

Defining Leadership

A Review of Past, Present, and Future Ideas

BY

MATTHEW R. FAIRHOLM, PH.D.

DIRECTOR, LEADERSHIP STUDIES AND DEVELOPMENT, CEMM

MONOGRAPH SERIES

MS02-02

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR EXCELLENCE IN MUNICIPAL MANAGEMENT

Center for Excellence in Municipal Management's Research Program

Since its inception, The George Washington University Center for Excellence in Municipal Management has focused on providing practitioner oriented research to support and expand its mission. The Center's efforts have grown to include professional and academic research around such Center-related themes as government transformation, leadership and management, public-private partnerships, and leadership and executive education. The Center supports the School of Business and Public Management's mission by engaging in research and other scholarly activities to advance leadership and management theory and practice and by providing management and professional expertise to government organizations.

The Center's collection of working papers, academic and professional journal articles, book extracts, and thought pieces is designed to highlight current and future trends in public management, enhance the Center's training and advisory services, encourage collaboration between practitioners and academics, and provide another outlet for the creation and dissemination of innovative ideas to SBPM students, alumni, faculty, and the general public.

The Center's research products can be found on our website: www.TeachingLeaders.org

Center for Excellence in Municipal Management
2033 K Street, NW, Suite 240
Washington, DC 20052
202-994-5390, fax 202-994-5389
cemm@gwu.edu

We encourage the distribution of these materials. However, no part of the contents may be reproduced without proper credit given to the author(s) and the GWU Center for Excellence in Municipal Management.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
“I KNOW IT WHEN I SEE IT”	1
HISTORICAL THREADS OF LEADERSHIP THOUGHT	2
<i>Trait Theory</i>	2
<i>Behavior Theory</i>	5
<i>Situational Theory</i>	6
<i>The Leadership and Management Distinction</i>	8
<i>Values-based Transformational Leadership: Beyond Reductionism</i>	10
Values-based Transformational Theory.....	12
Values and Leadership.....	12
THE MORALITY AND PHILOSOPHY OF LEADERSHIP: WHAT GREENLEAF AND BURNS BEGAN.....	13
EMERGING VIEWS AND DESCRIPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP.....	16
PERSPECTIVAL APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING LEADERSHIP	17
FAIRHOLM’S CONCEPTIONS	18
<i>Leadership as (Scientific) Management</i>	19
Efficient, Predictable Use of Resources, and Optimality.....	20
Individual Performance Issues, Organizing, Planning, and Direction	20
Incentivization and Control	21
<i>Leadership as Excellence Management</i>	21
Continuous Process Improvement, Transforming Environments and Perceptions	23
Listening Actively, Being Accessible, and Expressing Common Courtesy	23
Motivation and Engaging Others in Problem Solving.....	23
<i>Leadership as a Values Displacement Activity</i>	23
Developing Individuals.....	25
Encouraging High Performance and Self-led Followers	26
Setting, Enforcing, and Prioritizing Values.....	26
Visioning and Communicating the Visions.....	26
Teaching, Coaching, and Empowering.....	27
<i>Trust Culture Leadership</i>	27
Trust and Ensuring Cultures of Trust.....	29
Fostering and Maintaining Shared Cultures and Prioritizing Mutual Cultural Values and Conduct..	29
Team Building, Sharing Governance, and Group Performance	29
<i>Spiritual (Whole Soul) Leadership</i>	30
Liberating the Best in People and a Concern for the Individual	32
Developing Individual Wholeness While Building Community and Promoting Stewardship	32
Fostering an Intelligent Organization, Setting Moral Standards, and Modeling a Service Orientation	32
Inspiration.....	33
SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW	33
CONCLUSION	35
REFERENCES.....	39

List of Tables

Table 1: Historical Threads Of Leadership Research And Theory	36
Table 2: Fairholm's Perspectives On Leadership Aligned With The Literature Review	37

Defining Leadership: A Review of Past, Present, and Future Ideas

Matthew R. Fairholm, Ph.D.

Introduction

Defining leadership is a recent academic activity, though the phenomenon of leadership has been ever present in human relations. Stogdill reminds us that the word “leader” has origins back to the 1300s and the word “leadership” dates back to the 1800s. He reviewed over 3,000 studies directly related to leadership and suggested that there are almost as “many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept” (Stogdill, 1974, p. 7). Bennis and Nanus (1985) found 350 definitions from thousands of studies. Rost (1991) found 221 definitions in 587 books and articles written from 1900 to 1990.

These reviews of leadership studies and definitions have certainly not closed the book on leadership research. In fact, many researchers lament the progress (or lack of progress) made in understanding and defining leadership. Bennis and Nanus (1985) conclude that “[n]ever have so many labored so long to say so little” (p. 4). Rost (1991) is even more indicting when he comments that “these attempts to define leadership have been confusing, varied, disorganized, idiosyncratic, muddled, and, according to conventional wisdom, quite unrewarding” (p. 99). Yet these researchers, and many others, continue their work studying, defining, identifying, and developing leadership.

Yukl (1988) encourages this continued focus on leadership study. Rather than cynically reflecting on past efforts, he suggests we draw upon the many exist-

ing conceptualizations of leadership to give us a better, more thorough grasp of this necessarily elusive social phenomenon. His attempts to grasp leadership involve trying to integrate many of the previous leadership theories into an overarching “supermodel” of leadership.

“I Know It When I See It”

As players in the social and interpersonal world, people have their own conceptions of leadership; in other words, “We know it when we see it.” While many researchers recognize this, few study leadership with that notion in mind. Researchers in the past have failed to account for the personal, more intimate idea of defining leadership for oneself. They ignored the personal frames of reference, world views, and cultural constructs that call for each of us to answer for ourselves the question, “What is leadership?” Recently, Fairholm (1998a) has recognized this lack of focus and began work on understanding different leadership perspectives, or “virtual realities,” within which people operate and measure the success or failure of leadership.

Fairholm’s model will be discussed later and will form the foundation for this research effort. His model may presage a significant thread for further research. However, it is important to gain a basic understanding of the historical threads of leadership study that have woven the research paths that we are on today. While every effort is made to summarize this review of leadership literature, the field is such that it requires a fairly en-

compassing review of many ideas to gain a proper and sufficient understanding of the topic.

This summary first provides a review of four historical threads of leadership thought and discusses the debate about the relationships between management and leadership. It then turns to a discussion of broader philosophical trends of leadership theory, such as values-based transformational leadership, leader/follower interactions and followership, and sense-making conceptions of leadership. Fairholm's model of leadership virtual realities is then reviewed. In sum, what follows describes how past approaches that focused on leaders evolved into broader definitions of leadership and now point to more comprehensive understandings of leadership in terms of ever-more encompassing individual conceptions of leadership. Finally, the literature review concludes with a brief overall summary.

Historical Threads of Leadership Thought

Four threads of leadership thought help us discover the evolution of leadership thinking: trait theory, behavior theory, situational theory, and values-based transformational theory. The first three threads lean toward a reductionist methodology of understanding leadership by aggregating data about leaders and situations. Sanchez (1988) suggests that the examination of leadership theory using these three threads provides a useful framework for examining the evolution of leadership thought. He cites Lewin's (1951) model of behavior as a reasonable foundation for examining these three elements of leadership (see Colvin, 1996). The model suggests that behavior depends upon the individual's involved and the circumstances of that person's environment or situation, or $B = F(P, S)$ – behavior is a function of

person and situation. Colvin (1996) similarly describes the historical threads of leadership to include the leader as a person, the leader's behavior, and the leadership demands of the situation. These three approaches mirror Fairholm's (1991) review of leadership theory in terms of what the leader is, what the leader does, and in which situation a leader is effective.

Although three of the historical threads mentioned above are still commonly used as a framework for understanding leadership, a new way of approaching the leadership theory goes beyond these assumptions. A fourth thread, values-based transformational leadership, begins to move the discussion towards a more holistic approach to understanding leadership. It moves the discussion from the leader to the phenomenon of leadership. This thread examines the relationships between leader and follower and the activity of sharing, or coming to share, common purposes, values, ideals, goals, and meaning in our organizational and personal pursuits.

This section begins by examining these four threads of leadership research and theory. First, trait theory is discussed, then behavior theory followed by situational theory. Next is a review of values based transformational leadership with accompanying discussions of leader/follower relationships and meaning sharing activities of leadership. The last part of this section highlights the growing consensus that leadership is distinct from traditional views of management.

Trait Theory

Trait theory looks at the study of leadership as the study of great leaders, or at least, their traits and qualities. The first attempts to codify leadership and determine what "makes a good leader"

centered on the belief that leaders are born, not made (Galton, 1870; Wiggam, 1931, see Stogdill, 1974). This gave rise to various forms of trait theory: the idea that leadership depends upon personal qualities, personality, and character.

In this sense, Carlyle's (1841/1907) essay on heroes and our current fascination with celebrity figures can be viewed as studies of leadership. More explicitly, Dowd (1936) concludes that different individuals in every society possess certain traits or qualities that define their position in society, including leadership. More comprehensively, Jennings (1960) defined the "great man" theory of leadership, wherein much of leadership study can be found in biographies of historical figures. These biographies may explicitly or implicitly describe a conception of leadership, but they all belie the belief that to understand leadership, it is necessary to understand leaders. Figures such as George Washington (Clark 1995), Winston Churchill (Coote & Batchelor, 1949; Emmert, 1981; Gilbert, 1981; Hayward, 1997), and Martin Luther King, Jr. (Carson, 1987), are often dissected to discover secrets of leadership.

The search for the set of qualities that these great people and superior individuals possessed, led researchers to an exhaustive search for particular leadership traits. This search began first by identifying generalities. Strength of personality equating to leadership was a consistent theme (Bingham, 1927; Bogardus, 1934; Bowden, 1926; Kilbourne, 1935). From these general discussions of the influence of personality, more specific studies tried to identify the set of qualities or traits that defined leadership across the board. Stogdill's (1974) review of leadership trait studies identified the following areas as important in successful leaders: chronological age; height; weight; physique, energy, health;

appearance; fluency of speech; intelligence; scholarship; knowledge; judgment and decision; insight; originality; dominance; initiative, persistence, ambition; responsibility; integrity and conviction; self-confidence; mood control or mood optimism; emotional control; social and economic status; social activity and mobility; biosocial activity; social skills; popularity and prestige; cooperation; patterns of leadership traits that differ with situation; and the potential for transferability and persistence of leadership. Later studies focused on physical characteristics, social background, intelligence and ability, personality, task-related characteristics, and social characteristics (Stogdill, 1974). The focus on the last two categories presage the beginnings of behavioral theory.

Broadening the great person theory, Scott (1973) discusses a theory of significant people. Significant people are the administrative elite who control the "mind techniques" of others because they do significant jobs and are superior to everyone else. Their justification is not for control, but rather to improve efficiency. Since people will benefit from the techniques, it can be considered morally correct. The result in improved efficiency will enable the elite to handle crisis situations better than before. An equation representing this concept is written: $AE+MT = SP$ (administrative elite + mind techniques = significant people).

Charismatic leadership is rooted in trait theory, though it is a topic of considerable debate. Conger and Kanungo (1988) call charisma the elusive factor in organizational effectiveness. Nadler and Tushman (1990) say charismatic leadership, involving enabling, energizing, and envisioning, is critical during times of strategic organizational change. Valle (1999) suggests charisma, in conjunction with crisis and culture, helps define successful leadership in contem-

porary public organizations. Sashkin (1982), however, views charisma as leadership in wolves' clothing. In other words, charisma is a replacement for leadership, not a trait that leaders necessarily possess. Rutan and Rice (1981) also question whether charismatic leadership is an asset or a liability to organizations. The potential for good and evil is too significant to ignore as charismatic leaders influence others by appearing "more than" human.

The focus on trait theory diminished over the years. While the qualities and traits of leaders were not ignored, researchers began to link traits with other requirements of leadership, such as behavior and situation. Drucker (1966) uses trait theory as a springboard to understanding leadership in terms of personal discovery and proceeds to describe essential practices of effectiveness management. Here we see the synonymous usage of leadership and management overlaid by a discussion of traits and practices.

Bennis (1982) also finds roots in trait theory as he studies how organizations translate intention into reality. His study focused on ninety CEOs of reputable companies. By surveying these "leaders" he reveals certain qualities of leadership. Sashkin (1989) continues the migration from trait theory towards a more complex understanding of leadership. He states that to understand leadership, one must consider personal characteristics *and* behaviors and situations.

Schein's (1989) study of women and leadership concludes that the traits of leadership are virtually identical between men and women. Though some disagree (see Rosener, 1990), the discussion often revolves around the typical traits and characteristics displayed. Hackman and Johnson's (1991) view of leadership as a communication dynamic

reveals the specific skills and traits of communication and articulateness that are required for leaders to be successful.

Though trait theory may be waning as the dominant perspective in which to understand successful leaders, and hence leadership, recent research has seen somewhat of a resurgence. Jacques and Clement (1991) hearken back to the superior individual, significant people, and great man debates when they suggest certain people are innately better suited to leadership roles. The most direct reexamination of trait theory and leadership comes from Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991). Their work argues that though leadership study has moved beyond traits, towards behaviors, and on to situational approaches, a shift back to a modified trait theory involving the personal qualities of leaders is occurring. They identified six traits leaders possess as distinct from non-leaders. However, they argue that the traits are simply necessary, but not sufficient, for success. Possessing these qualities simply gives individuals an advantage over others in the quest for leaders; it does not predestine them to leadership. More recently, the work by Goleman (1995) on emotional intelligence hearkens back to the trait theorists.

Trait theory is a constant in leadership studies. It is seemingly the most obvious avenue for researchers to embark upon. However, it assumes that leadership is simply an aggregation of the qualities of good leaders. While trait theory has its advantages, the quest for a single list of universal qualities still eludes researchers. History shows that instead of reworking the reductionist methodology of understanding leadership, eventually theorists simply turned their attention to a different focus: the behavior of leaders.

Behavior Theory

Behavior theory differs from trait theory in that leadership is described not as what leaders are like, but rather as what leaders do – their behavior and functions. Behavior theory describes leadership as being the sum of two important behaviors that great leaders seem to hold in common: getting things done and relating well with people.

This was a potentially more "scientific" approach to leadership study, because behaviors could be seen, observed, measured, and potentially mimicked (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). Along with behavior theory in general, were specific theories based on interaction and expectancy of roles, exchange activities between leader and follower, and the perceptions that followers have of leaders (Follett, 1983; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Hollander, 1997; House, 1996; Nolan & Harty, 1984). These behavior-based theories did provide a way for people to copy what other leaders have done, but the behaviors in the end do not prove to be generalizable.

Behavior theory is where much of the confusion between leadership and management theory originates. The rise of this research focus coincided with the efforts to understand the rigors of management and executive authority in the industrial age. Therefore, "leadership theories" were in reality management theories; the idea being that the best people at the top of an organization equal leaders and by studying what they *did*, the mysteries of leadership will be unfolded.

Many of the organizational theorists focused on the top of the organizational hierarchy to understand management practices (Argyris, 1957; Barnard, 1938a; Barnard, 1938b; Follett, 1918 / 1998; Follett, 1926; Gouldner, 1954; Gulick, 1937; Homans, 1950; Maslow, 1943; Taylor, 1915;

Whyte, 1956). In these efforts, those at the top were more often than not called leaders. Therefore, what they did in their management or titular headship roles, the logic went, was leadership. The roots of the confusion that persists to this day, between what is leadership and what is management, are easy to see.

The classic Ohio State and Michigan studies on leadership were the prime example of and the watershed event for the development of behavior theory in leadership research. Hemphill (1950) and others proceeded to discern from factor analysis research two main elements of leadership behavior: consideration and initiation of structure. The Michigan studies verified these findings with data describing relationship building and task-focused orientations. From these studies emerged the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire which assisted researchers in their goal of understanding leader behavior (Hemphill & Coons, 1957).

From these beginnings, Stogdill and Coons (1957) edited a series of research efforts describing and measuring leader behavior. Jay (1967) popularized managerial tactics by employing the advice and wisdom of Niccolo Machiavelli. Blake and Mouton (1964) developed a behaviorally-based grid describing leadership behavior and positing an ideal leader type based on the two factors of the Ohio State studies. Gardner's (1987) review of the tasks of leadership moves the discussion from management to leadership, but retains the focus on leader behavior. In many ways, writers on total quality management (Deming, 1986; Juran, 1989) add the behavior approach to good managerial leadership.

Gardner's (1990) argument that most of leadership is learned reflects a behavioral approach. It opened the door for

many to write about organizational learning and leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 1990; Senge, 1990; Heifetz, 1994; Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1993). Much of what could be learned centered on the power relationships that are inevitable in the leadership dynamic, even though that dynamic was not yet clearly defined (Fairholm, 1993). Much of the contemporary practices of leadership, and especially leadership development training, emerged based on modern illustrations of behavior theory (Drucker, 1990; Kotter, 1996; Vaill, 1996; Collins & Porras, 1997).

Situational Theory

Situational theory suggests that behavior theory is not adequate for the complicated world of organizations and society, because specific behaviors are most useful only during specific kinds of situations. Though there is a specific theory of leadership labeled contingency theory (see Fiedler, 1967), in the broadest sense contingency theory, also known as situational leadership theory, tries to define leadership through what leaders do in specific situations that differ because of internal and external forces. In this sense, leadership is not something definable without the specific context of the situation in which leaders seem to emerge.

Studies began to focus on the environments in which leadership takes place. The thinking was that situations determine what leaders do, and that behaviors must be linked to the specific environment at hand. Situational theory, contingency theory, and the more humanistic models of leadership emerged. It was during this emphasis of leadership study that the desire to differentiate between managers and leaders emerged. Not all theorists thought it necessary to make the distinction. Nonetheless, the unique elements and

foci of leadership and management made it necessary to begin to look at the two as different and develop theories accordingly.

Researchers began to look at a wide range of variables that could influence leadership style, and at different situations that would call for various leadership behaviors or call forth those individuals that have various leadership traits. Homans (1950) developed a theory of leadership using three basic variables: action, interaction, and sentiments. Hemphill (1954) studied leadership in terms of the situations in which group roles and tasks are dependent upon the varying interactions between structure and the office of the positional authority. Evans (1970) suggests that the consideration (or relationship) aspects of leadership depends upon the availability of rewards and the paths through which those rewards are obtained. Fielder's (1967) classic contingency theory model suggests that leadership effectiveness depends upon demands imposed by the situation in that task-oriented leaders are more effective in very easy and very difficult situations, and relationship-focused leaders do better in situations that impose moderate demands on the leader. Many researchers have used Fiedler's approach and his Least Preferred Coworkers (LPC) methodology to verify his hypotheses (see Cheng, 1982; Offermann, 1984; Rice & Kastenbaum, 1983; Shouksmith, 1983).

Hollander (1978) suggested practical guidelines for leadership interactions in different group circumstances. Hersey and Blanchard (1979) built upon the behavioral work of Blake and Mouton, and suggested that the best leadership style depends upon the situation and the development of the leader and the follower, concluding that empirical studies suggest there is no normatively best style of leadership and that effective-

ness depends upon the leader, the follower, and other situational elements. Nicholls (1985) reviewed Hersey and Blanchard's model and suggested there were fundamental flaws in the model and provided ways to improve it. He argued that their model violates three logical principles – consistency, continuity, and conformity. Nicholls' model performs all the functions of the original model in relating leadership style to the situation, while avoiding the problems inherent in the original's fundamental flaws. The model posits a smooth progression of the leader from parent to the leader as developer, and balances the task and relationship orientations in the leader's style.

Hunt, Osborn and Marton (1981) describe the testing of a model of leadership effectiveness that centers on nine macro variables and the idea of leadership discretion. Their macro variables were represented by the complexity of the environment, context, and structure of a unit. Vecchio and Gobdel (1984) studied the vertical dyad linkage (VDL) model of leadership, suggesting that the type and distribution of leader and follower interaction determines leader effectiveness. They determined that in-group status was associated with higher performance ratings, reduced propensity to quit, and greater satisfaction with supervision. Objective measures of actual job performance yielded results that were congruent with the prediction of a positive correlation with subordinate in-group status. Triandis (1993) contributed to this line of thought by studying leadership in terms of triads.

Stimpson and Reuel (1984) studied the variable of gender in determining the kind of styles managers adopt. Results showed that managers tended to model the style of their boss and that females evidenced this tendency to a greater degree than males. Furthermore, when the boss was a female, male subordi-

nate managers became somewhat more participative than the boss, while female subordinate managers became more authoritarian.

Vroom and Yetton (1973) developed a contingency model of decision-making to determine effective leadership behaviors in different situations. Heilman, et al. (1984) were some of the many researchers who examined the validity of Vroom and Yetton's contingency model. They determined that the perspective of the individual viewing a leader influences the way in which he/she evaluates that leader's task effectiveness. Data from this study indicate a consistently more favorable affective response to the participative than to the autocratic leader, regardless of the subject's perspective or the circumstances.

Contingency theory, especially in combination with trait and behavior theory, offered new avenues of research into what makes leaders effective. Contingency theory seemed to ignore the emotive and inspirational attachment that leaders tend to evoke no matter what the situation. Yet, in so doing it gave rise to researchers who focused on those very issues. At times it was difficult to separate distinctly the theories from each other as they morphed from one to the other. The new avenues of research included follower dynamics, relationships, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, organizational culture, organizational change, and power in an effort to understand what variables influenced the effectiveness of leaders. However, contingency theory disappointed some thinkers because it defined leadership down to "it all depends." To answer this lack of confidence in what makes an effective leader, leadership began to be thought of in terms separate and distinct from leaders and more as a theory of social interaction or organizational philosophy.

The Leadership and Management Distinction

As mentioned earlier, rising from behavior theory and situational leadership theory was a question of whether or not leadership and management as concepts and practices were the same thing. This debate still goes on today. The basic questions historically and contemporarily revolve around whether what has formerly been called and written about as management is indeed the same thing as leadership, whether they are two subsets of each other, or whether they are two distinct concepts.

Since Frederick Taylor's (1915) scientific management approach to organizational efficiency, management has been central in the academic's and practitioner's study and structure of organizations. Taylor's work began to illustrate the good and the bad of "management" (Weisbord, 1987). Over time, the distinctions of good and bad became deeper and more socially profound. The labor movement grew in opposition to "management" (meaning the positional, hierarchical figure). The sterile approach of many managers became stereotypical of what was bad about organizational life. On the other hand, the industrial model with its emphasis on management, is often given credit for much of the success of modern industrial America. The Hawthorne Studies (Dickson & Roethlisberger, 1966; Mayo, 1945; Roethlisberger, Dickson, & Wright, 1941) showed that human systems needed to be taken into account in organizations, and most of the management theorists of the time agreed.

Yet, amid this study and practice of management, the meanings of words such as "management," "manager," "leader," and "leadership" were defined in similar ways, often blurring and confusing the concepts. Efforts to study these concepts and to develop a vo-

cabulary of management muddled the definitions and differences, if indeed differences existed at all. Some of the confusion may have been caused by the fact that more sophisticated "management tools" were developed alongside the notion that leadership was situational. Thus, the practices of a leader looked very much like good management practices. Understanding leadership appeared similar to Justice Stewart's (Jacobellis v. Ohio, 1964) description of how to distinguish art from hardcore pornography – "I know it when I see it" – or what Roger Smith described as the abominable snowman – "you see the tracks, but never the thing itself" (Smith, 1995, p. 464).

Eventually, there arose a recognition that management and leadership, while both important, may not be the same phenomenon. This is not to say that managers and leaders need be different individuals (though they may be), nor that there are normative judgements about the value of each. Simply, "doing leadership" and "doing management" are two different tasks.

In *Leaders*, Warren Bennis & Burt Nanus (1985) make clear that, "managers are masters of routine, they accomplish, they are efficient; whereas, leaders are masters of change, they influence, they are effective." McFarland, Senn, and Childress (1993) also make a point to distinguish between the two, saying that in the past the distinctions between "leadership" and "management" were blurred, and they were often used interchangeably (see also Kotter 1990; Fairholm 1991; Yukl 1998). Not so today.

Zaleznik (1977) suggests that organizations depend upon people who keep the processes moving along, insure productivity, control, and schedule the use of appropriate resources, but organizations also need people who can infuse the organization with purpose and common

values and help determine the character of the organization and insure its long-term survival. The skills and competencies required to do the first critical activity are substantially different than those needed to do the second one described. The first is the domain of the manager; the second is the domain of the leader (see Fairholm, 1991).

While some authors and practitioners continue to confuse the two concepts or make no distinction (see Drucker, 1954; Whetton & Cameron, 1998), more and more the literature is asserting that management is not leadership and leadership is not management. Management is defined as the act of controlling, counting, and supervising other people so that they perform in specific ways to increase the overall productivity of the system or operation (see Taylor 1915; see also Selznick 1983; Stodgill, 1974). Gulick's conception of POSDCORB (an acronym standing for planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting) is the traditional realm of management (Gulick, 1937; Stodgill, 1974). The words "control", "supervision", "incentives", and "inducements" are equivalent, in many respects, to management.

Nelson (1997) challenges whether that conception of management is sufficient in today's organizations. In his review of motivation in today's work environment, he explains that "managers have fewer ways to shape employee behavior – coercive and authoritarian behavior is no longer an option. To be effective, today's managers must create supportive work environments that can influence, but not ordain, desired behavior and outcomes" (p. 35). In saying this, Nelson suggests we need to change our understanding of how individuals relate to each other in the workplace.

Wheatley (1997) offers a broader discussion of the distinction. She suggests

that traditional management activities are used to change organizations by "tinkering with incentives" and reshuffling organizational pieces and parts, but that "these efforts are doomed to fail, and nothing will make them work. What is required is a shift in how we think about organizing" (p. 22). She continues that even though most of us "learned to play master designer, assuming we could engineer people into perfect performance....You can't direct people into perfection; you can only engage them enough so that they want to do perfect work" (p. 25).

But confusion persists about what else besides management is necessary. Much of this confusion is due to a lack of precise definition. Nirenberg's 1998 study of organizational behavior textbooks revealed much about how leadership is reviewed in the literature and taught in schools. He concludes "leadership, as presented in the selected texts, is a collection of control theories that ignores essential aspects of the leadership concept. Furthermore, these texts imply that leadership is achieved by being promoted into a supervisory role" (p. 84). He goes on to suggest

that the definition of leadership itself has been undergoing a transformational shift unrecorded in the texts. Leadership, according to the texts, like the concept of management, has been thought to mean the act of getting things done with and through people, albeit in a kinder, gentler way. Typically, the authors simply say it is the process of influencing others. Nelson and Quick, for example, define leadership as 'The process of guiding and directing the behavior of people in the work environment.' ...Manager could replace leader in this definition without losing any meaning (Nirenberg, 1998, p. 84, emphasis added).

Nirenberg suggests the notion of leadership is changing dramatically. He seems to suggest that whereas position was the predictable domain of management, relationship becomes the distinct realm of leadership.

Further refining what leadership may be, some have explicitly differentiated headship and leadership, where headship refers to managerial position and authority. Differentiating between the structure of headship and the philosophy of leadership allows us to see that leadership is, and perhaps always has been, distilled throughout the organization, developing individuals into leaders in their own right.

Baruch (1998) clarifies the distinction further in a 1998 study, the aim of which was to explore whether studies focusing on the phenomenon of leadership were examining actual leadership cases or another phenomenon – appointmentship:

There is a significant difference between the two. Appointmentship is a case where a person is granted, through an external authority, certain power and responsibilities over other people. The emergence of leadership, however, is concerned with inner processes, where people recognize and are ready and willing to be influenced by a person. As results, it is not simple, and perhaps even misleading to draw an analogy from one phenomenon to the other. Even worse is ignoring the difference and referring to one phenomenon as if it was actually the other (p. 101, emphasis added).

Kotter (1990) continues to differentiate between leadership and management. He suggests management is about coping with complexity and leadership is about coping with change. These two activities demand different sets of skills

and different organizational perspectives that substantially distinguish between the two activities. In a similar vein, Ackerman (1985) discusses the difference between leadership and management, arguing that leadership is followership based on personal attraction while management is followership based on acceptance of organizational position.

A description of leadership, then, should distinguish leadership from management. Once again, this does not mean that one person cannot be both a leader and a manager. Just as quantum physics teaches us that light is both a particle and a wave but never at the same time, one individual may perform both management and leadership, but *not* at the same time (see Wolf, 1989). As the characteristics of particle light are distinct from the nature of wave light, so are the characteristics, perspectives, and values set of management distinct from those of leadership. The two are complementary, but not the same. Leadership encompasses technologies and mindsets that are different (not necessarily better) than management.

Values-based Transformational Leadership: Beyond Reductionism

As alluded to earlier, researchers have attempted to answer the questions of where leaders have gone as they describe what it really means to be a leader. But still the focus of many is on the leader, as if to say leadership can only be understood by studying specific individuals in specific situations. Stogdill suggests that although the endless accumulation of bewildering findings has not produced an integrated understanding of leadership, the overarching approach to understand leadership must be based on valid experimental findings (Stogdill, 1974). This is an emphatic reiteration of the idea that the best way to understand leadership is to under-

stand the leader's being, doing, and accommodating – the who, what, and when of leadership.

There are some, though, who go beyond the mere study of leaders. Recognizing that studying individual leaders may not facilitate a better understanding of leadership, these researchers reject, implicitly or explicitly, the idea that leadership per se is a summation of the qualities, behaviors, or situational responses of individuals in a position of authority. To study leaders is not, in this sense, to study leadership.

Spitzberg (1987) supports this idea. He presents questions that are intended to understand leadership, not developing or training leaders. He continues that “those who wish to develop leaders must understand much more than the current state of knowledge about leadership if they are to do more than engage in documentation of trivia. Leadership development is an important personal and social goal. But it is a goal dependent upon better understanding the nature of leadership” (p. 33). There is an implicit acceptance that leadership is something more expansive than the title “leader” and that an integrated understanding of leadership requires a broader more holistic approach. That is, one must try to understand the “nature of leadership.”

Here a clear distinction must be made. The terms “leader” and “leadership” are not the same, nor are they interchangeable. The confusion and imprecise use of each term in describing certain phenomena may be at the core of the confusion (and dissension) among those who study the topic. Indeed, this confusion exists even in this literature review. As the views of different authors are presented it becomes clear that leader and leadership are often used interchangeably.

While studying the qualities, behaviors and situational responses of those who claim to be, or are given the title of leader is a useful perspective – it is also limiting. This type of researcher more often than others confuse leadership and management. They view leadership study from a reductionist perspective with the case studies of leaders aggregating to the essence of leadership: leaders, therefore, define leadership. A different approach to leadership research, however, views leadership as something beyond the sum of individual leader styles, behaviors, and qualities. Leadership from this approach encompasses a unique conception of individual interaction. In this sense, leaders do not define leadership; rather, leadership defines what a leader is, what a leader does, and how a person can be one.

Unfortunately, not every researcher and author on leaders and leadership make distinct the definitions of the terms “leader” and “leadership.” In fact, they may not recognize the need for distinctions and clarifications. However, the literature does reflect these two different approaches and it behooves researchers to acknowledge them. One perspective is very much an aggregation or mechanistic system. The other is much more a philosophy. This philosophical perspective frees one of the notions that leadership is positional, hierarchical, or managerial and allows for leadership to be more pervasive in organizations and life because leadership is not tied to structure, qualities, or birth. This approach allows leaders to develop, because it is developmental in nature. It moves us from mundane cookie-cutter approaches to power relationships and allows us to accept creativity, flexibility, and inherent, emerging order. The approach is inspirational, rather than merely motivational. The quest from this more holistic approach is to study what leadership actually is. The attempt, it is assumed, will yield different and more

precise definitions of "leadership" than we have had in the past, and will, as a consequence, change our definitions of "leader" based on the elements of these more precise definitions.

Values-based Transformational Theory

When researchers focus on a broader, more philosophical conception of leadership, they focus less, or not at all, on the traditional observable phenomena of specific individual characteristics, behaviors, and situations. Rather they focus more on the broader, less definable aspects of a certain kind of relationship between people. The elements of this relationship deal more with values, morals, culture, inspiration, motivation, needs, wants, aspirations, hopes, desires, influence, power, and the like. The emphasis is not on studying specific leaders in specific situations, doing specific things. Rather, the focus is on the common relationship elements exhibited over time that characterize this thing called "leadership."

Throughout the development of management and leadership theory, it has only been recently that researchers began to think about leadership in ways that transcend the trait, behavioral, or contingency theories that have dominated debate (see, for example, (Burns, 1978; Covey, 1992; Cronin, 1984; Fairholm, 1991; Greenleaf, 1977; Rost, 1991; Spitzberg, 1987; Wheatley, 1992/1999). Values-based transformational theories are a recent (late 1980s and early 1990) example of a shift in methodologies. This shift began to distinguish leadership and management and change our focus from the leader to the phenomenon of leadership.

Some authors recognized that there are ways to look at leadership that transcend and/or encompass the theories of the past and allow us to look at leader-

ship in more "complete" ways. This is not necessarily new. Barnard (1938b) and Follett (1918 / 1998) were two of the few writers who, early on, seemed to transcend a reductionist discussion of managerial leadership and move towards a more contemporary philosophical approach to interpersonal relationships. Burns tried to do this in his 1978 book, but it has only been recently that a more holistic view of leadership has emerged. A look at a few values-based transformational theories follows.

Values and Leadership

Many leadership theorists believed there was something unique about leadership that transcended the situation and remained constant despite the contingencies. Values-based transformational theory defines this something as the leader tapping into long-held beliefs and personal or organizational values that inspire others to move in certain directions and develop in certain ways (see Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bennis, 1984b; Burns, 1978; Covey, 1992; Cuoto, 1993; DePree, 1989; Fairholm, 1991; Greenleaf, 1977; Manz & Sims, 1989; O'Toole, 1996; Quinn & McGrath, 1985; Rost, 1991). This values leadership philosophy allows a leader to overcome the pathologies of today's organizations (and societies) because it recognizes the need to develop the individual, letting him or her express their values and flourish independently, while maintaining a functioning organization that fulfills its goals in an excellent manner.

In a more practical sense, values leadership encompasses the actions of leaders who internalize and legitimize the values of the group and teach these values to followers who internalize and express them in their individual behaviors. Leaders in this sense are teachers first and foremost (Tichy, 1997) , with a unique capacity to understand the val-

ues that enervate a group and individuals, and communicate them effectively. Upon these principles also rest the communitarian notion of the good society. That is, one that “must rely largely on its members’ realization that the ways they are expected to conduct themselves are in line with the values in which they believe, rather than because they fear public authorities or are driven by economic incentives” (Etzioni, 1996, p. 86). In this way, leaders create a culture of trust that allows individuals to act in ways supportive of the group values and goals while enhancing their autonomy because of self-led activity (see Fairholm & Fairholm, 2000; Fairholm, 1994; Kouzes & Posner, 1993; Mitchell, 1993).

Fairholm (1991) suggests that values leadership is the philosophy that seeks to meld individual actions into a unified system focused on group desired outcomes and is only possible if a few criteria are met. First, the members of the organization must share common values. Second, leadership has to be thought of as the purview of all members of the group and not just the “heads.” Third, individual development and fulfilling group goals are the focus of leadership. And fourth, shared, intrinsic values must be the basis for all leader action. Values become the bridge that links the individual (and groups of individuals) with the tasks that are required or expected of the group.

This values view of leadership is much different than previous studies in leadership, going beyond the leader and focusing on the phenomenon itself in terms of values displacement, culture, and teaching. Instead of studying the leader, values-based transformational leadership theory engages the entire process of leadership taking into account such things as traits, behavior, and situations, but not being dependent on them. It is a transcending point of

view that intends a holistic understanding of leadership.

The Morality and Philosophy of Leadership: What Greenleaf and Burns Began

Much of values-based transformational theory owes its beginnings to the work of Robert Greenleaf and James MacGregor Burns in the late 1970s. Greenleaf (1977) proposed a thesis he himself labeled unpopular: that more servants should emerge as leaders and that we should follow only servant-leaders. Trying to understand what it takes for leaders to solve the woes of society, Greenleaf describes how service, first and foremost, qualifies one for leadership and that service is the distinctive nature of true leaders. In his book, *Servant Leadership*, Greenleaf traces this idea from conception to potential application, but peppers the discussion with a serious focus on the need for and the ways to serve. He moves the discussion of leadership towards an explicitly moral dimension and toward an overarching social/relationship phenomenon.

Robert Greenleaf defines servant leadership as the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then, conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant to first make sure that other people’s highest priority needs are being served (see Greenleaf, Frick, & Spears, 1996). A characteristic of servant leadership is to serve the real needs of people, needs that can only be discovered by listening.

Greenleaf asserts that leadership is about choosing to serve others and making available resources that fulfill a higher purpose, and in turn, give meaning to work. He suggests there is a moral principle emerging that guides

leadership, and perhaps always has: the only authority deserving one's allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to, and in proportion to, the clearly evident servant stature of the leader. Adherents to this will not casually accept authority of existing institutions. Rather, they will freely respond only to individuals who are recognized as leaders because they are proven and trusted as servants.

Such servant leaders serve first, naturally, then a conscious choice brings them to aspire to lead. This is a much different dynamic, Greenleaf says, than lead first, then decide to serve. Servant leaders constantly ask four major questions: 1) Are other people's highest priority needs being served? 2) Do those served grow as persons? 3) Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? 4) What is the effect on the less privileged in society, or will they at least not be further deprived? Ultimately, Greenleaf's servant leadership model assumes that the only way to change a society (or just make it go) is to produce people – enough people who will change it (or make it go) – who simply want to serve.

James MacGregor Burns (1978) adds to this philosophical approach. He is not simply trying to talk about biographies of those who in the past have been labeled leaders. He is not trying to develop a list of qualities or even techniques that "leaders" in the past have developed or used. He delves into the true nature of leadership -- not what it "looks like on others," but what it conceptually is. Burns embarks on a more philosophical approach to understanding and describing leadership. He points a way to a general theory of leadership.

If nothing else Burns explicitly states

there should be a "school of leadership," that leadership is a legitimate field of study. This field should marry the heretofore "elitist" literature on leadership and the "populistic" literature on followership. Burns begins this marriage by differentiating between transactional and transformational leadership, helping us to begin to recognize the difference between management and leadership. His greatest, self-stated, concern, however, is with the idea of moral leadership and its power, influence, and capacity to change and inspire people.

Most of what the world remembers of this work is Burns' distinction between transforming and transactional leadership. Transactional leadership is defined this way:

Such leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things. The exchange could be economic or political or psychological in nature: a swap of goods or of one good for money; a trading of votes between candidate and citizen or between legislators; hospitality to another person in exchange for willingness to listen to one's troubles. Each party to the bargain recognizes the other as a person. Their purposes are related, at least to the extent that the purposes stand within the bargaining process and can be advanced by maintaining that process. But beyond this, the relationship does not go. The bargainers have no enduring purpose that holds them together; hence, they may go their separate ways. A leadership act took place, but it was not one that binds leader and follower together in a mutual and continuing pursuit of a higher purpose (pp. 19-20).

Burns defines transforming leadership

this way:

Such leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Their purposes, which might have started out as separate but related, as in the case of transactional leadership, become fused. Power bases are linked not as counterweights but as mutual support for common purpose. . . . The relationship can be moralistic, of course. But transforming leadership ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus it has transforming effect on both (p. 20).

These two conceptions seem to be the easiest to grasp, explain, and "put into practice." However, what Burns hopes will be implemented is his general theory of moral leadership (developed in part by understanding the transformational and transactional distinction) not the institutionalization of this distinction in management texts and consulting practices. In a sense, his observations of these two phenomena became, to his cursory readers, the point, instead of serving to elucidate the more general point of moral leadership that he was trying to develop. And yet, this distinction between transformational and transactional leadership *is* powerful and compelling. Transformational leadership, as opposed to the transactional or managerial leadership, forms the foundation of recent leadership study.

Burns' observations regarding transforming and transactional leadership serve to support his general theory of leadership and the structure of moral leadership. Burns answers some important questions about the role of values (the leader's and the follower's) and

which ones should be mobilized and how. He concludes by this surmise: "leaders with relevant motives and goals of their own respond to the followers' needs and wants and goals in such a way as to meet those motivations and bring changes consonant with those of both leaders and followers, and with the values of both" (p. 41). To make the point even more sharply, Burns concludes that

to control things – tools, mineral resources, money, energy – is an act of power [management], not leadership, for things have no motives. Power wielders may treat people as things. Leaders may not. . . . I define leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and motivations – the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations – of both leaders and followers. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their follower's values and motivations (Burns, 1978, pp. 18-19).

The leader taps into and shapes the common values, goals, needs, and wants to develop and elevate others in accordance to the mutually agreed upon values set and foster appropriate changes. Leaders address the needs, wants, and values of their followers (and their own) and, therefore, serve as an independent force in changing the makeup of the followers' values set through gratifying motives.

What Burns has done is to create a theoretical understanding of leadership, with certain definitions and perspectives so that the study of leadership practice will be both more focused and more accurate. Much of his definitional work revolved around the concepts of power, motives and values. Power and the power-wielder have already been

quickly reviewed. Motives and values deserve more attention.

From his conceptual work on values and motives, and drawing upon the themes outlined earlier, Burns develops a general theory of leadership. His theory is not limited to the political or corporate world, but applies also to the social world, the family, the volunteer group, and the work unit. Burns' conception of leadership goes beyond the political theory and historical biographies that he uses to develop his themes. He argues that leadership is, at heart, philosophical. He argues it involves a relationship of engagement between the leader and follower based on common purpose and collective needs. The key to leadership is the discerning of key values and motives of both the leader and follower and, in accordance with them, elevating others to a higher sense of performance, fulfillment, autonomy, and purpose.

The development of this general theoretical framework of leadership has dramatically altered the study and application of leadership principles. Burns' work is an essential part of any study into the true nature, purpose, and applicability of leadership in today's organizations. Not all accept this approach. Perhaps this explains why some of the recent literature on leadership misses the point about understanding leadership holistically – focusing on the checklists and measurements of "effective" leadership and often confusing true leadership with management functions. Burns' great service to the study of leadership may lie less in the popular distinction between transactional and transformational leadership (though this ushers in the contemporary distinctions between the technologies of leadership and those of management) and more in the elevation of leadership as a philosophical and developmental relationship between people who share common

purpose, motivations, and values.

Both Greenleaf and Burns deserve recognition for their part in enhancing the study and practice of leadership by transcending the traditional focus on the leader and focusing on the more pervasive, holistic philosophy of leadership.

Emerging Views and Descriptions of Leadership

The conceptual work of Greenleaf and Burns lays a foundation for other ways of viewing leadership by differentiating between leadership and management in terms of values and relationships. Today, some begin to define leadership in more sophisticated and specific terms drawing upon experience and the distinctions between management and leadership that may have been evident throughout organizational life, but only now have been made explicit.

Drath and Palus (1994) take a constructivist approach to describe the essence and process of leadership as establishing values and context that gives meaning to individual action and social interaction. That meaning creation is leadership, however, only when it is found in a community of practice.

Another way of describing the leadership phenomenon is to understand organizational relationships in terms of frames or metaphors. In this sense, Bolman and Deal (1984; 1997) suggest that frames become windows on the world, filtering out some things and ordering the world. They suggest managers pervasively use frames or metaphors whether they know it or not and these frames dramatically influence a manager's organizational stance and the organizational activities that take place. Leadership, in this sense, may be described as seeing organizations in

multiple ways while maintaining a set of core beliefs and acting on them. Leadership is contingent on the metaphor or image of the organization that is chosen to be used to describe the condition or nature of the organization. In this sense, leadership is not defined as "one thing" but as an effective understanding of, and adept use of, the dominant organizational metaphor. This differs somewhat from the contingency approach. Instead of the contingencies defining what leadership is, leadership is required in some sense to define, at least to identify, the bounds of the contingencies. The idea of metaphor or images in organizational life is reinforced as a useful way to understand the roles and responsibilities of organizational actors and the organizations in which they operate. (Harmon & Mayer, 1986; Kass & Catron, 1990).

Relatedly, post-modernist theory may reject the notion of leadership. In part, this rejection may come from the post-modern critique of the idea of leadership that it is simply another construct of power and potential domination. Indeed, post-modernism is justified in discounting leadership theory, if leadership theory is grounded squarely in the functionalist paradigm (see Burrell & Morgan, 1979) against which it is predominately reacting. Nevertheless, it is a narrow critique. Recent leadership theory suggests that leadership can be understood in fundamentally relationship contexts – the kind of positions post-modernists are wont to adopt (see DePree, 1989; Fairholm, 1991; Fairholm, 1997; Greenleaf, 1977; Wheatley, 1992; Fairholm, 1998a; Fairholm, 1998b).

Again, Burns (1978) points out that contemporary leadership literature has jumped the hurdles that history and intellectual narrowness presented. As Burns states, "at last we can hope to close the intellectual gap between the

fecund canons of authority and a new and general theory of leadership" (Burns, 1978, p. 26). The idea of frames or worldviews to help describe leadership in practice may be a way of answering the critiques of leadership and adopt a research approach that Burns encourages.

Using the concept of frames, metaphors or paradigms to better understand the phenomenon of leadership is promising. While leadership may indeed encompass certain elements, the individual's ability to understand or apply those elements may be limited by the perspectives they (and, perhaps, their followers) bring to organizational and social life. It is in this direction that research may be fruitfully focused to determine leadership conceptions that would inform both the theory and practice of leadership. As Pfeffer (1993) suggests, "paradigm development is theoretically important" to any field (p. 599).

Perspectival Approach to Understanding Leadership

A fifth thread of leadership research, then, may indeed be a thread that focuses on a perspectival approach to holistically understanding the leadership phenomenon. Paradigmatic, perspectival, or worldview, conceptions of how we look at the world are not new in the literature. Some suggest there are life filters that shape our moral and psychological development. Barker (1992) uses the term paradigm to suggest a system or pattern of integrating thoughts, actions, and practices. Graves (1970) describes different states of being. Each state of being, or level of existence, determines actions, relationships, and measures of success. Though the states of being are somewhat hierarchically arranged, Graves' research shows that a person need not grow to higher levels or states of being. This is similar

to Kohlberg's (1984) model of moral development. Other authors see culture as shaping the way we view things in our everyday experiences (see Herzberg, 1984; Hofstede, 1993; Quinn & McGrath, 1985; Schein, 1992).

Harman (1998), in reviewing the history of science and knowledge, suggests there are three ways of seeing and knowing the world which are commensurable with each other. They include the M-1, or materialistic monism perspective, the M-2, or dualism perspective, and the M-3, or transcendental monism perspective. Postmodern writers further suggest that people produce (or co-produce) the realities in which they operate and constantly change that reality through continual, critical interaction or discourse with others (see Farmer, 1995; Harmon, 1997; Rorty, 1991). Burrell and Morgan (1979), building on Kuhn's (1962 / 1996) work on paradigms, suggest that four paradigms dominate and are incommensurable with each other, including functionalism, interpretivism, radical humanism, and radical structuralism.

McWhinney (1984) touches on the importance of looking at paradigmatic perspectives in studying leadership. He argues that the different ways people experience reality result in their having distinctly different attitudes toward change, and that understanding these different concepts contributes to new understanding of resistance to change and the modes of leadership. Morgan (1998) also suggests that the way we see organizations influences how we operate within them and even shapes the types of activities that make sense within them. Some work on frames and perspectives have been done. However, more explicit work linking these ideas to leadership is helpful (see Fairholm, 1998a; Fairholm, 1998b).

While the practice of leadership is

something people recognize in social and organizational life, the theory of leadership is continuing to be refined. From trait theory to behavior theory to contingency theory, from values based-transformation theory to a distinction between leadership and management, researchers and theorists are attempting to understand leadership better with a clear knowledge that they are not yet there. Perhaps the next step in leadership thought is to look at leadership in broader, more philosophical, more holistic terms, recognizing that individual perspectives are brought to bear on understanding leadership. While leadership may contain certain elements, these elements may not be understood fully nor put into practice at all, except through individual conceptions of what leadership is.

Fairholm's Conceptions

This research draws upon the conceptions outlined by Fairholm (1998b). Fairholm's five conceptions are described below supported by elements found in contemporary leadership literature (see Table 3).

Fairholm suggests that people hold alternative ways of viewing the world. These perspectives shape not only how one internalizes observation and externalizes belief sets, they also determine how one measures success in oneself and others. Thus, Fairholm says, "defining leadership is an intensely personal activity limited by our personal paradigms or our mental state of being, our unique mind-set" (p. xv). Our leadership perspective defines what we mean when we say "leadership" and shape how we view successful leadership in others. He uses the metaphor of virtual reality computer technology to help explain how people live in and are shaped by the reality they perceive.

In terms of the leadership phenomenon, this perspectival, or virtual reality, approach suggests that individuals hold alternative conceptions of what leadership actually is and use this conception to measure their own leadership activities and the relative success of others. When one mentions leadership, individuals immediately draw upon their conceptions to internalize the conversation, define leadership for themselves, and judge whether or not others are exercising leadership. Frustration and confusion surrounding the definitions of leadership and the lack of agreement on what leadership is can be explained by understanding that individuals may simply have multiple conceptions of the phenomenon.

Leadership as (Scientific) Management

The first perspective Fairholm describes equates leadership with management, specifically the type of management that draws upon the scientific management movement of the first part of the 20th century. At that time, much emphasis was placed on the officers of management understanding the best way to promote and maintain productivity amongst the employee ranks. The executive functions and skills that Gulick (1937) outlined (namely, planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting - POSDCORB) operationalized the role of organizational actors.

This perspective of leadership views “management” as getting the job done through predicting, shaping, controlling and measuring the work of others. Mintzberg (1975) adds to our understanding of this perspective of leadership by suggesting a set of managerial characteristics and by outlining various roles that managers (read, also, as leaders in this perspective) play in or-

ganizations. Mintzberg’s characteristics and roles highlight the elements of this conception of leadership, and include: 1) managers produce a great quantity of work at an unrelenting pace; 2) they prefer variety, fragmentation and brevity; 3) they prefer specific, explicit issues that are on the current agenda, not long-term seminal issues; 4) managers are at the center of a communication network of contacts; 5) they prefer verbal media in communicating; and 6) they seek to be in control of their own affairs. The ten roles Mintzberg highlights as central to management include the interpersonal roles of figurehead, leader, and liaison; the informational roles of nerve center, disseminator, and spokesman; and the decisional roles of entrepreneur, disturbance handler, negotiator, and resource allocator.

Allison (1980) continues refining the activities of management by separating the functions of general management into three categories: 1) strategy, including establishing objectives and priorities and devising operational plans; 2) managing internal components, including organizing and staffing, directing personnel and the personnel management system, and controlling performance; and 3) managing external constituencies, including dealing with external units subject to some common authority, dealing with independent organizations, and dealing with the press and the public. Allison builds directly on Gulick and Urwick’s elements of management, reinforcing the perspective that leadership is at least the same thing as management, if not a subset of management.

Drucker (1966) stresses that effectiveness in management roles, such as those described above, can be learned. He identifies five practices essential to managerial effectiveness: recording and analyzing where the time goes; choosing to advance organizational contributions; knowing where and how to mobi-

lize strength for best effect; setting up the right priorities; and acting rationally based on good decision-making. These principles fit nicely into the perspective of leadership as management. Not only are they applicable to the organization, but also to the manager him or herself and in this way solidifies the link by equating good management with good leadership, and good managers with good leaders. More directly, Whetton and Cameron (1998) believe management encompasses leadership as typically defined. They state that "managers cannot be successful without being good leaders, and leaders cannot be successful without being good managers, ...effective management subsumes effective leadership" (p. 14). In the same vein, Drucker (1954) suggests that it is nonsense to separate management from leadership. He views the two concepts as part and parcel of the same job. They are different to be sure, but only as different as the right hand from the left or the nose from the mouth. In this sense, they fall into what Rost (1991) has labeled the "industrial leadership paradigm, where leadership is good management" (p.109).

Essentially, this perspective assumes that leadership equals management in that it focuses on getting others to do work the leader wants done, essentially separating the planning (management) from the doing (labor). Key elements of this perspective include: control, prediction, verification, headship, and a science-based measurement. More specifically, leadership elements associated with this perspective include the following ideas.

Efficient, Predictable Use of Resources, and Optimality

Gilbreth (1912) focuses much of his work on ensuring the predictability of work processes and devotes much attention to the measurement of resource

allocation and productivity (see also Gulick & Urwick, 1937; Taylor, 1915). Gulick and Urwick (1937) promote efficiency as an overarching value. Seckler-Hudson (1955) argues that "effective utilization of human resources and material to reach the known goal" will be regarded as the measure of effectiveness in managerial positions. Drucker (1966) says that part of being an effective manager is knowing and ensuring where and how to mobilize strength for best effect. Taylor (1915) suggested that managers need to figure out the fastest, most efficient, and least fatiguing way of doing things. Selznick (1983) suggests that managers control, count, and supervise other people so that they perform in specific ways to increase the overall productivity of the system or operation.

Individual Performance Issues, Organizing, Planning, and Direction

Millett (1954) suggests that managing in the public service is in large part a quest for effective performance. Newcomer (1997) places emphasis on helping new public managers focus on their individual performance and on the performance of public servants in general. Box (1999), Bozeman (1990), and Ingraham and Romzek (1994) emphasize performance measurement and appraisal in their discussions of public management. Mooney (1931) reviews five principles of organizing units: coordinative principle; scalar principle; hierarchy principle; functional principle; staff and line principle. Gulick (1937) offers that leadership is required to rationalize operations and locate responsibility at the top in efforts to organize work activities. He also defines the manager's direction role function as decision making. Drucker (1966) stresses five organizing and planning skills essential to success: managing time; choosing what to contribute to the particular organization; knowing where and how to mobilize strength for best

effect; setting up the right priorities; and good decision-making. Mintzberg's (1975) roles of management outlined above have a strong orientation towards planning and coordination activities. Price (1965) posits that decisional authority and planning inexorably flows from the executive suite to the technical office.

Incentivization and Control

House (1996) describes a path-goal theory of leadership that prescribes leaders' behavior in terms of followers perceptions and motivations. Drucker (1954) explains management by objectives which tries, among other things, to operationalize organizational incentives. Dowd (1936) suggests the importance of leadership in maintaining control in institutions. Jay (1967) used Machievelli's *The Prince* to review issues of managerial control and incentives. Gouldner (1954), in reviewing issues of organizational control, describes three possible responses to a formal bureaucratic structure: mock - where the formal rules are ignored by both management and labor; punishment-centered - where management seeks to enforce rules that workers resist; representative - where rules are both enforced and obeyed.

Leadership as Excellence Management

The second perspective of leadership suggests that leadership is management with a focus on what has recently been called the excellence movement. Popularized by Peters and Waterman (1982) in the early 1980's, this perspective focuses on systematic quality improvements with a focus on the people involved in the processes, the processes themselves, and the quality of products that are produced by the processes. The work of leadership is to create innova-

tion in an environment of honest managerial concern for all stakeholders.

The Total Quality Movement (TQM) of the 1980s is closely linked to this perspective of leadership. The skills highlighted in TQM specifically, and the excellence movement in general, link directly to the definitions of leadership that are illustrative of this perspective. The general framework of leadership as excellence management revolves around an organizational cultural change based on a management philosophy of meeting customer requirements through continuous improvement of people, process, and product. Elements of the manager/leader behavior in this perspective includes role modeling, using quality processes and tools, encouraging communication, sponsoring feedback and fostering a supportive environment. The mechanisms to achieve success include training, communications, recognition systems, teamwork, and customer satisfaction programs.

In the TQM movement, a leader is successful as he or she 1) defines mission, 2) identifies system output, 3) identifies customers, 4) negotiates customers' requirement, 5) develops a "supplier specification" that details customer requirement and expectation, and 6) determines the necessary activities required to fulfill those requirements (Ross, 1993).

Deming (1986) introduced a new philosophy of management when he outlined his Total Quality Management ideas. The key ideas in Deming's philosophy are subsumed in his fourteen points or philosophical principles; an emphasis on system stability; use of statistical control mechanisms to understand the system and point to areas for real improvement of the system; and an emphasis on a clearly defined and broadly understood aim (vision) for the system that intends to optimize (maxi-

mize benefit to all stakeholder) the system. According to Deming, the leader's job is to transform the system from what it is to one consistent with the fourteen points (principles) he enunciates, which include: 1) create consistency of purpose with a plan, 2) adopt the new philosophy of quality, 3) cease dependence on mass inspection, 4) end the practice of choosing suppliers based on price, 5) find problems and work continuously on the system, 6) use modern methods of training, 7) change from production numbers to quality, 8) drive out fear, 9) break down barriers between departments, 10) stop asking for productivity improvement without providing methods, 11) eliminate work standards that prescribe numerical quotas, 12) remove barriers to pride of workmanship, 13) institute vigorous education and retraining, and 14) create a structure in top management that will push every day on the above 13 points.

The essence of the Deming philosophy is much more than just statistical quality control. It is a leadership paradigm involving a new conception of the role of management. It involves the use of prediction techniques and scientific methods, but adds to the work of management the essential element of building relationships, encouraging communication, and inculcating pride for and rewarding quality work. This approach focuses on a refined sense of management and leadership, and reliance on profound knowledge, quality, and sound techniques.

Crosby's view of the TQM and excellence movements has a much more managerial feel (see Ross, 1993). His absolutes of quality management include: quality is defined as conformance to requirements, not "goodness;" the system for delivering quality is the prevention of poor-quality through process control, not appraisal or correction; the performance standard is zero de-

fects, not "that's close enough;" and rather than measure quality through indices, the measurement of quality is based on the price of nonconformance to the quality process.

Juran (1989) also built on Deming's work. His approach to excellence management focused on the managerial dimensions of quality planning, quality control, and quality improvement. His ten steps to quality improvement include: 1) build awareness of opportunities to improve, 2) set goals for improvement, 3) organize to reach goals, 4) provide training, 5) carry out projects to solve problems, 6) report progress, 7) give recognition, 8) communicate results, 9) keep score, and 10) maintain momentum by making annual improvement part of the regular systems and processes of the company.

Rago (1996) presents an example of excellence leadership in his case study of a planned TQM-type organizational transformation in a Texas State public agency. Although there were many successes over the course of events, they were marked by a series of struggles that had roots in a mixture of uncertainty regarding the next steps to take and in the need for the agency's senior managers to personally transform the way they go about their work. The struggle for managers to make this personal transformation is an important aspect of the study and points to deeper leadership issues.

Kee and Black (1985) discuss overarching leadership concerns about bringing this perspective to the work of public administration. They suggest that implementing the ideas of the excellence movement to the public sector may face some distinct challenges to success. These challenges include: identifying the customer; determining core values; promoting risk-taking. They are challenges because of the unique public

contexts that make these elements difficult to agree upon or wrap ones hands around. They suggest there are some similarities, however, with the private sector that allows for this perspective to be useful and successful in the public context. These similarities include: people need to succeed; vision counts; simple structures, lean staff; measurement.

The role and functions of leadership in this perspective emphasize quality and productivity process improvement rather than just product and people over either product or process, and require the management of values, attitudes, and organizational aims within a framework of quality improvement. Some of the key elements of this perspective include being sensitive to the human relations needs of workers along with the productivity demands on them, improving the process, having a concern for performance excellence/quality, and focusing on stakeholder development and interaction. More specifically, leadership elements associated with this perspective include the following ideas.

Continuous Process Improvement, Transforming Environments and Perceptions

The work of Deming (1986), Juran (1989), Ross (1993), and Rago (1996) outlined above illustrate the significance and concepts of this element. Davis and Luthans (1984) test the position that leadership exists as a causal variable in subordinate behavior and organizational performance by evaluating the impact of specific process improvements.

Listening Actively, Being Accessible, and Expressing Common Courtesy

Heifetz (1994) emphasize the importance of listening and accessibility in managerial roles. Fairholm (1991) mentions that expressing common courtesy and respect for others are significant parts of

leadership. Deming (1986) also makes a point that TQM initiatives must place significant emphasis on the individual and on individual expression.

Motivation and Engaging Others in Problem Solving

Vroom and Jago (1988) encourage the engagement of followers in defining problems and solving those problems in a context of participation throughout the organization. Hughes et al. (1993) state that “many people believe the most important quality of a good leader is the ability to motivate others to accomplish group tasks” (p. 327). Roethlisberger et al. (1941) emphasize the impact of human influences in personal and organizational motivation. McGregor et al. (1966) summarize various perspectives and research findings concerning the managerial imperative of motivation. Herzberg et al. (1959) also emphasize the role of motivation in organizations and unpacks the meaning and tools of motivation.

Leadership as a Values Displacement Activity

The third perspective of leadership suggests that leadership is essentially a relationship between leader and follower that allows for typical management objectives to be achieved in ways different from prediction and control. Leadership success is dependent more on values and shared vision than it is on prediction and control. Fairholm (1998b) suggests that this may be what pre-modern leadership ideas reflect. He suggests that modern management as described in the first two perspectives arose to allow for predictability and stability to counter the previous organizational structures based on personality, traits, charisma, and shamanism that yielded unpredictability in organizational systems (p.57-58).

Rost (1991) points out that leadership as good management is what the “twentieth-century school of leadership” is all about. What is needed, in Rost’s view, is a new paradigm of leadership that includes the interplay between leaders and followers. Values leadership does this. This perspective suggests that the unilateral nature of scientific management and the predictable process improvement techniques of excellence management are insufficient to describe the leadership phenomenon. Leadership is rather better described as a relationship activity where the leader helps the led aspire to common goals by coming to mutually shared values and aspirations.

This conception begins to separate the distinct technologies of leadership and management. Sashkin and Rosenbach (1998) review the development of this perspective highlighting the work of Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) in defining transactional leadership and transformational leadership. The former has come to be known as management and the latter has been known to better describe the unique leadership phenomenon. Sashkin and Rosenbach describe elements of transactional leadership to include contingent-reward dynamics and management-by-exception. Transformational leadership, on the other hand, points to the less measurable elements of charisma (noting that charisma is the result of transformation leadership, not the cause), inspiration, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation.

Sashkin’s Visionary Leadership Theory (see Sashkin & Rosenbach, 1998) states that leaders take everyday managerial tasks – a committee meeting for example – as opportunities to inculcate values. Leaders “overlay” value-inculcating actions on ordinary bureaucratic management activities. Without a sound base of management skills, this

would never be possible; without management, there could be no leadership. Thus both are important – but they are different. This third conception of leadership, then, separates the management technologies from the leadership technologies and may form a bridge between the former two perspectives and the latter two that will be discussed later.

The skill sets and functions of values leadership differ from those of management and excellence management. Kouzes and Posner (1990) suggest that leaders challenge the process, inspire a shared vision, enable others to act, model the way, and encourage the heart. Sashkin (1989) describes the value of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) in sorting out the key elements of leadership. These elements fit nicely into the conception of values leadership. They include clarity, communication, consistency, caring, creating opportunities, being self-confident, having a need for power, and using vision.

Two distinctive elements that emerge in this perspective are organizational vision and values. These elements help define and guide the leader/follower relationship. Though some in practice short-change the power of vision by simply borrowing common phrases found in other organizations’ vision statements, as if from a “vision warehouse,” the power of sincerely articulated vision, forms the foundation of leadership activities (see Thornberry, 1997). Collins and Porras (1997) describe vision as a vivid description with an artistic and emotional component. Vision serves to make explicit the organizational purpose or reason for being and inspires organizational members in their work efforts. Barker (1992) describes vision as dreams in action, that are leader initiated and then taught to followers. Vision is neither rhetoric nor platitude; it provides direction and guid-

ance and aligns people. Common advice in setting a vision include: 1) senior management must get in touch with their leadership responsibilities, 2) craft vision, 3) don't wait for perfection, 4) have fortitude, and 5) remember that visioning can happen at all levels.

Vision is almost always connected in the literature to some sense of cultural beliefs or values. Burns (1978) says that values are standards that can be used to establish choices made, determine equity, and balance policies and practices. Thayer (1980) states that values are operationally similar to objectives, goals, ends, purposes, or policies. Fairholm (1998b) suggests that values are statements of oughts; they are broad general beliefs about the way people should behave or some end state that they should attain.

Values may be defined in terms of their instrumental nature or in terms of their terminal results. Instrumental values encompass the beliefs and desires that help us achieve certain ends. Terminal values are those ends that people hold in esteem. Examples of values in the public sector include respect for life, liberty or freedom of choice, justice, unity, happiness (see Fairholm, 1998b). Others include integrity, trust, listening, respect for followers, those that O'Toole define as the Rushmorean values (see O'Toole, 1996).

Kidder (1995) undertook a more comprehensive study of values in an effort to outline certain universally held values, if such existed. He conducted interviews all over the world and concluded that there are some common values held by people regardless of culture or nationality. These include love, truthfulness, fairness, freedom, unity, tolerance, responsibility, and respect for life. Others included courage, wisdom, hospitality, peace, and stability. What good comes from knowing these codes of values?

Kidder responds by saying:

"It gives us a foundation for building goals, plans, and tactics, where things really happen and the world really changes. It unifies us, giving us a home territory of consensus and agreement. And it gives us a way - not the way, but a way - to reply when asked, 'Whose values will you teach?' Answering this last question, as we tumble into the twenty-first century with the twentieth's sense of ethics, may be one of the most valuable mental activities of our time" (p. 9).

The values leadership approach depends upon an understanding of values, what they are generally and which they are specifically, and how we as people come to share them and use them to accomplish group and individual goals.

The values leadership perspective is the integration of group behavior with shared values through the leader setting values, and teaching those values to followers through an articulated vision that leads to excellent products and service, mutual growth and enhanced self-determination. Some of the key elements of this perspective include: everyone has values and those values trigger behavior, group shares values in common, values provide the goals (vision) and measures of success, individual change and development and group productivity are equally considered core purposes. More specifically, leadership elements associated with this perspective include the following ideas.

Developing Individuals

Barnard (1938b) states that executives induce people to convert their abilities into coordinative effort and that organizations are cooperative systems wherein the function of the executive is to maintain a dynamic equilibrium be-

tween the needs of the organization and the needs of employees. Fairholm (1991) focuses on the social interactions within organizations and a reliance on values that allows the leader to not only evoke excellent results from the organization, but also, more importantly, develop individual followers into leaders in their own right. Sullivan and Harper (1996) provides thoughts on the meaning of leadership and a commitment to shared values, how to identify objectives and maintain a long-term vision, when to challenge the status quo, and how to invest in and nurture employees.

Encouraging High Performance and Self-led Followers

Bennis and Nanus (1985) describe a leader as one who commits people to action, who converts followers into leaders, and who may convert leaders into agents of change. Manz and Sims (1989) say the most appropriate leader is one who can lead others to lead themselves. This they call "superleadership" and suggest that leaders become "super" because they can possess the strength and wisdom of many persons by helping to unleash the abilities of the "followers" (self-leaders) that surround them. Rost (1991), as stated above, argues for a paradigm of leadership that includes the interplay between leaders and followers.

Setting, Enforcing, and Prioritizing Values

Conger (1991) posits that leaders depend upon values. They depend upon the melding of individual values into the values of the organization and vice versa. Covey (1992) describes a perspective of leadership that emphasizes a reliance on principles. Fairholm (1991) espouses a philosophical conception of leadership that is values-driven, change-oriented, and developmental – grounded in specific values for American public administrators embod-

ied in the Constitution and Declaration of Independence. Frost and Egri (1990) say there is a need for perspectives large enough to embrace the fact that we are living, valuing beings--and to place that value-centric fact at the core of our studying the leadership question. Nirenberg (1998) suggests that "ultimately, diversity of thinking will usher in a new concern for exploring shared values and the impact of serious values-based differences in organizations. Ultimately, leadership is the expression of values" (p. 95). As outlined before, Kidder (1995) explains an important aspects of setting and prioritizing values. Bennis (1982) held that leadership is concerned with organizations' basic purposes and general directions centering on doing the right things, not merely doing things right.

Visioning and Communicating the Visions

Felton (1995) expounds on the impact of language and rhetoric on leadership, leaders, and followers as an area that deserves more attention, especially when highlighting the values-laden and inspirational essence of leadership. To define rhetoric may also be to define leadership – moving people to action, by moving their feelings with stirring verbal tools. Sashkin (1989) explains ways to express, explain, extend, and expand the vision. Cleveland (1972) asserts that decision making in the future will call for continuous improvisation on a general sense of direction that may be thought of as a vision. To Bennis (1982), how organizations translate intention into reality and sustain it is the central question, answered mainly by communicating a direction and vision. Nanus (1992) suggests that a key function of leadership is creating a compelling sense of direction by visioning.

Teaching, Coaching, and Empowering

Tichy (1997) says teaching is what leaders do and posits that teaching is leading (see also Fairholm 1997). McFarland, Senn, and Childress (1993) discuss the idea of bringing out the best in others in terms of developmental coaching and empowerment activities. Sullivan and Harper (1996) discuss how to invest in and nurture employees. O'Toole (1996) posits that the most difficult challenge of leadership is bringing about change without imposing one's will on others and suggests a strategy of empowerment and teaching based on legitimate values.

Trust Culture Leadership

Values leadership differentiates leadership and management, but still focuses much on the role of the leader in the relationship. The next conception, trust culture leadership, shifts the focus more on the interaction between leader and the led and recognizes the follower as having a much more influential role in the leadership relationship. This focus on the follower is important in this conception because of the emphasis on teams, culture, and mutual trust between leader and follower.

Rosenbach and Taylor (1989) conducted research that suggests the qualities we find in good leaders are the same we find in good followers. Pittman, Rosenbach, and Potter (1998) further outline this line of inquiry. They note the fundamental dimensions of followership are performance initiative and relationship initiative. Performance initiative is defined by the follower's ability to do the job, work with others, use self as a resource, and embrace change. Relationship initiative includes the follower identifying with the leader, building trust, engaging in courageous commu-

nication, and negotiating differences. Placing these dimensions on a grid, followers' styles, they continue, include 1) the contributor, high in performance and low in relationship, 2) the politician, low in performance and high in relationship, 3) the subordinate, low in performance and low in relationship, and 4) the partner, high in performance and high in relationship.

Nolan and Harty (1984) agree that followership and leadership share many of the same characteristics. They argue that little attention has been paid to the relationship between followership and leadership in educational administration, although the behaviors required of good followership are similar to those required of good leadership. Chaleff (1997) notes that followers' skills are learned informally, but they are essential for effective organizational leadership. This is especially poignant as we conceive of leadership in terms of teams and shared culture. Followers play a key role in the success of teams and co-produce the shared culture that is essential for leadership to be present.

Fairholm (1998b) states that the leader's role is to build unity, a team, out of different individuals. This activity is not a function of amalgamation, but of aligning individual concerns with the core essence of the group (p. 103). The first goal in leading a diverse workforce is to define common values and customs. The second is to integrate and acculturate workers into the team culture, its value systems, and operating practices. Leadership, then, is a process of building a trust culture within which leader and follower can relate in accomplishing mutually valued goals using agreed-upon processes. In this sense, leadership is a sharing, not a starring role.

Wildavsky (1984) mentions that leadership is a consequence of corporate culture, and culture is a result of leader-

ship. The two are intertwined. This also relates to the values connotation of the work of leadership. While leaders shape values, they are made manifest in the culture through attitudes fostered and rites, rituals, myths, strategies and goals assumed. Values establish the foundation for more specific operational and interpersonal work standards used by the group. Selznick (1957) asserted that the function of the institutional leader is to help shape the environment in which the institution operates to define new institutional directions, infusing the organization with values.

Barker (1992) states that strong cultures act as intellectual and emotional paradigms. Schein's (1992) definition of culture links it to leadership: A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid, and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (p. 279). This conception requires the leader to be a teacher because we learn to have these shared patterns. Schein also suggests that culture and leadership must be understood together. If one wishes to distinguish leadership from management or administration, one can argue that leaders create and change cultures, while managers and administrators live within them. Schein convincingly argues that organizational cultures are created in part by leaders, and one of the most decisive functions of leadership is the creation, the management, and sometimes even the destruction of culture. In this sense, leadership and culture are conceptually intertwined. Schein warns that if one is not aware of the need to manage cultures, those cultures will manage you.

Sashkin and Sashkin (1994) suggest five strategies for leaders to create a

successful team culture: 1) value-based staffing, 2) using conflict constructively, 3) modeling values in action, 4) telling stories about heroes and heroines, and 5) creating traditions, ceremonies, and rituals. Dreilinger (1998) states that one of the roles of leadership is to overcome organizational cynicism by building culture through accountability and high ethics and eliminating causes of mistrust.

This conception of leadership assumes that follower development, team success and building effective cultures depends upon trust. Fairholm (1998b) states that common values build trust, and trust is the foundation of cooperative action. The kind of leadership that grows out of shared values only flourishes in a climate within which individuals can accept the individuality of others without sanctioning all of their behavior or words. Without trust, he warns, cultural values can become strictures, impeding individual and group progress (see pp. 77-78).

Kouzes and Posner (1993) in summarizing their research suggest people want leaders who are credible. They state that leaders we admire do not place themselves at the center; they place others there. This reinforces the notion of follower involvement in the leadership phenomenon. Credibility includes being honest, competent, and inspiring and doing what you say you will do. Credibility is the foundation of leadership and underlying the causes of credibility is trust. Fairholm and Fairholm (2000) reinforce the importance of trust in the leadership activity, and outline elements that might disrupt interpersonal and organization trust. They outline individual, organizational, and societal forces that hinder the development of trust. They also outline institutional and personal barriers to building a trust culture.

In sum, this perspective places two obli-

gations on leaders: first, to create a common culture where all members can trust one another to do their part to attain agreed-upon results; second, to insure that the trust culture that is created allows individual members to grow toward their personal self-development goals. Low trust cultures force us to manage, not lead.

Trust cultural leadership is a process of building trust cultures within which leader and follower (in an essentially voluntary relationship) relate to accomplish mutually – valued goals using agreed-upon processes from a variety of individual cultural contexts. Some key elements of this perspective include: unified, effective, harmonious culture of mutual trust; planned actions to create trusting environment based on common values; volunteerism based on trust (people choose to follow those they trust); and trust as the “organizational glue” that allows unified collective activity. More specifically, leadership elements associated with this perspective include the following ideas.

Trust and Ensuring Cultures of Trust

Malmberg (1999) suggests the ability to manage outcomes will be driven by their self-satisfaction with the job, and maintenance of an ethical correlation between their feelings and their sense of what is correct versus what is expedient. Success as leaders is increasingly dependent on achieving positive, trusting relations with others. Mitchell (1993) focuses on the potential danger posed by strong leaders and argues that trustworthy leadership involves reliable stewardship and social responsibility. As outlined above Kouzes and Posner (1993), Schein (1992), and Fairholm (1998a) also express a needed focus on trustworthiness, credibility, and cultures of trust. Fairholm (1994) holds that culture affects and influences the leadership of a group and, therefore, leaders

should cultivate a culture of trust.

Fostering and Maintaining Shared Cultures and Prioritizing Mutual Cultural Values and Conduct

Quinn and McGrath (1985) present a conceptual framework designed to provide consistency and structure to the environment of human perceptual values while at the same time illuminating the fundamental tensions and paradoxes that often exist among values. They continue to illustrate the models' analytical power by using it to map a major facet of organizational behavior-leadership – as a framework of competing values – and by showing how different types of organizational forms must be congruent with their cultural surroundings if organizations are to be effective. Hollander (1997) discusses the followers' impact on leadership and the nature of cultural relationships. Selznick (1983) states the art of creative leadership is the art of institution building, which means infusing the organization with values. Hofstede (1993) highlights the integral nature of culture by supporting with relevant research that the idea of building culture-free theories of management is not well-founded. Collins and Porras (1997) outline habits of successful companies including the development and maintenance of big, hairy, audacious goals (BHAGs) that shape and prioritize the energy, values, and purposes of the organization.

Team Building, Sharing Governance, and Group Performance

Gardner (1990) states that leaders should share leadership tasks unofficially because the vitality of middle and lower levels of leadership can produce greater vitality in the higher levels of leadership. Kaufman (1969) outlines pros and cons to increased decentralization in government bureaucracies and examines the intricacies of sharing governance with the people being gov-

erned. Luke (1998) expresses a model of catalytic leadership that respects and rewards the interconnectedness found in organizational life. Nolan and Harty (1984) focus on the followership aspects of the leadership relationship and describes some behaviors that bring leaders and followers together. Fraser (1978) considers different types of group structure, and their relationship to what happens in group interaction. Fairholm (1994) suggests that sharing governance within groups helps effective teams and team leaders to emerge.

Spiritual (Whole Soul) Leadership

The fifth perspective builds on the ideas of values and trust culture maintenance, focusing attention on the whole soul nature of both leader and led. This perspective assumes that people have only one spirit that manifests itself in both our professional and personal lives and that leadership engages individuals at this level. Spirit in the work place has no real relationship to religion in the workplace. The elements of spirituality as understood in this perspective define who the person is, not just what his or her moral stance is or the religious doctrines he or she espouses.

This perspective may encounter difficulties in contemporary work organizations. Spiritual matters have not formed a major part of modern leadership or management theory, and there are limits on spirituality in the workplace arising from traditional theory and practice. However, leaders in the modern organization can and do link our interior world of moral reflection and the outer world of work and social relationships (see Fairholm, 1998b, p. 133). We take our whole self with us everywhere we go, whether to home, to work, to church, to the PTA, etc.

Jacobsen (1994) defines spirituality as a

way of understanding our world, and an inner or personal awareness. In corporations, spirituality refers to the inner values of the leader and followers – the mature principles, qualities and influences that people implicitly exhibit in behavior and interactions with other people. A whole soul leadership focus sees transformation of self, others and the team as important. It involves the heart and mind, spiritual values and intellectual skills. It involves inner certainty, the essence of self, and the basis of comfort, strength, happiness. Spirituality is the source of personal meaning, values, life purposes, and personal belief systems and reflects the experience of the transcendent in life (see Fairholm, 1997).

Leadership in this conception requires a holistic, integrated approach. Cound (1987) says that through personal efforts, leaders assure that the team's value system is integrated and holistic in nature so they do not have to sacrifice values. Autry (1992) concludes that a holistic approach includes organizational services and programs that address both the professional and personal lives of stakeholders. Herzberg (1984) explains that leaders and organizations earn loyalty from their members when they help unify beliefs that fit into the underlying "mystery systems" of their cultures.

Greenleaf's (1998) writings suggest that organization members concern themselves with matters of the spirit, which informs the perspective of whole soul leadership (p. 55). He builds on the trust cultural perspective by suggesting that achieving many small-scale communities within the organization may be the secret of synergy in large institutions and the way leaders may influence the whole individual within large-scale organizations. Formidable obstacles stand in the way of maturing leaders and followers. This is mainly attributed

to acting on “the principle that knowledge, not the spirit, is power. Knowledge is but a tool. The spirit is of the essence” (p. 25). Vision, Greenleaf states, is needed to lift the sights of those that know and release their will to act constructively, because the only test of leadership is that somebody follows – voluntarily. Vision is required to open others to a willingness to use what they know and to work to extract hard reality from a dream.

Burns’ (1978) effort to describe a model of moral leadership is guided by the notion “that levels of wants and needs and other motivations, combined with hierarchies of values, and sharpened by conflict, undergird the dynamics of leadership” (p. 30). At the point of action, leadership is intensely individual and personal. Leadership is a process of morality to the degree that leaders engage with followers on the basis of shared motives and values and goals – on the basis, that is, of the followers’ “true” needs as well as those of leaders: psychological, economic, safety, spiritual, sexual, aesthetic, or physical. Only the followers can ultimately define their own true needs, but the first task of leadership is to bring to consciousness the followers’ sense of their own needs, values, and purposes. Essentially the leader’s task is consciousness-raising on a wide plane. The leader’s fundamental act is “to induce people to be aware or conscious of what they feel – to feel their true needs so strongly, to define their values so meaningfully, that they can be moved to purposeful action” (p. 44). Burns suggests that “the ultimate test of moral leadership is its capacity to transcend the claims of the multiplicity of everyday wants and needs and expectations, to respond to the higher levels of moral development, and to relate leadership behavior – its roles, choices, style, commitments – to a set of reasoned, relatively explicit, conscious values” (p. 46).

Vaill (1989) concludes that it is possible to lead a spiritual life at work in a typical western organization, be it public or private, profit or non-profit, large or small, successful or not successful. In fact, human organizations are inherently spiritual places where a spiritual life is invited by human organizations. Leadership of the whole person allows this spiritual element of work to be made explicit and valid. There is really no place to hide, no extra-organizational place to be more spiritual than seems to be possible in everyday organizations. Vaill suggests that if spiritual life is not possible in organizational life, then he must reluctantly conclude that he must give up the idea of spiritual life, for one cannot get away from organizations, especially as organizations are coming to be understood (see Weinberg, 1996; Wheatley & Kellner-Rogers, 1998). He helps define organizations as spiritual environments. Fostering organizational conditions and events where people have the feelings and experiences of a personal, whole soul, spiritual dimension is not an engineering problem because human beings are not material instruments. It is because organizations are valuing systems, that leadership of the whole soul is a credible and perhaps more inclusive perspective. Vaill outlines five dimensions of organizations as valuing systems and highlights the spiritual connotations of each, that include: the economic, the technical, the adaptive, the communal, and the transcendent.¹

Spiritual, or whole soul, leadership is the integration of the components of work and self – of the leader and each fol-

¹ These five dimensions seem to correspond with Fairholm’s five conceptions of leadership. While this connection is not made explicitly in this research, the coincidence is too significant to ignore and may represent an interesting area of future research.

lower – into a comprehensive system that fosters continuous growth, improvement, self-awareness, and self-leadership so that leaders see each worker as a whole person with a variety of skills, knowledge and abilities that invariably go beyond the narrow confines of job needs. Some key elements of this final perspective include: concern for and integration of the whole-soul, the inner self, of leader and led; enhancing self awareness and meaning in life; focusing on the core values – the spirit of the leader and led – not facts about personality or situation; understanding that a clear sense of the “spiritual” dimension of self and group members has a transformational effect on organizations, forms, structures, processes, behavior, and attitudes. More specifically, leadership elements associated with this perspective include the following ideas.

Liberating the Best in People and a Concern for the Individual

Argyris (1957) suggests a very necessary link between individual personality and the organization’s dynamics and success. Herzberg (1984) suggests that organizations do much for individual’s to understand “mystery systems,” meaning those elements of life that give meaning and self-efficacy. Levit (1992) hypothesizes that the motive force behind the influence of a leader is meaning and purpose, and that if leaders are to clarify meaning and purpose for others, they themselves must have a greater-than-average sense of purpose and meaning. Jacobsen (1994) reveals through his research that spirituality plays a vital role in the personal and professional activity of the participants in organizations. Burns (1978) suggests that the purpose of transforming leadership is to raise followers and leaders to high levels of existence. Nelson (1997) states that to be effective, “today’s managers must create supportive work environments that can influence, but not ordain,

desired behavior and outcomes” (p.35). Autry (1992) feels that love and caring for people as individuals is central to leadership.

Developing Individual Wholeness While Building Community and Promoting Stewardship

Barnard (1938b) claims an individual is always the basic factor in organizations and that the goal of the executive is to combine sentiment and rationality within the organizational structure. Drath and Palus (1994) argue that leadership is a sense-making activity, but that meaning creation is leadership, however, only when it is found in a community of practice. Block (1993) suggests that the stewardship concept defines leadership as service overcomes self-interest in organizational and social life. DePree (1992) states that while leadership is a serious meddling in people’s lives, the active pursuit of common good gives us the right to ask leaders and managers of all kinds to be not only successful, but faithful to certain core, fundamental values. Wheatley and Kellner-Rogers (1998) suggest as a basic principle of leadership that to create better health in a living system, the leader and the followers need to connect themselves to more of themselves in terms of core values, self-awareness, and holistic perspectives.

Fostering an Intelligent Organization, Setting Moral Standards, and Modeling a Service Orientation

Senge (1990) advises that only leaders who can develop and work within a learning organization will be successful and suggests four core disciplines: personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, and team learning. Vaill (1996) recommends that managers actively and continually learn to be able to cope with the complexities and rapidity of change in today’s organizations. Barnard (1938b) makes explicit reference to

the executives moral responsibilities as does DePree (1992), Covey (1992), Gini (1997), and Fairholm (1997). Prince (1995) states that in essence the leader can influence the moral conduct of others by demonstrating the desired behavior, rewarding ethical behavior, and punishing unethical conduct. Greenleaf (1977) suggests that more servants should emerge as leaders and, more dramatically, that we should follow only servant-leaders. His models and theories have brought service to the forefront of much of the leadership literature.

Inspiration

In speaking of creativity and empowerment, Berry (1997) suggests that "managers cannot command people to be entrepreneurial; they can only hope to inspire them to try something new or go the extra mile for a customer" (p. 32). Greenleaf (1977), Fairholm (1997), and Burns (1978) focus attention on the inspirational aspects of leadership. Wheatley (1997) says "most of us were raised in a culture that told us that the way to manage for excellence was to tell people exactly what they had to do and then make sure they did it. We learned to play master designer, assuming we could engineer people into perfect performance. But you can't direct people into perfection; you can only engage them enough so that they want to do perfect work" (p. 25).

In very general terms, these five perspectives are an elaboration of one general theme – that values are key in the leadership phenomenon. Burns (1978) made this a central point in his work. The notion that values play a key role in leadership provides a way to frame the variety of individual perspectives about values, organizations, and leadership. The first two perspectives key on values that depend upon organizational hierarchy and authority. The

last three take into account a more personal approach to values. Values leadership makes the case for values displacement as the task of leadership. The next perspective goes further to generalize shared values in a culture characterized by mutual, interactive trust. The final perspective makes the case that when engaging in leadership not all the values the leader or led hold are important, but only the core, soul values – the ones we just will not compromise, that define the true essence of leadership just as they define the individual as a person.

Fairholm's model suggests that "while there is a kind of evolutionary order to our understanding, each leadership virtual reality has adherents today. They can be ranked hierarchically along a continuum from managerial control to spiritual holism" (Fairholm, 1998b, p. xix). He goes on to suggest that "perhaps each of us has to move through each virtual leadership environment, accepting one for a while before we are ready to experience the next" (pp. xxiii-xxiv).

Summary of Literature Review

Leadership is a reality that people accept (even long for), but rarely understand enough to describe. Defining leadership not as a quality, technique, or methodology, but rather describing leadership as a philosophy, in no way implies leadership is something we cannot learn or apply. Leadership is in a very real way a philosophy adopted by some, implicitly understood by most. As a philosophy, leadership can be learned, studied, understood, and applied by people who are so inclined. The ethics of leadership is not found necessarily in its philosophical underpinnings but rather in its application by would be

leaders (whether good or bad).

Many have studied leadership as a quality or bunch of qualities, as a collection of techniques or behavior, or as a methodology or system of contingencies. The first attempts to codify leadership and determine what "makes a good leader" centered on the belief that leaders are born not made. This gave rise to various forms of trait theory: the idea that leadership depends upon personal traits, personality, and character. The great man (person) theory and many of the psychology-based theories of leadership depend on this perspective.

However, because it was so difficult to come up with a definitive list of traits or qualities that all leaders held in common, theorists shifted to studying behavior instead of inborn traits. This was a potentially more "scientific" approach to leadership study, because behaviors could be seen, observed, measured, and potentially mimicked. Along with behavior theory in general, were specific theories based on interaction and expectancy of roles, exchange activities between leader and follower, and the perceptions that followers have of leaders. These behavior-based theories did provide a way for people to copy what other leaders have done, but the behaviors did not prove to be generalizable.

Therefore, studies began to focus on the environments in which leadership takes place. The thinking was that situations determine the activities of leaders and that behaviors must be linked to the specific environment at hand. Situational theory, contingency theory, and the more humanistic models of leadership emerged. It was during this emphasis in leadership study that the desire to differentiate between managers and leaders emerged. Not all theorists thought it necessary to make the distinction. Nonetheless, the unique elements and foci of leadership and management

suggest that the two are different and theories should be developed accordingly.

To understand the true significance of studying the philosophy of leadership, we must explicitly determine the difference between management and leadership. In the past, the idea of leadership has suffered as it has been defined at best as being synonymous with good management and at worst as just another skill that makes up the competent manager. As we observe organizations, two critical competencies seem to emerge that past theory has labeled management. Fairholm (1991) explains, "We need competent, dedicated managers to provide continuity of process, to insure program productivity, and to control and schedule the materials needed for production or service delivery. We also need people who can infuse the organization with common values that define the organization, determine its character, link it to the larger society, and insure its long-term survival" (p. 41). However, the skills and competencies required to do the first are substantially different than those needed to do the second. When theorists and practitioners do not make that distinction, they confuse the issue of organizational success and set individuals up for failure.

One useful difference between management and leadership that other authors sometimes make implicitly is the idea that headship is not always leadership, even though much of the literature assumes it is. Differentiating between the structure of headship and the philosophy of leadership allows the concept of leadership to be spread throughout the organization, allowing individuals to develop into leaders in their own right.

Leadership is the art of influencing people to accomplish organizational goals, while management is the science of specifying and implementing means

needed to accomplish the same ends. In a sense, the pure leader is a philosopher and the pure manager is a technologist. Fairholm (1991) goes further to say, “as one moves up the organizational ladder to higher and higher levels of responsibility, a point is reached where the nature and scope of competencies changes. One no longer practices management skills but moves on to something else – to leadership focused on values, changing the character of the institution, and long-term survival issues. What was learned on the way up has little value once one reaches the pinnacle of the hierarchy” (p. 42).

This distinction helps clarify the contributions of such writers as Greenleaf and Burns. They approach leadership as a phenomenon to be understood independent of a particular leader. In fact the test of who is or is not a leader depends upon how one uses or implements the technologies of leadership. Other authors began to view leadership as something to understand and be applied without directly linking to the activities of perceived leaders.

This approach to leadership study began to clear up at least some of the confusion that characterizes leadership thought. Researchers began to notice and accept divergent views of leadership in the literature and in practice. Frameworks to understand these differing views are just now emerging. Fair-

holm’s (1998b) model of leadership as virtual realities is one such framework, unique to leadership theory. Conceiving of leadership in terms of virtual realities or alternative world views allow theorists and practitioners to better ground their leadership activities. Five perspectives culled from experience and literature include: leadership as management, leadership as excellence management, values leadership, trust cultural leadership, and spiritual, or whole soul, leadership. While these perspectives are unique and identifiable, they are related because they build upon each other to create increasingly more sophisticated and encompassing conceptions of leadership.

Conclusion

There is more confusion and debate about what leadership is than ever before. But there is also much progress in understanding what it is. There is a need to continue to place the leadership phenomenon in a context that can be easily understood so that the debate will be more useful, more enlightening, and more productive in the quest to understand the true nature of leadership. This understanding will help organizational actors place themselves appropriately as leaders in governance and societal issues.

Table 1: Historical Threads of Leadership Research and Theory

Historical Thread	Characteristic Concepts	Five Illustrative Authors
1. Trait Theory (who)	<p>Leadership depends upon who the leader is and what the leader is like (Leaders are...)</p> <p>Great person theory</p> <p>Leadership depends upon personal qualities, personality, and character</p>	<p>Wiggam, 1931 Dowd, 1936 Jennings, 1960 Scott, 1973 Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991</p>
2. Behavior Theory (what)	<p>Leadership depends upon what the leader does (Leaders do...)</p> <p>Managerial Grid</p> <p>Describes leadership as being the sum of two important behaviors that great leaders seem to hold in common: getting things done and relating well with people</p>	<p>Hemphill, 1950 Hemphill and Coons, 1957 Stogdill and Coons, 1957 Blake and Mouton, 1964 Kouzes and Posner, 1990</p>
3. Situational Theory (when)	<p>Leadership depends upon which situations are conducive to leadership and when the leader can emerge (Leaders emerge depending on...)</p> <p>Situational and Contingency Theories</p> <p>Leadership depends upon what leaders do in specific situations that differ because of unique internal and external forces; leadership is not definable without the specific context of the situation in which leaders seem to emerge</p>	<p>Homans, 1950 Fielder, 1967 Vroom and Yetton, 1973 Hollander, 1978 Hersey and Blanchard, 1979</p>
4. Values-based Transformational Theory (why)	<p>Leadership depends upon values and vision (Leaders believe and articulate...)</p> <p>Leader/follower relationships and the Leadership/ Management debate</p> <p>Emphasis is not on studying specific leaders in specific situations, doing specific things, rather, what are the common relationship elements exhibited over time that characterize this thing called "leadership"</p>	<p>Greenleaf, 1977 Burns, 1978 Bennis and Nanus, 1985 Fairholm, 1991 Covey, 1992</p>

Table 2: Fairholm's Perspectives on Leadership Aligned with the Literature Review

Leadership Perspective	Leadership Elements	Illustrative Citations
Scientific Management	Ensure efficient use of resources to ensure group activity is controlled and predictable	Gilbreth, 1912; Gulick & Urwick, 1937; Seckler-Hudson, 1955; Taylor, 1915
	Ensure verifiably optimal productivity and resource allocation.	Drucker, 1954; Gilbreth, 1912; Gulick & Urwick, 1937; Selznick, 1983; Taylor, 1915
	Measuring/ appraising/ rewarding individual performance	Box, 1999; Bozeman, 1993; Drucker, 1954; Gilbreth, 1912; Millett, 1954; New-comer, 1997
	Organizing (to include such things as budgeting, staffing)	Drucker, 1954; Drucker, 1966; Gulick, 1937; Seckler-Hudson, 1951
	Planning (to include such things as coordination and reporting)	Drucker, 1966; Malmberg, 1999; Mintzberg, 1975; Price, 1965
	Incentivization	House, 1996; Kohn, 1995; Drucker, 1954
	Control	Dowd, 1936; Drucker, 1954; Gouldner, 1954; Jay, 1967; Taylor, 1915
	Direction	Drucker, 1966; Mintzberg, 1975; Price, 1965
Excellence Management	Foster continuous process improvement environment for increased service and productivity levels	Deming, 1986; Juran, 1989; Ross, 1993
	Transform the environment and perceptions of followers to encourage innovation, high quality products, and excellent services.	Deming, 1986; Juran, 1989; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Rago, 1996
	Focusing on process improvement	Davis & Luthans, 1984; Deming, 1986; Ross, 1993
	Listening actively	Fairholm, 1991; Hefitz & Laurie, 1998
	Being accessible (to include such things as managing by walking around, open door policies)	Deming, 1986; Hefitz & Laurie, 1998
	Motivation	Deming, 1986; Herzberg, 1987; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1993; Juran, 1989; McGregor, Bennis, Schein, & McGregor, 1966; Roethlisberger, 1956
	Engaging people in problem definition and solution	Deming, 1986; Rago, 1996; Vroom & Jago, 1988
	Expressing common courtesy/ respect	Deming, 1986; Fairholm, 1998a
Values Leadership	Help individual become proactive contributors to group action based on shared values and agreed upon goals	Barnard, 1938; Fairholm, 1991; Kouzes & Posner, 1990; Sullivan & Harper, 1996
	Encourage high organizational performance and self-led followers	Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Fairholm, 1991; Kotter, 1996; Manz & Henry P. Sims, 1989; Rosenbach & Taylor, 1989; Rost, 1991
	Setting and enforcing values	Conger, 1991; Covey, 1992; Fairholm, 1991; Frost & Egri, 1990; Nirenberg, 1998; O'Toole, 1996
	Visioning	Barker, 1992; Collins & Porras, 1997; Kouzes & Posner, 1990; Nanus, 1992; Sashkin, 1989; Thornberry, 1997 Cleveland, 1972
	Focusing communication around the vision	Felton, 1995; Kouzes & Posner, 1990; Sashkin, 1989; Sashkin & Rosenbach, 1998
	Values Prioritization	Bennis, 1982; Burns, 1978; Covey, 1992; Fairholm, 1998b; Kidder, 1995
	Teaching/ Coaching	Fairholm, 1991; Rost, 1991; Tichy, 1997
	Empowering (fostering ownership)	McFarland, Senn, & Childress, 1993; O'Toole, 1996; Rost, 1991; Sullivan & Harper, 1996

Leadership Perspective	Leadership Elements	Illustrative Citations
Trust Cultural Leadership	Ensure cultures conducive to mutual trust and unified collective action	Dreilinger, 1998; Fairholm, 1998b; Kouzes & Posner, 1993; Schein, 1992; Malmberg, 1999; Mitchell, 1993
	Prioritization of mutual cultural values and organizational conduct in terms of those values.	Hofstede, 1993; Hollander, 1997; Schein, 1992; Selznick, 1983
	Creating and maintaining culture through visioning	Collins & Porras, 1997; Schein, 1992
	Sharing governance	Fairholm, 1994; Gardner, 1990; Kaufman, 1969; Rosenbach & Taylor, 1989; Rost, 1991
	Measuring/ appraising/ rewarding group performance	Fairholm, 1994; Fraser, 1978; Gardner, 1990; Luke, 1998
	Trust	Fairholm, 1994; Kouzes & Posner, 1993; Fairholm, 1998a; Fairholm & Fairholm, 2000
	Team Building	Luke, 1998; Sashkin & Sashkin, 1994; Tuckman, 1965; Fairholm, 1998a; Nolan & Harty, 1984
	Fostering a shared culture	Conger, 1991; Quinn & McGrath, 1985; Schein, 1992; Wildavsky, 1984; Nolan & Harty, 1984
Spiritual Leadership	Relate to individuals such that concern for the whole person is paramount in raising each other to higher levels of awareness and action	Argyris, 1957; Burns, 1978; Cound, 1987; DePree, 1989; Herzberg, 1984; Levit, 1992; Fairholm, 1998a
	Best in people is liberated in a context of continuous improvement of self, culture, and service delivery.	Autry, 1992; Jacobsen, 1994; Manz & Henry P. Sims, 1989; Nelson, 1997; Senge, 1998
	Developing and enabling individual wholeness in a community (team) context	Barnard, 1938; Cound, 1987; Drath & Palus, 1994; Herzberg, 1984; Vaill, 1989; Greenleaf et al., 1996
	Fostering an intelligent organization	Senge, 1990; Senge, 1998; Vaill, 1996
	Setting moral standards	Barnard, 1938; Burns, 1978; Covey, 1992; Gini, 1997; Prince, 1995
	Inspiration	Berry, 1997; Burns, 1978; Fairholm, 1997; Greenleaf, 1977; Wheatley, 1992/1999
	Liberating followers to build community and promote stewardship	Block, 1993; DePree, 1992; Fairholm, 1997; Vaill, 1989; Wheatley & Kellner-Rogers, 1998
	Modeling a service orientation	Greenleaf, 1998; Greenleaf, 1977; Greenleaf, Frick, & Spears, 1996

References

- Ackerman, L. (1985). Leadership vs. managership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 6(2), 17-19.
- Allison, G. T. (1980). "Public and private management: Are they fundamentally alike in all unimportant aspects?". *Proceedings for the Public Management Research Conference, OPM 127-53-1*(February), 27-38.
- Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and Organization*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Autry, J. A. (1992). *Love and Profit: The Art of Caring Leadership*. New York: Avon Books.
- Barker, J. A. (1992). *Future Edge: Discovering the New Rules of Success*. New York: Morrow.
- Barnard, C. (1938a). *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barnard, C. (1938b). A theory of authority, *Organization And Management, Selected Papers* . Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Baruch, Y. (1998). Leadership - Is That What We Study? *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(1, Winter 1998), 100-124.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership And Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Bennis, W. (1982). The Artform of Leadership. *Training and Development*, April.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Bennis, W. G. (1984). Transformative power and leadership. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), *Leadership and Organizational Culture* . Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Berry, L. L. (1997). Leading for the long term. *Leader to Leader*, Number 6(Fall 1997), 30-36.
- Bingham, W. V. (1927). Leadership. In H. C. Metcalf (Ed.), *The Psychological Foundations of Management* . New York: Shaw.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The Managerial Grid*. Houston: Gulf.
- Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing Service Over Self-Interest*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1934). *Leaders and Leadership*. New York: Appleton-Century.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). *Modern Approaches to Understanding and Managing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowden, A. O. (1926). A study of the personality of student leaders in the United States. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 21, 149-160.
- Box, R. C. (1999). Running government like a business: Implications for public administration theory and practice. *American Review of Public Administration*, 29(1 (March)), 19-43.
- Bozeman, B. (Ed.). (1993). *Public Management: The State of the Art*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Bozeman, B., & Straussman, J. D. (1990). *Public Management Strategies: Guidelines for Managerial Effectiveness*. (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*. London: Heinemann.
- Carlyle, T. (1841/1907). *Heroes and Hero Worship*. Boston: Adams.
- Carson, C. (1987). Martin Luther King, Jr.: Charismatic leadership in a mass struggle. *Journal of American History*, 74(September), 448-454.
- Chaleff, I. (1997). Learn the Art of Followership. *Government Executive*, 29(2), 51.
- Cheng, B.-s. (1982). The contingency model of leadership effectiveness: The empirical study of the meaning of LPC score and of the validity of model. *Acta Psychologica Taiwanica*, 24(2), 111-120.
- Cleveland, H. (1972). *The Future Executive: A Guide for Tomorrow's Managers*. New York: Harper Collins.

- Collins, J. C., & Porras, J. I. (1997). *Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Colvin, R. E. (1996). *Transformational Executive Leadership: A Comparison of Culture-focused and Individual-focused Leadership Modalities*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA.
- Conger, J. A. (1991). Inspiring others: The language of leadership. *Academy of Management Executive*(Number 5), 31-45.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (Eds.). (1988). *Charismatic Leadership: The Illusive Factor In Organizational Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coote, C., & Batchelor, D. (1949). *Winston S. Churchill's Maxims and Reflections*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Cound, D. M. (1987). A call for leadership. *Quality Progress, March*, 11-14.
- Covey, S. R. (1992). *Principle-Centered Leadership*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Cronin, T. E. (1984). Thinking and learning about leadership. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 14(Winter, 1984), 22-34.
- Cuoto, R. A. (1993). The transformation of transforming leadership. In T. J. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's Companion: Insights on Leadership Through the Ages*. New York: Free Press.
- Davis, T. R., & Luthans, F. (1984). Defining and researching leadership as a behavioral construct: An idiographic approach. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 20(3), 237-251.
- Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the Crisis*. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
- DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership Is An Art*. New York: Doubleday.
- DePree, M. (1992). *Leadership Jazz*. New York: Dell.
- Dickson, W. J., & Roethlisberger, F. J. (1966). *Counseling In an Organization: A Sequel to the Hawthorne Researches*. Boston, MA: Division of Research Graduate School of Business Administration Harvard University.
- Dowd, J. (1936). *Control in Human Societies*. New York: Appleton-Century.
- Drath, W. H., & Palus, C. J. (1994). *Making Common Sense: Leadership as Meaning-making in a Community of Practice*. Greensboro, North Carolina: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Dreilinger, C. (1998). Beyond cynicism: Building a culture which supports both ethical business practice and high performance. In W. E. Rosenbach & R. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* (4th ed., pp. 125-144). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Drucker, P. (1954). *The Practice of Management*. New York: Harper.
- Drucker, P. F. (1966). *The Effective Executive*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Drucker, P. F. (1990). *Managing The Non-Profit Organization: Practices And Principles*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Emmert, K. (1981). Winston S. Churchill on civilizing empire. In H. V. Jaffa (Ed.), *Statesmanship: Essays in Honor of Sir Winston Spencer Churchill*. Durham, North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press.
- Etzioni, A. (1996). *The New Golden Rule: Community and Morality in a Democratic Society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Evans, M. G. (1970). The effects of supervisory behavior on the path-goal relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 5, 277-298.
- Fairholm, G. W. (1991). *Values Leadership: Toward a New Philosophy of Leadership*. New York: Praeger.
- Fairholm, G. W. (1993). *Organizational Power Politics: Tactics in Organizational Leadership*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Fairholm, G. W. (1994). *Leadership and the Culture of Trust*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Fairholm, G. W. (1997). *Capturing the Heart of Leadership: Spirituality and Community in the New American Workplace*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Fairholm, G. W. (1998a). Leadership as an exercise in virtual reality. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 19(4), 187-193.
- Fairholm, G. W. (1998b). *Perspectives on Leadership: From the Science of Management to Its Spiritual Heart*. Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books.
- Fairholm, M. R., & Fairholm, G. (2000). Leadership Amid the Constraints of Trust. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 21(2), 102-109.

- Farmer, D. J. (1995). *The Language of Public Administration: Bureaucracy, Modernity, and Post-modernity*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Felton, K. S. (1995). *Warrior's Words: A Consideration of Language and Leadership*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A Theory Of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Follert, V. (1983). Supervisors' power: An exchange model of leadership. *Psychological Reports*, 52(3), 740.
- Follett, M. P. (1918 / 1998). *The New State: Group Organization - The Solution of Popular Government*. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania University Press.
- Follett, M. P. (1926). The Giving of Orders. In H. C. Metcalf (Ed.), *The Scientific Foundations of Business Administration*. New York: The Williams and Wilkins Co.
- Fraser, C. (1978). Small groups: I. Structure and leadership. In C. F. Henri Tajfel (Ed.), *Introducing social psychology: An analysis of individual reaction and response*. (pp. 176-200): Penguin Books, Inc, Middlesex, England.
- Frost, P. J., & Egri, C. J. (1990). Appreciating executive action. In S. Srivastva & D. L. Cooperider (Eds.), *Appreciative Management and Leadership: The Power of Positive Thought and Action in Organizations* (pp. 289-323). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc, Publishers.
- Galton, F. (1870). *Hereditary Genius*. New York: Appleton.
- Gardner, J. (1990). *On Leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Gardner, J. W. (1987). The Tasks of Leadership. *New Management*, 4(4 Spring), 9-14.
- Gilbert, M. (1981). In Search of Churchill's Character. In H. V. Jaffa (Ed.), *Statesmanship: Essays in Honor of Sir Winston Spencer Churchill*. Durham, North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press.
- Gilbreth, F. B. (1912). *Primer of Scientific Management*. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company.
- Gini, A. (1997). Moral leadership: An overview. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16, 323-330.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Gouldner, A. (1954). *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Graen, G. A., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership of 25 years. Applying a multilevel multi-domain approach. *Leadership Quarterly*(Number 6), 219-247.
- Graves, C. (1970). Toward humanism from animalism: An open systems theory of values. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, October, 25-39.
- Greenleaf, R. (1998). *The Power of Servant Leadership*. San Francisco: Berrett - Koehler.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K., Frick, D. M., & Spears, L. C. (Eds.). (1996). *On Becoming a Servant Leader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
- Gulick, L. (1937). Notes of the theory of organization. In L. Gulick & L. Urwick (Eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration* (pp. 3-13). New York: Institute of Public Administration.
- Gulick, L. H., & Urwick, L. (1937). *Papers on the science of administration*. (2nd ed.). New York,,: Institute of Public Administration.
- Hackman, M. Z., & Johnson, C. E. (1991). *Leadership: A Communication Perspective*. Prospect Heights, Ill: Waveland Press.
- Harman, W. (1998). *Global Mind Change: The Promise of the 21st Century*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Harmon, M. M. (1997). On the futility of universalism. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 19(1), 3-18.
- Harmon, M. M., & Mayer, R. T. (1986). *Organizational Theory for Public Administration*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Company.
- Hayward, S. F. (1997). *Churchill on Leadership: Executive Success in the Face of Adversity*. Rocklin, Calif.: Forum.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Heilman, M. E., Hornstein, H. A., Cage, J. H., & Herschlag, J. K. (1984). Reactions to prescribed leader behavior as a function of role perspective: The case of the Vroom-Yetton model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(1), 50-60.

- Hemphill, J. K. (1950). *Leader Behavior Description*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1954). *A Proposed Theory of Leadership in Small Groups*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Personnel Research Board.
- Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire. In R. M. Stodgill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1979). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*(June), 94-100.
- Herzberg, F. (1984, November 12). Why me? Whom do I turn to? Mystery systems shape loyalties. *Industry Week*, 101-104.
- Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*(September-October), 109-120.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York: Wiley.
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7(February), 81-94.
- Hollander, E. P. (1978). *Leadership Dynamics: A Practical Guide To Effective Relationships*. New York: The Free Press.
- Hollander, E. P. (1997). How and why active followers matter in leadership. In E. P. Hollander & L. R. Offermann (Eds.), *The Balance of Leadership and Followership* (pp. 11-28). University of Maryland: Kellogg Leadership Studies Project.
- Homans, G. C. (1950). *The Human Group*. New York: Harcourt Brace & World.
- House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: An examination of a prescriptive theory. *Leadership Quarterly*(7), 323-352.
- Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (1993). *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience*: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Hunt, J. G., Osborn, R. N., & Marton, H. J. (1981). A multiple influence model of leadership. *US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral & Social Sciences Report*. TR, 520(182).
- Ingraham, P. W., & Romzek, B. S. (1994). *New Paradigms for Government: Issues for the Changing Public Service*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Jacobsen, S. (1994). *Spirituality and Transformational Leadership in Secular Settings: A Delphi Study*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Seattle University, Seattle, WA.
- Jaques, E., & Clement, S. D. (1991). *Executive Leadership: A Practical Guide To Managing Complexity*. Arlington, VA: Cason Hall.
- Jennings, E. E. (1960). *An Anatomy of Leadership: Princes, Heroes, and Supermen*. New York: Harper.
- Juran, J. M. (1989). *Juran on Leadership for Quality: An Executive Handbook*. New York: Free Press.
- Kass, H. D., & Catron, B. L. (1990). *Images and Identities in Public Administration*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Kaufman, H. (1969). Administration decentralization and political power. *Public Administration Review*.
- Kee, J., & Black, R. (1985). Is excellence possible in the public sector? *Public Productivity Review*, Spring, 25-34.
- Kidder, R. M. (1995). Universal human values: Finding an ethical common ground. *Public Management*, 77(June), 4-9.
- Kilbourne, C. E. (1935). The elements of leadership. *Journal of Cost Artillery*, 78, 437-439.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive*(5), 48-60.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The Psychology of Moral Development: The Nature and Validity of Moral Stages*. (1st ed.). San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review*(May-June), 45-56.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading Change*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1990). *The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: How Leaders Gain and Lose It, Why People*

- Demand It*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Levit, R. A. (1992). Meaning, purpose, and leadership. *International Forum for Logotherapy*, 15(2), 71-75.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers*. New York: Harper.
- Luke, J. S. (1998). *Catalytic Leadership: Strategies for an Interconnected World*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Malmberg, K. B. (1999). *A Vision For The Future: The Practice Of Leading In The Federal Workplace*. Paper presented at the The American Society for Public Administration, Orlando, FL.
- Manz, C. C., & Henry P. Sims, J. (1989). *Superleadership, Leading Others To Lead Themselves*. New York: Prentice Hall Press.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of motivation. *Psychological Review*(50), 370-396.
- Mayo, E. (1945). *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. Boston,: Division of Research Graduate School of Business Administration Harvard University.
- McFarland, L. J., Senn, L. E., & Childress, J. R. (1993). *Twenty-first Century Leadership: Dialogues with 100 Top Leaders*. Long Beach, CA: The Leadership Press.
- McGregor, D., Bennis, W. G., Schein, E. H., & McGregor, C. (1966). *Leadership and Motivation: Essays*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
- McWhinney, W. (1984). Alternative realities: Their impact on change and leadership. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 24(4), 7-38.
- Millett, J. D. (1954). *Management in the Public Service: The Quest for Effective Performance*. New York,: McGraw-Hill.
- Mintzberg, H. (1975). The manager's job: Folklore and fact. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 19-32.
- Mitchell, T. R. (1993). Leadership, values, and accountability. In R. A. Martin M. Chemers (Ed.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions*. (pp. 109-136): Academic Press, Inc, San Diego, CA, US.
- Mooney, J. D., & Reiley, A. C. (1931). *Onward Industry! The Principles of Organization and Their Significance to Modern Industry*. New York: Harper & brothers.
- Morgan, G. (1998). *Images of Organization: The Executive Edition*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1990). Beyond the Charismatic Leader: Leadership and Organizational Change. *California Management Review*, 32(Winter), 77-97.
- Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary Leadership: Creating a Compelling Sense of Direction for Your Organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nelson, B. (1997). Creating an energized workplace. *Leader to Leader*, 5(Summer), 34-39.
- Newcomer, K. E. (1997, September 24-26, 1997). *Preparing Public Managers for the 21st Century: Holding Ourselves Accountable for Their Performance*. Paper presented at the International Symposium on Performance-based Management in Public Administration and Its Training Implications, Caserta, Italy.
- Nicholls, J. R. (1985). A new approach to situational leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 6(4), 2-7.
- Nirenberg, J. (1998). Myths we teach, realities we ignore: Leadership education in business schools. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(1, Winter), 82-99.
- Nolan, J. S., & Harty, H. F. (1984). Followership => leadership. *Education*, 104(3), 311-312.
- Offermann, L. R. (1984). Short-term supervisory experience and LPC score: Effects of leader's sex and group sex composition. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 123(1), 115-121.
- O'Toole, J. (1996). *Leading Change: The Argument for Value-Based Leadership*. New York: Ballentine Books.
- Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*. New York: Warner Books.
- Pfeffer, J. (1993). Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 599-620.
- Pittman, T. S., Rosenbach, W. E., & Potter., E. H. (1998). Followers and partners. In W. E. Rosenbach & R. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* (4th ed., pp. 107-120). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Price, D. K. (1965). *The Scientific Estate*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Prince, H. T. (1995). Moral development in individuals. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's Companion* (pp. 484-491). New York: The Free Press.
- Quinn, R. E., & McGrath, M. R. (1985). The transformation of organizational cultures: A competing values perspective. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Organizational Culture*. (pp. 315-334). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Rago, W. V. (1996). Struggles in transformation: A study in TQM, leadership, and organizational culture in a government agency. *Public Administration Review*, 56(3), 227 - 234.
- Rice, R. W., & Kastenbaum, D. R. (1983). The contingency model of leadership: Some current issues. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology*, 4(4), 373-392.
- Roethlisberger, F. J. (1956). *Management and morale*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Roethlisberger, F. J., Dickson, W. J., & Wright, H. A. (1941). *Management and The Worker: An Account of a Research Program Conducted by the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Rorty, R. (1991). *Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenbach, W. E., & Taylor, R. L. (Eds.). (1989). *Contemporary Issues In Leadership* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*(Nov-Dec), 52-59.
- Ross, J. E. (1993). *Total Quality Management: Text, Cases, and Readings*. Delray Beach, FL: St. Lucia Press.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership For The Twenty-First Century*. Westport CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- Rutan, J. S., & Rice, C. A. (1981). The charismatic leader: Asset or liability? *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice*, 18(4), 487-492.
- Sashkin, M. (1982). *A Manager's Guide to Participative Management*. New York, N.Y.: AMA Membership Publications Division American Management Associations.
- Sashkin, M. (1989). Visionary leadership: The perspective from education. In W. E. Rosenbach & R. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* (2nd ed.,). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sashkin, M., & Rosenbach, W. E. (1998). A New Vision of Leadership. In W. E. Rosenbach & R. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* (4th ed.,). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sashkin, M., & Sashkin, M. G. (1994). *The new Teamwork: Developing and Using Cross-function Teams*. New York: AMA Membership Publications Division American Management Association.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational Culture And Leadership*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, V. (1989). Would women lead differently? In W. E. Rosenbach & R. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* (2nd ed.,). Boulder, CO.: Westview Press.
- Scott, W. (1973). The theory of significant people. *Public Administration Review*(August), 24-32.
- Seckler-Hudson, C. (1951). *Processes of Organization and Management*. Washington, DC: American University Press.
- Seckler-Hudson, C. (1955). *Organization and Management: Theory and Practice*. Washington DC: The American University Press.
- Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in Administration*. New York: Row, Peterson.
- Selznick, P. (1983). *Leadership in Administration : A Sociological Interpretation*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Senge, P. (1998). Leading learning organizations. In W. E. Rosenbach & R. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* (4th ed., pp. 174-178). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Shouksmith, G. (1983). The factor structure of "Most Preferred Co-worker," and "Assumed Similarity of Opposites" scores. *Psychological Reports*, 53(1), 255-258.

- Smith, R. B. (1995). Talent and training for leadership. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's Companion* (pp. 464-471). New York: The Free Press.
- Spitzberg, I. J. (1987). Paths of inquiry into leadership. *Liberal Education*, 73(2 (March/April)), 67-77.
- Stimpson, D. V., & Reuel, L. K. (1984). Management style: Modeling or balancing? *Journal of Psychology*, 116(2), 169-173.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (Eds.). (1957). *Leader Behavior: Its Description And Measurement*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Sullivan, G. R., & Harper, M. V. (1996). *Hope is Not a Method: What Business Leaders Can Learn from America's Army*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Taylor, F. W. (1915). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Thayer, F. C. (1980). Values, truth and administration: God or mammon. *Public Administration Review*, 45(January-February), 91-98.
- Thornberry, N. (1997). A view about "vision". *European Management Journal*, 15 (February)(1), 28-34.
- Tichy, N. M. (1997). The mark of a winner. *Leader to Leader*, 6(Fall), 24-29.
- Triandis, H. C. (1993). The contingency model in cross-cultural perspective. In R. A. Martin M. Chemers (Ed.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions*. (pp. 167-188): Academic Press, Inc, San Diego, CA, US.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63(6), 384-389.
- Vaill, P. (1989, July 21, 1989). *Spirituality in the Age of the Leveraged Buyout*. Paper presented at the Spirituality in Life and Work, Washington, DC.
- Vaill, P. (1996). *Learning as a Way of Being: Strategies for Survival in a World of Permanent White Water*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Valle, M. (1999). Crisis, culture and charisma: The new leader's work in public organizations. *Public Personnel Management*, 28 (Summer)(2), 245-257.
- Vecchio, R. P., & Gobdel, B. C. (1984). The vertical dyad linkage model of leadership: Problems and prospects. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 34(1), 5-20.
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The New Leadership: Managing Participation In Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership And Decision-Making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Weinberg, L. (1996). Seeing through organization: Exploring the constitutive quality of social relations. *Administration & Society*, 28 (August)(2), 117 -124.
- Weisbord, M. R. (1987). *Productive Workplaces: Organizing and Managing for Dignity, Meaning, and Community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Wheatley, M. (1997). Goodbye, command and control. *Leader to Leader*, 5(Summer), 21-28.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1992/1999). *Leadership and the New Science: Learning about Organization from an Orderly Universe*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Wheatley, M. J., & Kellner-Rogers, M. (1998). Bringing life to organizations. *Journal for Strategic Performance Measurement*, April/May(41-49).
- Whetton, D. A., & Cameron, K. S. (1998). *Developing Management Skills*. (4th ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Whyte, W., H., Jr. (1956). *The Organization Man*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Wiggam, A. E. (1931). The biology of leadership. In H. C. Metcalf (Ed.), *Business Leadership*. New York: Pitman.
- Wildavsky, A. (1984). *The Nursing Father: Moses As a Political Leader*. Birmingham: University of Alabama Press.
- Wolf, F. A. (1989). *Taking the Quantum Leap: The New Physics for Non-Scientists, revised*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Yukl, G. A. (1988). *Leadership in Organizations*. (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*(55), 67-78.