the perspective of


charismatic leaders so that relationship between charismatic leaders and followers were not examined.

Walumbwa conducted a comparative study on transformational(Charismatic) leadership, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction in Kenya and the United States financial firms.

Within his study, he mentioned the knowledge which can support their research study was originated from historical studies that have revealed that transformational(Charismatic) leadership was positively associated with significant work-related attitudes and behaviors, such as job satisfaction, job performance, commitment of employees, trust, and fewer turnover intentions (Avolio B. J., 2004)49.

And studies that stated transformational(Charismatic) leadership have received the more historical inspection in the organizational science literature than have all other leadership theories for the past two decades (Bass B. M., 1998)50.

They successfully corroborated their hypotheses that “Transformational leadership is positively related to followers’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment in Kenya and in the United States”, and that “Transformational leadership has a greater impact


among U.S. employees than among Kenyan employees” (Fred O. Walumbwa, 2005).  

Another important and authoritative research, which put experiments into 62 cultures around the world was conducted by Harton, Dorfman (Den Hartog, 1999), proved that attributes of transformational/charismatic leadership are universally endorsed.

In this case, since attributes of charismatic leadership are universally endorsed, constructing a conceptual framework to compare cross-cultural difference in charismatic leadership in terms of follower’s satisfaction has become more reasonable and more plausible.

Follower’s satisfaction can ensure a stronger and more steady compliance with charismatic leaders, not only because the empowerment of followers has been satisfied, but also because satisfaction can lead to better performance of followers’ team under the lead of charismatic leader.

But before we start to construct a framework to compare the influence between charismatic leadership and follower’s satisfaction in eastern and western countries, we have to understand whether follower’s satisfaction is an important variable to measure charismatic leadership in eastern countries and also whether western countries consider follower’s satisfaction as important as what eastern countries consider.


3. Charismatic Leadership in Western Cultures

3.1 Western Charismatic Leadership Analysis

Throughout last 20 to 30 years, the most remarkable and distinguished work on Charismatic Leadership in western cultures went to Professor Jay A. Conger and Professor Rabindra N. Kanungo who have been making substantial contribution in studying Charismatic Leadership. Conger and Kanungo have developed fundamental and continuously been conducting experiment and analysis on Charismatic leadership from late 1980s to 1990s. Eventually a comprehensive book named *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations* (Jay A. Conger R. N., 1998)\(^53\) was published in 1998 in recognition of exceptional contribution made by Conger and Kanungo. Within the book *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations*, historically in their studies, for the first time, they constructed and developed a formal conceptual framework to identify the structure of charismatic leadership through the definition of concepts, descriptions of its contents and components, and creation of links that can connect with its antecedents and consequential conditions that can demonstrate the whole procedure underlying the phenomenon. Measuring charismatic leadership and empirically corroborating predictions as stipulated in their formal conceptual framework was ultimately necessary so that total six comprehensive studies were conducted within that period. In their first two studies, not only did they came up with the practical questionnaires for experiment participants that we would like to take into consider while designing questionnaires, but also they finished a series of examination on the Conger-Kanungo model and furthermore they achieved the refinement of Conger-

---

Kanungo model. Following the study three, four, and five they implemented the study on managerial levels about convergent and discriminant validity and discriminatory power on charismatic leaders. It was not until the last study that study six started to consider the perception and reaction from followers and subordinates of charismatic leaders. As mentioned in chapter 1 that sense of reverence for manager, trust in manager, sense of group solidarity, sense of task efficacy, feeling of personal empowerment, and satisfaction with manager were all tested within the study.

The results illustrated that there was no direct relationship between charismatic behavior and trust or satisfaction, and relationship between trust and satisfaction was non-significant in the saturated model. They also mentioned that these six studies have been conducted in three different countries- Canada, India, and United States, while they did not mention that whether cross-cultural influence could affect the results since basically majorities of their studies were conducted in western counties where English was native language.

Whether it is possible that by excluding variables such as trust and reverent, Charismatic leadership and follower’s satisfaction could be positively related just as Walumbwa (Fred O. Walumbwa, 2005)\textsuperscript{54} corroborated that “Transformational leadership is positively related to followers’ job satisfaction”? Therefore, this paper will suggest to examine the relationship between charismatic leaders and follower’s satisfaction directly.

4. Charismatic Leadership in Eastern Cultures

4.1 Central Eastern Charismatic leadership analysis

Admittedly, when looking back to the origin of charismatic leadership theory, derived from his studies of prophetic and messianic traditions (Wyszomirski, 1972)\(^{55}\), Weber ascribed charismatic leadership to Christian cultural background which presumably fits more reasonably into western cultures.

However, Richard (Wyszomirski, 1972) used the example that Mahdi recruited loyal followers in a Sudan evolution to discuss in Islamic culture, charismatic leadership could also be reflected on leaders as long as they were embodied with charisma that can cause follower to transcend self-interests in behalf of the team or organization, to engage in self-sacrifice for the passion of the mission, and so forth. Despite of the fact that Sudan might not be considered as an eastern country, nor did this paper did not mention whether followers’ satisfaction is important, this research provided a strong reference for analyzing non-western circumstances.

Furthermore, David (Edwards, 1986)\(^{56}\) offered an even more robust argument that it was not difficult to see how “charisma” could be related to the antecedent controversy of the types of religious authority found in Afghan Islam. In his argument, *sayyid* and *faqir*, who both shared tight connection to God of Islamic family, were thought to have been endowed by God with exceptional qualities and therefore to enjoy a closeness to God that

---


is denied to ordinary men. Henceforth, charismatic leadership can be applied in non-western circumstances regardless of difference of religion.

In short, Richard and David both proved that religious factors would not be the boundary to extend Charismatic leadership into Eastern countries.

4.2 East Asian Charismatic leadership analysis

Because more and more foreign companies have been transplanting western company cultures into Eastern Asian companies by transferring western managers or CEOs from western headquarters, leadership influence has been gradually exposed into Eastern Asian companies, therefore some scholars have already started to analyze Charismatic Leadership in Eastern Asian companies. In an initial exploratory experiment of charismatic leadership in China, Tsui et al. (Tsui AS, 2004)\(^{57}\) conducted focus-group interviews with 65 managers and professionals by asking them to depict distinct behaviors they observed in their leaders. After gathering and systematically analyzing 320 descriptions, a questionnaire which contained 45 questions was developed and subsequently administered to 1,446 professional employees and middle managers. By using Conger and Kanungo’s charismatic leadership measurement in English context, Tsui et al. (Tsui AS, 2004)\(^{58}\) came up with a conclusion that Conger and Kanungo’s charismatic leadership framework may not be generalizable in China.


Later on, Lian et al. (Huiwen Lian, 2011)\textsuperscript{59} systematically test Conger and Kanungo’s Charismatic leadership framework in China by implementing experiment in sample 1 which included full-time employee from multiple organizations located in Beijing, Shanghai and Taiwan, and in sample 2 which consisted 2 companies that one was foreign-owned and located in Beijing and the other one was privately-owned and located in Beijing.

Lian et al. (Huiwen Lian, 2011)\textsuperscript{60} utilized measurement on Charismatic Leadership in 20-item C-K scale, Personal Identification with the leader in scale of MLQ (Bass B., 1985)\textsuperscript{61}, Organizational Identification in Mael and Ashforth’s (Mael, 1995)\textsuperscript{62} six-item scale, Task performance in a four-item scale adapted from Motowidlo and Van Scotter (Stephan J. Motowidlo, 1994)\textsuperscript{63}, Job Satisfaction in a four-item scale adapted from Brayfield and Rothe’s (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951)\textsuperscript{64} scale that had previously been

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{59} Huiwen Lian, D. J. (2011). Distal charismatic leadership and follower effects: An examination of Conger and Kanungo’s conceptualization of charisma in China. \textit{Leadership}, 7(3), 251-273.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Huiwen Lian, D. J. (2011). Distal charismatic leadership and follower effects: An examination of Conger and Kanungo’s conceptualization of charisma in China. \textit{Leadership}, 7(3), 251-273.
\end{itemize}
translated into Chinese (H, 2003). In conclusion, especially in *Job Satisfaction* measurement corroborated the hypothesis brought by Lian et al. (Huiwen Lian, 2011) that Perceptions of the charismatic leadership of top executives in Chinese society will be positively related to followers’ job satisfaction. R. K. Shastri et al (R. K. Shastri1, 2010) conducted an experiment to examine the relationship of charismatic leadership in Indian organizations. By comprising 147 employees from eastern and northern Indian, R. K. Shastri et al (R. K. Shastri1, 2010) conducted experiment based on Conger and Kanungo’s Charismatic leadership framework and the results revealed that five of the six Conger and Kanungo-factors were significantly correlated with the commitment factors. Furthermore, the multiple regressions analysis demonstrated strong support for main objectives-among the two main antecedents (charismatic leadership and job satisfaction) is found to expand the firmest effect on organizational commitment of the employees of Indian organization.

---


5. Cross-Cultural Comparison Framework

Throughout the aforementioned, we have found that follower’s satisfaction could play a great role between charismatic leader and followers by increasing willingness and empowerment to perform beyond the minimum levels of specified by the organization, while in both Western and Eastern cultural circumstance follower’s satisfaction is equally important.

By searching past papers and researches, we did not find a framework that was utilized to compare how and why charismatic leader and follower’s satisfaction differs in cross-cultural situations.

Indeed Bradley (Bradley L. Kirkman, 2009) examined that power distance orientation affected cross-cultural relationship that transformational (charismatic) leadership had with procedural justice and that individual follower's "power distance" orientation and their group's shared perceptions of transformational leadership were positively related to follower's procedural justice perceptions, however whether power distance orientation could influence the follower’s satisfaction remained to be examined.

Schaubroeck (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007) proved that transformational leadership with a higher team collectivism and higher team power distance, team potency


can be increased, while whether individualism that is mainly presented in western cultures and collectivism that is mainly presented in eastern culture could conduct opposite consequences in followers’ satisfaction remains to be examined.

Previous researchers have just been concentrated on either one cultural domain or two to three cultural domains individually, a conceptual framework which can be used to generalize similarities and differences of followers’ satisfaction between Western and Eastern cultures could provide a solid foundation to step further on charismatic leadership and follower’s relationship in a global scale.

By excluding adjacent influencing variables such as trust and reverent, we could directly and straightforward to compare whether follower’s satisfaction is equally important in western and eastern cultures.

The questionnaires should be professionally translated into different languages, such as Chinese, Korean, Indian, Japanese, and so forth, to ignore the influences caused by the mind set for non-English speaking countries as English is not their native language.
Figure 5.1 Cross-cultural comparison framework
6. Future Experiment Description

By generalizing discussions in previous chapters and to test the practicability of Figure 5.1, forthcoming experiments are based on following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1:** Western culture that is associated with individualism will have lower follower’s satisfaction in charismatic leadership and follower’s relationship.

**Hypothesis 2:** Eastern culture that is associated with collectivism will have higher follower’s satisfaction in charismatic leadership and follower’s relationship.

Concerning about sample size and origins of experiment participants, this experiment is expected to select mid-level companies, owning 200-500 employees, that are located in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, China, India, and South Korea. By selecting three western culture orientated companies and three eastern culture orientated companies, comparison within cross-cultural difference can be analyzed, and influence of power distance, individualism and collectivism can be tested.

Questionnaires (See Appendix 1) are supposed to send to potential participants via companies’ mass internal mail system in order to assure the delivery. In each mail, letter should not only address that participation is completely voluntary, but also mention that the reward message of $1 or 1 unite currency from that country after finishing surveys to encourage participation.

After collecting the questionnaires sent out, specific measurements will be applied into the data analysis about dependent variable Charismatic leadership and independent variable job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and workplace satisfaction.
7. Discussion

The study did quantities of research and literature review about the analyses and experiments on charismatic leadership and its followers. Scholars have been passionately contributing into this domain for decades and the writer once had difficulty in choosing one topic that has never been analyzed before.

Direct analysis between charismatic leaders and their followers in cross-cultural domain might have upcoming problems concerning about the interference from other cultural factors such as power distance.

Besides, this study has not brought up the measurement about charisma on leaders, or managers and supervisors according to employees within the company. Therefore, remaining work should not only exclude relevant and irrelevant factors in cultural aspects, but also come up with measurement about charisma on leaders in terms of numerous experiments conducts by dedicated scholars.
Appendix 1

Please rate how well the following statement describe your feeling with your direct supervisor by using the 7-point scale:

7 - Strongly agree
6 – Agree
5 - Slightly agree
4 - Neither agree nor disagree
3 - Slightly disagree
2 – Disagree
1 - Strongly disagree

1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
   1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

2. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.
   1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

3. The conditions of my life are excellent.
   1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

4. I like the people I work with.
   1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

5. I am happy at work.
   1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

6. I would like to refer someone to work here.
   1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7
7. I have a clear understanding of my career path.

   1------2------3------4------5------6------7

8. I feel like the management team here is transparent.

   1------2------3------4------5------6------7

9. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.

   1------2------3------4------5------6------7

10. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.

    1------2------3------4------5------6------7

11. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.

    1------2------3------4------5------6------7

12. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

    1------2------3------4------5------6------7

Question 1, 3, 9 and 12 which indicate life satisfaction are drawn from Ed (Ed Diener, 1985)\textsuperscript{70}, question 2, 4, 10, and 11 which indicate job satisfaction are drawn from Paul (Spector, 1994)\textsuperscript{71}, question 5, 6, 7, and 8 which indicate workplace satisfaction are drawn from TINYpulse (Son, 2017)\textsuperscript{72}.
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