

## CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### Leadership

Leaders and leadership have long been the subject of study, analysis, and reflection. The need to understand leadership has figured prominently in man's search for knowledge and wisdom. Early leaders were prophets, priests, chiefs, and kings who served as representatives of the highly evolved man. They were exemplars of competency, ambition, privilege, or duty.

Thomas Carlyle's "Great Man" theory of leadership had its roots in these legendary figures. The study of their traits and skills was one of the earliest forms of serious inquiry appearing early in the 1900s. The field of leadership has since expanded to include an exploration of not only "traits, but styles, behaviors, situations (contingencies), and a variety of other related concerns, including the interaction of multiple variables and sets of variables" (Immegart, 1988, p. 259).

Perhaps the most comprehensive compendium of research on leadership is Richard Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications (1974), which Bass revised twice (1981, 1990). This work drew on over 5,000 references in an attempt to document and promote understanding and application of leadership and leadership theory. Bass in the later editions, attempted to give legitimacy to social science scholarship which he saw complementing the heretofore scientifically oriented inquiries.

The study of leadership did indeed evolve borrowing from studies done in the fields of psychology, sociology, and as well as science. The goals were usually consistent as researchers attempted to explain how, and under what conditions, leadership manifests itself and what makes it effective.

### Leadership Definitions

Bass (1990) offers one of the most comprehensive definitions of leadership based upon his extensive review of the research over several decades. He favors his own definition because it facilitates understanding of a broad variety of leadership research findings. Bass defines leadership as "the interaction among members of a group that initiates and maintains improved expectations and the competence of the group to solve problems or to attain goals" (p. 20).

Others argue that leadership is about the behavior of an individual directing others (Hemphill & Coons, 1957), leadership is about initiating change (Schein, 1992), leadership is about giving meaning to work (Drath & Palus, 1994), leadership is about articulating vision and values (Richards & Engle, 1986). Due to the many definitions of leadership, there exists ambiguity in the meaning of leadership. Additional confusion results from the imprecision in use of such terms as authority, management, administration, control, and supervision.

Management, for example, is a term used frequently in the literature along with another term, administration. Many researchers appear to agree that management and administration are activities concerned with

procuring, coordinating, and distributing human and material resources. Leadership on the other hand is also concerned with transforming the organization, thus moving it toward a vision (Burns, 1978; Sashkin, 1988).

Yukl (1998) argues that one definition is insufficient for the variety of studies conducted on leadership. He notes that researchers have defined leadership in terms of traits, behavior, influence, interaction patterns, role relationships, and occupation of administrative position. Since researchers usually define leadership according to their individual perspectives and since there is no common definition, it is prudent that they fully explain the operational definitions they use in research. This would allow for comparison over time of both investigative research efforts and conceptual understanding about definitions.

In reviewing the literature, Yukl (1981, 1998) points out that among the definitions of leadership there is a common denominator. The commonality revolves around the fact that leadership is a group phenomenon that involves interaction between two or more persons. Furthermore, "one person exerts intentional influence over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships".

One way to examine the vast number of studies, theories, and writings about leadership is to view them according to the type of variables emphasized. Considered in this manner, leadership can be divided into: (1) trait, (2) behavior, (3) contingency (which encompasses situational), (4) power-influence, and (5) integrative approaches (Yukl, 1998). The following review presents the leadership literature through these five perspectives. In addition, historical markers are included to provide a sense of evolution.

### Trait Theories

Trait theories, espoused during the first half of the twentieth century, attempted to explain leadership by identifying the personal attributes of leaders including personality, temperament, physiological and social needs, motives, and values. Researchers examined physical factors such as appearance and energy level along with personality and ability. What began as studies of single traits in isolation evolved into the study of many traits or clusters.

Immegart (1988) identified four traits that consistently appear to be linked to leaders. They are intelligence, dominance, self-confidence, and high energy/activity level. Researchers believed that certain traits (and skills) improve a leader's chances of success (Van Fleet & Yukl, 1986).

Skills refer to the ability to do things effectively. Like traits, it is generally believed that they are determined jointly by heredity and learning. The most widely accepted approach for classifying managerial skills is through a typology identified with managerial effectiveness as shown in Table 2.1 (Yukl, 1981, 1998).

Table 2.1 Managerial Skills Associated with Effectiveness

- ? **Technical skills** - knowledge about methods, processes, and procedures as well as how to use the tools and related equipment
- ? **Human relations skills** - knowledge about human behavior and interpersonal processes including an understanding about feelings, communication, and cooperation
- ? **Conceptual (or cognitive) skills** - general analytic ability, logical thinking, proficiency in understanding complex and ambiguous concepts, problem solving ability, and creativity

Note. From Leadership in Organizations (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), (pp. 242-243), by Gary Yukl, 1998, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. Copyright 1998 by Prentice-Hall, Inc. Reprinted with permission.

Table 2.2 lists the traits and skills Yukl identified through a synthesis of the leadership literature to be the most relevant aspect of personality for effective leadership in large organizations (Yukl, 1998, p. 244).

Table 2.2 Traits Predicting Leadership Effectiveness

- ? High energy level and stress tolerance
- ? Self-confidence
- ? Internal control orientation
- ? Emotional maturity
- ? Personal integrity
- ? Socialized power orientation
- ? Moderately strong need for achievement
- ? Relatively weaker need for affiliation

Note. From Leadership in Organizations (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), (p. 244), by Gary Yukl, 1998, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. Copyright 1998 by Prentice-Hall, Inc. Reprinted with permission.

Improvement in methods and measurements allowed researchers to continue investigating managerial traits and skills throughout the later half of the twentieth century taking into consideration the integrative quality of traits in creating personality. The most popular approach to classification is still a three-skill taxonomy: technical skills, interpersonal skills, and conceptual skills (Katz, 1955; Mann 1965). Researchers believe that these types of skills contribute to leadership effectiveness, particularly when considered in conjunction with leadership behavior (Yukl, 1998).

#### Behavior Theories

About the middle of the twentieth century, concurrent with the continuation of trait studies, researchers expanded inquiry to include leadership behavior. This type of research is described in terms of

activity patterns, managerial roles, or behavior categories and generally falls into two categories of research: nature of managerial work and effectiveness of managerial work (Yukl, 1998).

### Nature of Managerial Work

Research efforts on the nature of managerial work began in the early 1950s with the study of executives (Carolson, 1951) and a variety of other managerial positions (Hales, 1986; McCall, Morrison & Hannan, 1978). The research attempted to discover what managers do and how they spend their time.

Perhaps the most famous of these work-studies was conducted by Mintzberg who studied the nature of work of five bureau chiefs. Mintzberg found that leaders experienced a hectic schedule filled with activities of varied content that required lots of interactions involving oral communication. Most planning was informal and decision-making was disorderly and, at times, political.

After collecting and analyzing the data he obtained from observations and interviews, Mintzberg (1980, pp. 166-170) divided the executive's managerial activities into three categories he called interpersonal, informational, and decisional. Each category contained three specific executive roles. The ten managerial roles are listed in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3 Mintzberg's Ten Managerial Roles

<b>Interpersonal</b>
? Figurehead
? Leader
? Liaison
<b>Informational</b>
? Monitor
? Disseminator
? Spokesman
<b>Decisional</b>
? Entrepreneur
? Disturbance Handler
? Resource Allocator
? Negotiator

### Effectiveness of Managerial Work

During the late 1940s, while Mintzberg was studying managers using interviews and observations, Ohio State University undertook research to study leader effectiveness. They sought to identify effective leader behaviors for the attainment of group and organizational goals through using questionnaires. The now famous Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) resulted from the analysis of questionnaire responses revealing subordinates' perceptions of leadership behavior.

It is from this work that two distinct categories emerged to describe leader behavior: consideration and initiating structure. Consideration had to do with establishing and maintaining relationships while initiating structure had to do with creating conditions to facilitate work efforts (Fleishman, 1953; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hemphill & Coons, 1957).

Unfortunately, most of the research yielded weak and inconsistent findings regarding leadership effectiveness (Bass, 1990, Fisher & Edwards, 1988) However, there did appear to be a positive relationship between consideration and subordinate satisfaction (Fleishman & Harris, 1962, p. 53).

At approximately the same time that the Ohio State Leadership Studies were underway, the University of Michigan was investigating yet another phenomenon associated with leadership: the relationship between leader behavior and group processes, including performance.

Likert (1961) in his book, New Patterns of Management, attempted to integrate the findings from the Michigan studies and provide a theoretical framework to explain them. Several managerial practices distinguished effective from ineffective managers. Table 2.4 summarizes some of the effective managerial behavioral practices discussed by Likert.

Table 2.4 Effective Managerial Behavior

**Task-Oriented Behavior:** Effective managers support the tasks of their subordinates through planning, scheduling, and allocating resources. They also assisted subordinates in setting goals which were important to the organization.

**Relations-Oriented Behavior:** Effective managers support their subordinates through practicing good human relations and building subordinates' sense of personal worth and importance.

**Participative Leadership:** Effective managers support their subordinates through group meetings where setting goals and making decisions are central processes.

Likert's participative leadership research gave rise to the notion of shared leadership. It was believed that members of the group could perform many leadership functions. Bowers and Seashore proposed a theory consisting of four leadership behaviors to explain leadership effectiveness (Bowers & Seashore, 1966). Together they are known as the Four-Factor Theory (see Table 2.5).

Table 2.5 Four-Factor Theory

**Support** - behavior supporting someone else's personal worth and importance

**Interaction facilitation** - behavior encouraging group members to develop close relationships

**Goal emphasis** - behavior stimulating enthusiasm for the achievement of group goals and performance excellence

**Work facilitation** - behavior facilitating group goals such as planning and coordinating and provides materials, tools, and technical knowledge

Studies such as those conducted in Ohio and Michigan appeared to set the pattern for leadership research investigations through the 1990s. The focus, which grew out of those studies, was on relations with people and structuring for performance. The most widely used research tool for these investigations was behavior description questionnaires; however, lab and field experiments, as well as critical incidents were also utilized (Yukl, 1998).

#### Taxonomies

The development of taxonomies provides the opportunity for categorization and organization of research. Realization of this opportunity through agreement on categories and measures opens the possibility for comparison and aggregation. For example, broad categories like consideration and initiating structure provide too general and simplistic a picture of leadership. Many researchers advocate using typologies or taxonomies to aggregate behavior (Yukl & Nemeroff, 1979).

#### Contingency Theories

Edgar H. Schein (1965) said that a good manager must value a spirit of inquiry. In order to be effective, a leader must be able to read the environment and be sensitive to the needs of the people. Then, he must have the flexibility to vary his own behavior to meet the diverse needs of his subordinates. Contingency leadership theories focus on a leader's ability to be perceptive and adaptable, which, in turn, according to contingency theory, affects his or her *effectiveness* as a leader.

Contingency theory examines how the *effects of leadership* vary from one situation to the next situation. It encompasses not only situational research, which examines how managerial behavior varies across situations, but also the effect that leader behavior has on the situation.

All contingency theories investigate how situational moderator variables (i.e., aspects of a situation) enhance or nullify the effects of a leader's traits or behaviors. Theories that account for the effectiveness of leaders through situational moderator variables are considered contingency theories. The incorporation of intervening variables enriches contingency theory by attempting to explain why the effect of behavior on outcomes varies across situations (Yukl, 1981, 1998).

Several important contingency theories emerged during the 1970s and 1980s. They attempted to explain interactional behavior between leaders and subordinates within the context of situations. Four theories are examined: Fiedler's LPC Model, House's Path-Goal, Hersey & Blanchard's Situational Leadership and Blake & Mouton's Managerial Grid.

### LPC Model

During the 1970s, Fred Fiedler influenced research efforts by investigating why consideration and initiating structure do not predict or correlate with group performance. He believed that certain situational factors were at work with personality attributes to determine leadership effectiveness (Hanson, 1991).

Fiedler's LPC (Least Preferred Co-worker) contingency model proposed that a person's personality characteristics are stable and they underlie the motivational system of the leader. These characteristics predispose leaders toward an emphasis in relationship or task in their style. Situational variables like leader-member relations, task structure, and formal power position affect the leader's degree of control and thus the expression of leadership (Hanson, 1991).

Two other important contingency theories of leadership emerged during Fiedler's time. They were path-goal theory and situational leadership theory.

### Path-Goal Theory

House and Mitchell (1974) developed the path-goal theory of leadership to explain how the behavior of a leader influences subordinates, their performance and their satisfaction. Four types of leader behavior (see Table 2.6) emerged from their research.

Table 2.6 Path-Goal Leader Behaviors

**Directive leadership:** The leader give structure to the work situation by establishing specific expectations for the subordinates, such as what, how and when a task should be performed. Specific performance standards are maintained.

**Supportive leadership:** The leader has friendly relationships and shows concern for the well-being and needs of subordinates. The leader is approachable and exhibits trust.

**Achievement-oriented leadership:** The leader expects high levels of productivity from subordinates and exhibits the confidence that subordinates can achieve these high levels. The leader sets challenging goals and emphasizes excellence.

**Participative leadership:** The leader consults with subordinates and considers seriously their views before a decision is made.

Note. From *Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior*, (p. 201), by E. M. Hanson, 1991, Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon. Copyright 1991 by Allyn & Bacon. Reprinted with permission.

According to this theory, the characteristics of the task and the characteristics of the subordinates determine the appropriate type of leader behavior. Leader behavior influences both motivation and satisfaction of subordinates.

### Situational Approach

The situational approach to studying leadership emphasizes the contextual factors that surround and encompass a leader's behavior. Factors include the nature of the work and the environment, which includes interaction with subordinates. The emphasis is on how that behavior varies across situations (Yukl, 1998).

Managerial grid theory. As the Ohio and Michigan Leadership Studies progressed through the 1960s, the task and relationship orientation to studying leadership continued to grow. Blake & Mouton (1964) introduced the managerial grid. The managerial grid is a task/consideration model that ranks managerial behavior on a continuum. The vertical axis represents a score associated with concern for people while the horizontal axis represents a score associated with production. A 9,9 (or High, High) rating is an optimal rating indicating superior performance in both concern and production.

To facilitate understanding, areas of the grid where intersections occur are characterized by descriptive managerial styles such as *authority-obedience management* (for high task, low consideration) and *country club management* (for high consideration, low task). Understandably, the leader who is both high in consideration and high in task is most likely to influence performance positively.

Situational determinants. Stewart (1967, 1976, 1982) investigated situational determinants. She extended Mintzberg's managerial content studies to address the leader's role requirements when associated with a particular managerial position. She formulated a three-component model that explains the demands, constraints, and choices that face most managers. In addition, her work identified subtle demands placed on managers. These demands influence their behavior including their work relationships, work patterns, and exposure (i.e., responsibility for decision-making).

Stewart's work reflected a shift in managerial research efforts to address situational determinants of managerial behavior. Heretofore, research efforts did not address, for the most part, such things as size of the working unit, level of management, or aspects of an organization's life cycle.

Situational leadership. Hersey and Blanchard (1977) extended Blake and Mouton's work calling it situational leadership theory. Based in behavioral science, Hersey and Blanchard attempted to provide a useful model to managerial practitioners that would help them understand and influence their followers, although the model is appropriate for use in any relationship.

This theory is based the interactive behavioral adjustments that occur between the followers and the leader. Hersey & Blanchard (1988) believe that the leader's ability to give task direction and socio-emotional support affect and are affected by the readiness of followers.



The postulate here is that as the situational variable, subordinate maturity, increases (as measured by a criterion such as goal setting), the leader should use more relationship-oriented behavior. As subordinate maturity increases, the leader's relationship-oriented behavior should decline. This creates a model of appropriate leader behavior for each level of subordinate maturity.

The governing assumption is that a leader's positive influence attempts are correlated with his or her ability to adapt to the situation. Of course, inherent in this assumption is a leader's ability to diagnose the needs of his or her subordinates.

### Power-Influence Theories

The power-influence theories associated with leadership concern the exchange of power and influence among leaders and followers. This approach to examining leadership addresses leadership effectiveness in terms of the amount and type of power a leader possesses as well as how it is used. Power is distinguished from influence through recognition of capacity: power refers to an agent's capacity to influence a target person. Influence is often thought to be more subtle than power because it is merely the effect of one party, the agent, on another, the target. Authority, as distinguished from influence and power, is based on perceptions of rights and obligations associated with positions within an organization or social system. It is often referred to as legitimate power because its legitimacy lies in working towards the organization's best interests (Yukl, 1998).

Power is an essential commodity used by leaders to direct organizational behavior. It is intangible and, therefore, difficult to define and distinguish from influence and authority. (Vecchio, 1997).

The front cover of Michael Korda's best selling book (1975) reflects what some might consider a prevalent view of power in organizations: "Power! How to Get It, How to Use It (This book will get you a bigger raise, a better job, and total control over everyone around you!)". It reflects the American power dream where more is better and getting to the top means knocking others down (Steiner, 1981).

There are many ways to examine power. One popular taxonomy, which examined the sources of power, was created by French and Raven (1959). It is summarized in Table 2.7.

Table 2.7 French and Raven Power Taxonomy

**Reward Power:** The target person complies in order to obtain rewards controlled by the agent.

**Coercive Power:** The target person complies in order to avoid punishments controlled by the agent.

**Legitimate Power:** The target person complies because s/he believes the agent has the right to make the request and the target person has the obligation to comply.

**Expert Power:** The target person complies because s/he believes that the agent has special knowledge about the best way to do something.

**Referent Power:** The target person complies because s/he admires or identifies with the agent and wants to gain the agent's approval.

Note. From *Leadership in Organizations* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), (p. 178), by Gary Yukl, 1998, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. Copyright 1998 by Prentice-Hall, Inc. Reprinted with permission.

Another examination classifies power in terms of the sources of power (see Table 2.8) within organizations (Yukl & Falbe, 1991).

Table 2.8 Sources of Power in Organizations

**Position Power**

- Formal authority
- Control over rewards
- Control over punishments
- Control over information
- Ecological control

**Personal Power**

- Expertise
- Friendship/Loyalty
- Charisma

**Political Power**

- Control over decision processes
- Coalitions
- Co-optation
- Institutionalization

Note. From *Leadership in Organizations* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), (p. 179), by Gary Yukl, 1998, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. Copyright 1998 by Prentice-Hall, Inc. Reprinted with permission.

Because the exercise of power, influence, or authority seems inherent in almost every human interaction, it is useful to use the psychological and social sciences to expand and enrich current notions of power. May (1978) arranges power into five different kinds: exploitative, manipulative, competitive, nutrient, and integrative. Exploitative power dominates others; one of the most extreme forms is slavery. It is sometimes rationalized as the *masculine* way of dealing with women sexually (p. 105). Citing Hitler's manipulation of the German people, May contends that people who live in despair and anxiety are prime targets for this type of manipulation. Competitive power has a dark and light side. In its

darkest form, it annihilates; however, in its most positive form it improves and strengthens (e.g., a better mousetrap, a stronger person).

Nutrient power is power used for others and comes from a concern for the welfare of a group. Statesmanship is a good example of nutrient power. Integrative power is power with another person in a relationship characterized by cooperation. Examples of this include Mahatma Ghandi's and Martin Luther King's non-violent approaches to instituting change. May points out in summarizing these different kinds of power that it is in man's best interests to learn how to use all of these forms of power in ways appropriate and adequate to the situation.

James A. Hillman, a noteworthy Jungian analyst, in his book Kinds of Power: A Guide to Its Intelligent Uses (1995), discusses twenty different kinds of power. Moving beyond the vigorous, competitive, athletic notions of power behind Western myths of the hero and Western Christianity, there lay types of power based in the impersonal effect of gifting: altruism, charity, endowment, and magnanimity. May would label this nutrient power while Hillman refers to it as subtle power. Teaching is such an agency as are nursing and gardening whereby the capacity to nourish, protect, and enhance the life of another is central to exercising power.

This nurturing kind of power is different and distinguished from other forms of power characterized by domination and control. It is a form of power that is empowering and that maximizes influence using discretion rather than direction. Hillman places this type of power into a category he calls subtle power which contains feminism, the arts and mysticism, as well as animistic powers. These are invisible forms of power or energies that operate in the environment, forces that a wise leader acknowledges.

Leadership and authority that keeps its own vision risks offending powers it does not see. Hillman (p. 213) quotes the great African teacher, Malidoma Some (1993), ". . . because more than we are involved . . . ." Hillman explains further in the following passage.

Anyone in power must keep one foot in each world, responding to each according to its claims. The instinct on which leadership depends is quite close to intuition, that nose for what's in the air. A person in power addresses and is addressed by the subtle forces in the air and acts as a collective troubleshooter of the troubling spirits, feels upset by them and vulnerable to them. This openness, this capacity to be influenced, and to resist as well, places those in power in communal service to the growth and maintenance of an organization.<sup>1</sup>

#### Integrative Theories

The last approach to examining leadership is the integrative approach because it emphasizes the interdependent nature of leadership qualities and followership attributes (Yukl, 1998). Leader effectiveness is dependent upon how followers perceive themselves and perform the group

---

<sup>1</sup>From Kinds of Power: A Guide to Its Intelligent Uses, (pp. 213-214), by J. Hillman, 1995, New York: NY: Currency Doubleday. Copyright 1995 by James Hillman. Reprinted with permission.

objectives. Transformational leadership theory attempts to explain this interdependent relationship.

### Transformational Leadership

The interest in what today is known as transformational leadership theory began in the 1980s as researchers became interested in the emotional and symbolic aspects of leadership. Bass (1985), the founder of this theory, identified four types of transformational behavior: charisma, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and inspirational motivation. Transformational behavior creates feelings of trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect toward the leader by followers.

According to this theory, leaders build upon these feelings and extend them to commitment to the organization. Through these feelings, they empower followers to carry out the organizational mission. This, of course, requires that followers be motivated, or perhaps even inspired, to put the well-being of the organization above their own.

Transformational leadership theory arose out of the work of Burns (1978) who posited that leadership is an exchange of rewards for compliance. Through this process, contingent reward, active management by exception, passive management by exception, and laissez-faire leadership enhance follower motivation and performance.

Bass (1985) claims that transformational leaders often make use of transactional behavior. However, they use it with charisma (called idealized influence) which creates strong followership through an appeal to an individual's emotions. Followers identify with a leader who represents to them an idealized image of their own values as well as their aspirations. This identification process together with the leader's desire to empower and elevate followers creates commitment to the organization and its members.

### Charismatic Leadership

If the appeal to followers lies purely in personal identification and ideology, and does not transfer to commitment to the organization, leadership is charismatic. Charismatic leadership primarily focuses on building personal loyalty through keeping followers weak and dependent rather than inspiring them to commit to ideals which transcend their self-interest (Bass, 1985).

### Cultural Leadership

Schein (1992) defines the culture of an organization as shared assumptions and beliefs about the world and the nature of self, others, time, and space within that world. Beliefs about internal integration and external adaptation are the basis for determining status and power, allocating resources, handling intimacy and aggression through rules and customs, as well as maintaining consensus on the meaning of words and symbols.

Cultural leadership seeks to bring about a positive change effort through influencing the organizational culture. Attention is focused on what has come to be known as the cultural elements of an organization, that is, ideology, symbols, rituals, and practices.

Culture is best instilled, according to Schein (1992) through consideration of five structures which address the mechanisms operating within and around the leader (see Table 2.9).

Table 2.9 Schein's Primary Mechanisms for Shaping Culture

**Attention:** Leaders communicate priorities through what they ask questions about, reward, praise, criticize, and ignore.

**Reaction to Crisis:** Leaders' responses to crises relate strong messages about values and assumptions.

**Role Modeling:** Leaders communicate values and expectations through their own actions especially actions showing loyalty, self-sacrifice, and service beyond the call of duty.

**Allocation of Rewards:** Leaders' allocation of resources and rewards signal organizational values.

**Selection and Dismissal:** Leaders' criteria for recruiting, selecting, promoting, and dismissing people influence culture.

Note. From *Leadership in Organizations* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), (p. 330), by Gary Yukl, 1998, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. Copyright 1998 by Prentice-Hall, Inc. Reprinted with permission.

Building upon the work of Bennis and Nanus (1985) as well as upon a collection of research reviewed for inclusion in his book, Yukl (1998) identified nine transformational leader behaviors. They are listed in Table 2.10.

Table 2.10 Guidelines for Transformational Leadership

- ? Articulate a clear and appealing vision
- ? Explain how the vision can be attained
- ? Act confident and optimistic
- ? Express confidence in followers
- ? Provide opportunities for early successes
- ? Celebrate successes
- ? Use dramatic, symbolic actions to emphasize key values
- ? Lead by example
- ? Empower people to achieve the vision

Note. From *Leadership in Organizations* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), (p. 342), by Gary Yukl, 1998, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. Copyright 1998 by Prentice-Hall, Inc. Reprinted with permission.

There is another type of cultural leadership about which little is known. It seeks to influence the organizational culture in a subtle manner and perhaps is not a consciously directed exertion of power and influence. Nonetheless, it can be powerful in transforming attitudes and behavior. It is known as servant leadership or as it is sometimes referred to, stewardship.

Servant leadership. Much more than a model, servant-leadership is a way of being. Its founder and author, Robert K. Greenleaf, says that it is "a long-term transformational approach to life and work" (Spears, 1998, p. 5). It begins with the personal desire to be of service to an individual or an organization. Greenleaf explains his idea of a servant-leader (1971).

The servant-leader is servant first . . . . It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. He is sharply different from the person who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions. For such it will be a later choice to serve - after leadership is established. The leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types. Between them there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature.

The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is: do those served grow as persons; do they, *while being served*, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to come servants?<sup>2</sup>

Greenleaf served as the director of management and research at AT&T for many years and was keenly aware of the need for building community within organizational structures. Inspired by the belief that vision and an ethic of service can make a substantial difference in the quality of society, Greenleaf (1977) believed true leaders are chosen by their followers.

According to Larry Spears, a disciple of Robert Greenleaf's, true leaders possess specific characteristics (Spears, 1998), which are outlined in Table 2.11.

Table 2.11 Characteristics of Servant Leaders

- |  |
|--|
| ? Good listener                            |
| ? Empathic                                 |
| ? Healer facilitating wholeness            |
| ? Awareness of self and others             |
| ? Persuasive                               |
| ? Ability to conceptualize and communicate |
| ? Foresight                                |
| ? Stewardship ethic                        |
| ? Commitment to growth of people           |
| ? Community builder                        |

Note. Adapted from The Power of Servant Leadership, (pp. 5-8), by Larry Spears, 1998. Copyright 1998 by The Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership. Reprinted with permission.

<sup>2</sup>From The Servant as Leader, (p. 7), by Robert K. Greenleaf, 1971, Indianapolis, IN: Robert K. Greenleaf Center. Copyright 1991 by The Robert K. Greenleaf Center [921 E. 86<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite, 200, Indianapolis, IN 46240]. Reprinted with permission.

Servant-leadership is a practical philosophy that seeks to assist people who want to serve others first and then lead as a way to expand service. The focus is conceptualized as an inverted pyramid with employees, customers, and community at the top as the number one priority.

This inverted pyramid concept that is built upon the premises of collaboration, trust, foresight, listening, the ethical use of power, and empowerment, is very similar to what the literature has labeled "women's ways of leading". The notion that women lead in ways different from men has led to a growing body of research concerning gender differences in leadership.

### Gender Differences in Leadership

A topic of growing interest since the 1980s is the possibility that differences exist between women and men in leadership behavior and effectiveness. It is undeniable that a person's sex remains an important characteristic in forming an impression of a person. People react to others at least in part according to their sex. Sex is one of the primary categories used to understand and think about the social world (Cross & Markus, 1993).

Eagly (1987) contends that ideas about gender are shaped by observations of women and men in the roles that they commonly play in daily life. Women are believed to possess attributes suited to their family and occupational roles while men are likewise believed to possess role-appropriate attributes (Gilbert & Malone, 1995). Stereotypes emerge and are reinforced from these observations. Women are believed to be receptive and cooperative while men are considered independent and aggressive.

Historically, the division of labor in modern nations assigns women the majority of domestic work thereby reinforcing maternal behaviors that support care and relationship. The assignment of domestic work to women, therefore, is no doubt an important contributor to gender stereotyping as are other work roles assigned to them (Eagly & Steffen, 1984).

Women have served in the service or helping professions (e.g., teachers, nurses, clerical assistants). Even today the employed workforce is segregated to some extent by sex. For example, at least 98% of dental hygienists and secretaries are women whereas the reverse is true for automobile mechanics and carpenters (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1998). These work role assignments also contribute to gender stereotyping.

Gender stereotyping both reflects and promotes sex segregation in employment (Cejka & Eagly, 1999). Lerner (1987) argues that women's subordination is based upon two founding metaphors: her devaluation in relation to the divine and the Aristotelian philosophy that women are incomplete and damaged human beings. Women's subordination has been historically considered natural, and hence invisible, thereby instituting patriarchy as the ruling ideology in Western Civilization. This devaluation of women economically results sex discrimination in employment particularly in terms of wages, status, and managerial employment representation.

Why have women been disadvantaged in the work place? Historically, comparisons between the sexes rendered women inferior and even deviant (Schur, 1983). They were considered physically and intellectually weaker

(Clarke, 1992, 1873) perhaps because their heads were "too small for intellect but just big enough for love" (Meigs, 1847, p. 67, as cited in Walsh, 1997, p. 1). Even today, myths about menstruation perpetuate beliefs about women's diminished physical and mental capacity particularly before and during menstruation (e.g., Premenstrual syndrome [PMS]).

It was this kind of Victorian thinking that prompted women like Woolley (1903) to conduct experimental laboratory research on gender differences. She compared mental abilities and found that the similarities far outweighed the differences. Her work prompted discourses challenging the old ways of thinking about women as inferior.

Karen Horney (1926) likewise ignited discourse in the psychoanalytic community as she challenged her mentor, Sigmund Freud. She insisted that his psychoanalytic theories about women evolved from a male point of view and, therefore, were biased. From that point forward, it is interesting to note that the psychoanalytic literature no longer solely extrapolated from men's psychology to explain women (Westkott, 1986).

The women's movement of the 1960s awakened widespread interest in the psychology of women and sex differences in psychological research. What began as interest in biological explanations (e.g., reproduction, appearance, physical strength, mental abilities, hormones and emotions, sexuality, associational patterns) of differences during the 19<sup>th</sup> century expanded into explorations based in psychology, sociology, anthropology history, and political science. This culminated later in the 20<sup>th</sup> century in the creation of an entire discipline called *women's studies*.

Historically, the term *sex differences* was used in all explanations related to both biological and socially derived distinctions of women and men. This usage has given way to the use of two terms: the term "sex" is used to discuss biological differences while "gender" is used when referring to normative expectations which are socially constructed. For purposes of this analysis, sex is the term used for biological differences and gender is the term used for sociocultural differences.

While it is impractical to include a complete analysis of the research on sex and gender differences, it is important to note their influence upon the study of leadership. Many explanations about gender differences in leadership proceed from biological, psychological, and/or sociological inquiries about gender.

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) conducted one of the most famous psychological studies on sex differences. After synthesizing more than 2000 studies, they concluded that gender differences did exist between men and women but only in aggression and in spatial, verbal, and mathematical aptitude where males were slightly superior. On the other hand, they concluded that many other ideas about masculine superiority were unfounded. For example, boys are better at higher-level cognitive tasks and girls are more suggestible. There was one achievement-related characteristic that consistently differentiates the sexes: self-confidence. Performance expectancies and self-evaluations of abilities are lower among women than men. Maccoby and Jacklin's work served as a warning against overgeneralizing sex differences.

Just as Horney challenged the psychoanalytic community, Gilligan (1982) likewise challenged mainstream psychological thought. She claimed



that women's psychological development differs from normal or traditional psychological development because the later is predicated on masculine models. When traditional masculine development is defined as "normal", the female voice is rendered deviant. Science is a category of knowledge and subject to bias. To leave women, their values and experiences, out of the conversation is to perpetuate bias render science impoverished.

Gilligan reported that women are not weaker, but different. Women's moral development focuses upon conformity to the rules of right conduct and identity with care and responsibility within the context of relationship. Men's moral development focuses upon concern with fairness (e.g., rights and rules) and concern for individuation and individual achievement.

It is difficult to discuss gender without also considering the type of study conducted as well as the economic, political, and social context of the time or particular agenda of the researcher. During the 1970s, feminist psychologists sought to demonstrate that gender differences were insignificant or groundless. Maccoby and Jacklin's work was used to argue equality. Feminist social scientists (Gilligan, 1982; Chodorow 1978), on the other hand, elevated differences claiming these special qualities of empathy, caring, and consensus building enhanced the existing social system rather than restricted women's activities (Crawford & Marecek, 1989).

There is little agreement even today about whether these special qualities stem from female traits or whether they stem from women's subordinated position in society (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1990). However, it is out of this discourse that theories of feminine leadership are being formulated.

Do women have different leadership styles than men? Out of the debate about sex and gender differences arises the debate about leadership and managerial ability in the work place. Most of the research in this area began in the mid-1970s. Initially research focused on the question of why women were less likely to be leaders than men were. A variety of findings indicated that women either lacked confidence (Hancock, 1989; Horner, 1972) or experienced a career-family conflict (Schwartz, 1989).

As more women secured managerial positions, research expanded to examine similarities and differences in their leadership style when compared to men. Empirical data, however, provided only contradictory evidence regarding differences. Gary N. Powell (1997, p. 299), a noted authority on gender and management, points out that four views on leadership comparisons currently prevail:

1. No differences: Women managers reject stereotypical behaviors associated with femininity (e.g., traits, behaviors, goals, and careers) in favor of behaviors associated with masculinity.

2. Stereotypical differences favoring men: Women behave in ways different from men, predicted by gender stereotypes, due to early socialization. This leaves men better suited to be managers.

3. Stereotypical differences favoring women: Women behave in ways different from men, predicted by gender stereotypes, due to early

socialization. This leaves women better suited to be managers because of their feminine traits which are needed in business.

4. Nonstereotypical differences: Women managers and male managers manage in ways contrary to gender stereotypes. Women have had to compensate for early socialization experiences, which are different from men.

In an overview of the literature, C. Johnson (1992), enumerated research studies supporting these different points of view. Although there are a few studies which have found men leaders to be more person-oriented (Winter & Green, 1987) and women to be more task oriented (Bartol & Wortman, 1979; Helmich, 1974), most of the research which found gender differences provide support for gender stereotypic beliefs about behavior where women leaders are more relationship oriented (Gupta, Jenkins, & Beehr, 1983; Statham, 1988) than men who are more task oriented (Baird, & Bradley, 1979; Eskilson & Wiley, 1976; Fowler & Rosenfeld, 1979).

In an examination of leadership effectiveness, Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani (1995) found that women were judged more capable in roles defined by feminine standards while men were judged more capable in roles defined by masculine standards. Also, women who cross the gender line and adopt a more autocratic style are more likely to receive negative treatment (Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992).

The vast majority of gender studies, however, have found little evidence to support significant gender differences (Adams, 1978; Bartol, 1973; Bartol & Martin, 1986; Birdsall, 1980; Camden & Witt, 1983; Day & Stodgill, 1972; Dobbins & Platz, 1986; Donnell & Hall, 1980; Instone, Major & Bunker, 1983; Koberg, 1985; Osborn & Vicars, 1976; Rice, Instone & Adams, 1984, Terborg, 1979).

Most of the gender studies on leadership examine behavior along two dimensions: task style and interpersonal style (Powell, 1997). Two of the most widely used survey instruments for comparing male and female leadership styles delineate behavior along just these two dimensions (Johnson, 1992). On the Leader Behavior Description questionnaire (LBDQ), they are referred to as initiating structure (delineating role and work expectations) and consideration (concern for others) (Stodgill, Goode, and Day, 1963).

Task style refers to how a leader initiates work activity, organizes it, and defines how it is to be done. Interpersonal style refers to how a leader attends to the welfare of the group including members' comfort, well-being, status, and contributions. Since these two dimensions are usually considered independently, a leader could score high on both, low on both, or high on one and low on the other.

A third aspect which is often considered in leadership style studies is the extent to which a leader exhibits democratic leadership practices, which encourage participation, as opposed to autocratic practices which is considered to be opposite. In gender difference studies, researchers will often highlight which sex is more democratic. When women significantly demonstrate this democratic aspect, they use it to validate their positive potential contribution to workplace.

One of the most extensive studies of managerial characteristics was conducted by American Telephone and Telegraph in the early 1980s. Although men and women were identified as having "advantages" in certain areas (e.g., women were found to be advantaged in interpersonal skills and sensitivity, written communication skills, and administrative ability while men were found advantaged in loyalty, motivation to advance, attentiveness to power structures), there were no gender differences in intellectual ability, leadership ability, oral communication skills or stability of performance (Powell, 1988).

These findings correspond with those of Eagly, who is perhaps the most prominent scholar in the field of gender differences. In an extensive meta-analysis of research on leadership styles, she found that women and men exhibited similar leadership styles. On the independent dimensions of task and relationship, women were only slightly more inclined to relationship than task (Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

In a separate meta-analysis, Eagly, Karau, and Makhijani (1995) reported that while there were no sex differences in overall leader effectiveness, men and women fared better in same-sex dominated work environments. Men fared better in such work environments as the military while women fared better in female-dominated settings such as schools

In another extensive study of gender differences conducted by the Management Research Group (1998) and directed by Robert I. Kabacoff, Ph.D., compared 900 female and 900 male managers who completed 360-degree evaluations as part of a leadership development program. The research subjects were rated across 22 leadership practices as evaluated by self and a group called "observers" consisting of boss, peers, and subordinates. Findings were consistent overall with no gender differences as bosses rated men and women as equally effective in terms of overall leadership ability while subordinates and peers rated women slightly higher in leadership ability.

Discrete dimensions were examined and significant findings noted. Male managers scored higher than women managers did in the visionary aspects of leadership as well as in the greater business skill areas such as financial understanding, effective decision making, and knowledge of organizational dynamics. Women managers scored higher in people skills, which includes willingness to listen, credibility, and the capacity to get people involved.

Perhaps the most interesting and surprising finding is that this study found women to be more assertive, competitive, results oriented, and energetic while seeking to establish supportive relationships with others and demonstrating active concern for others' well-being.

Most of the research about leadership style differences appears to presuppose that gender socialization creates differences in behavior, which in turn affects leadership behavior. This perspective asserts that men and women acquire, either biologically and/or through sociocultural experiences, different personality characteristics, skills, and beliefs that predispose women to be concerned with feelings and relationships while men are concerned with being directive and effective (Martin, 1985; Riger & Galligan, 1980).

This supposition lends credibility to the findings that support stereotypic behavior where women tend to relationship while men tend to task.

It appears that in early discourses on leadership style differences arguments favoring no differences were used to justify women's presence in managerial arena while arguments favoring differences were used to exclude them. Feminine behaviors were believed to be different from masculine behaviors and, also, inadequate for the complex managerial demands requiring high productivity and organizational efficiency. These were the values of the traditional command-and-control organizations described by Peters and Waterman in their best selling book, In Search of Excellence (1982); there was only limited value placed on emotional consideration and person-oriented managerial practices.

In response to this type of thinking, Rosener (1990) acknowledged that women did indeed have different leadership styles from men just as women possess "ways of knowing" (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986) and "ways of talking" (Tannen, 1990) different from men. However, many characteristics possessed by women are needed in the managerial profession. Rosener contended women are comfortable with ambiguity and favor collaboration, which together empower workers.

Due in large part to debate ignited by Rosener's work, the 1990s witnessed a new trend in research emerge validating women's leadership differences and their value in managerial positions. Statistics, however, have not caught up with this new thinking. The U.S. Glass Ceiling Commission reported that only 3-5 percent of top U.S. executives were female ("Glass Ceiling?", 1995). If Rosener is correct, then is it not in the best interests of our country, not only in terms of equity but in terms of economics, to place women in top managerial positions?

Research and models abound now comparing men and women; many of them tout the advantages of previously devalued feminine characteristics claiming they are necessary for the service-oriented, fast-paced information based world of business. Appendix B presents several tables and models contrasting masculine and feminine associations.

While researchers and scholars are describing and ferreting out explanations about gender and leadership style, practitioners are identifying and applying solid business practices, enlightened by the gender debate, to solve their managerial problems. Such was the case with a large Canadian steel company (Hurst, 1984) whose operational framework was a traditional one not unlike those described by Peters and Waterman (1982). After an acquisition by another less structured company, the steel company's hard, rational framework fell apart. The management team's priority changed overnight from growth to survival. In addressing the changing needs of the company, management found that the hard, rational model wasn't wrong, it just wasn't enough. They also needed a soft, intuitive framework to assist with their new managerial challenges.

The rational model (metaphorically called "boxes") views people as rational beings while the intuitive model (called "bubbles") views people as social beings. Recognizing this dichotomy in contexts enables managers to choose an appropriate action for administrative action. In order to manage effectively, managers must find the bubble in the box and put the

box in the bubble -- out of which will come shared meaning and a spirit of cooperation (Hurst, 1984).

A simple application of this involves decision-making. Preparation for the decision is made in the box (e.g., tasks, structure, decisional processes, compensation, people). If all key players are not "on side" with the decision, there must be a "creative stall" period before making the announcement from the bubble (e.g., roles, groups, networks, rewards, people). After everyone is on board and the announcement made, implementation is rapid through the people who are considered as both boxes (e.g., rational, produce, think, tell, work) and bubbles (e.g., social, create, imagine, inspire, play). Humor is used to rescue people from "stuck positions" within boxes or bubbles as implementation proceeds.

After examining the concepts associated with the box and bubble thinking, it is evident that these hard and soft qualities could be easily associated through a gender lens labeling the hard qualities as masculine and the soft qualities feminine. Stereotypical biases and prejudices, which might taint and jeopardize acceptance of the conceptual framework, are sidestepped through a focus on substantively delineated behavioral qualities. As demonstrated through the choice of model and its application, thought and language are the keys to managing perceptions.

In hard box thought structures, one tends to use conceptual frameworks as lenses, to sit on one side and examine an object on the other. In bubble structures, the frameworks are mirrors reflecting one's own nature and its effect on one's perceptions; object and subject are on the same side. In the hard box, knowledge is facts, from learning; in the bubble, knowledge is wisdom, from experience.<sup>3</sup>

In reviewing progress three years after instituting this framework, the company realized the importance of creating a new culture with its own language, symbols, norms, and customs. The new culture supports teaming and consensual decision making thus making it similar in values to oriental ways of thinking. Hurst suggests Taoists, for instance, would have no trouble recognizing the polarities of the hard box and soft bubble and the need to keep a balance between the two. See Table 2.12 for a pictorial view of balancing.

---

<sup>3</sup>From "Of Boxes, Bubbles, and Effective Management," by D. K. Hurst, 1984, Harvard Business Review, 3, p. 86. Copyright 1984 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Reprinted with permission.

Table 2.12 Balancing the Polarities

? <b>Heaven</b>	...&...	? <b>Earth</b>
? Yang		? Yin
? Father		? Mother
? Man		? Woman

Note. From "Of Boxes, Bubbles, and Effective Management," by D. K. Hurst, 1984, *Harvard Business Review*, 3, p. 87. Copyright 1984 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Reprinted with permission.

Hurst claims that the symbols are instructive because most everyone grew up with two bosses: father usually played the hard box parts while mother played the soft, intuitive, and entrepreneurial roles making the family the original team.

#### Summary

The literature review indicated that research in leadership is plentiful and varied in focus across traits, behaviors, leadership effectiveness (contingency theories), leadership power and influence, and interdependent studies focusing on leader and follower relations (integrative). It is difficult to aggregate these studies due to the varying research contexts and different variables compounded by the influence of interactive effects.

Today, findings on gender are mixed perhaps because of confounding and intervening variables affecting gender differences in leadership. Although many studies focus on dichotomies in leadership, Carol Tavris (1992) argues that thinking in opposites is a mistake even when it elevates women because it perpetuates bipolar thinking emphasizing difference and opposition rather than similarity and reciprocity. She believes that the woman-is-better school is no better than the woman-is-deficient school.

As women's representation in the business world, and managerial positions in particular, continues to increase, this topic of inquiry will undoubtedly continue to grow (Lengermann & Wallace, 1985).

The focus on gender will need to expand to include specific women studied on their own terms, that is, in the context of their individual work lives. Research, such as this study, will provide rich descriptive observations of the behavioral characteristics of individual women that would inform us about femininity and how it expresses in individual women.

There are stereotypical feminine behaviors and traditional (masculine) behaviors present in women across many studies. Factors influencing behaviors include both biological origin as well as environmental conditioning along with multitudinous combinations.

Papalewis (1995) noted that the literature on women in educational administration has focused on either barriers to advancement or on the "inadequacies" of women when compared to male norms of leadership behavior. In order to create a feminist-inclusive theory of leadership, beliefs, knowledge, thoughts, and values of women must be researched and incorporated into existing administrative theory.

The research questions addressed in this study are not fully represented in administrative theory nor are there many in-depth descriptive studies of women in school administration. There are many interview- and survey-based studies; however, there are few comprehensive descriptions such as set forth in this study.