Leadership in Public Organizations

Now in a completely revised and updated Third Edition, *Leadership in Public Organizations* provides a compact but complete analysis of leadership for students and practitioners who work in public and nonprofit organizations. Offering a comprehensive review of leadership theories in the field, from the classic to the cutting-edge, and how they relate specifically to the public sector context, this textbook covers the major competency clusters in detail, supported by research findings as well as practical guidelines for improvement. These competencies are graphically portrayed in a leadership action cycle that aids readers in visually connecting theory and practice. Including questions for discussion and analysis and hypothetical scenarios for each chapter, as well as an easily reproducible leadership assessment instrument students may use to apply the theories they've learned, this Third Edition also explores:

- The rise of e-leadership, or the relationship between leadership and information and communication technologies, as well as the role leaders play in selecting those technologies

- The challenges of nonprofit management leadership, including an extensive case study designed to illustrate the differences between public and nonprofit sector leadership curricula

- Separate, dedicated chapters on charismatic and transformational leadership; distributed leadership; ethics-based leadership; and power, world cultures, diversity, gender, complexity, social change, and strategy.

Leadership in Public Organizations is an essential core text designed specifically with upper-level and graduate Public Administration courses on leadership in mind, but it has also proven an indispensable guidebook for professionals seeking insight into the role of successful leadership behavior in the public sector. It can further be used as supplementary reading in introductory courses examining management competencies, in leadership classes to provide practical self-help and improvement models, and in Organizational Theory classes that wish to balance organizational perspectives with individual development.

Montgomery Van Wart is Professor in the Department of Public Administration at California State University, San Bernardino.

Paul Suino is a long-time reviewer and editor of public administration materials.

Leadership in Public Organizations

An Introduction

THIRD EDITION

Montgomery Van Wart

With Paul Suino

Contents

About the Author

Montgomery Van Wart is a Professor in the Department of Public Administration at California State University, San Bernardino. He is currently an honorary professor at the University of Hong Kong, and has been a Visiting Professor at Rutgers and KU Leuven. He has worked in higher education in various capacities for thirty years, nearly always in an administrative role. He has over 100 publications. Some of his other books include *Dynamics of Leadership in Public Service* (Second Edition), *Leadership Across the Globe* (with Gupta), and *Leadership and Culture: Comparative Models of Top Civil Servant Training* (with Hondeghem and Schwella). He has done extensive training of leaders at all levels of government around the world.

Preface to the Third Edition

Leadership in Public Organizations addresses the need for a compact but nonetheless complete analysis of leadership for students and practitioners who work in public and nonprofit organizations.

The first half of *Leadership in Public Organizations* addresses the basic issues and theories related to leadership; the second half looks at leadership as a cycle of action requiring an array of competencies. Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the leadership literature, focusing on issues related to the public sector administrative context. Chapter 2 discusses how to examine leadership theories comparatively and examines the ten styles used in leadership theories, although under a variety of names. Chapter 3 examines the foundation of leadership studies by examining the early classical management and trait theories, as well as a sample of prominent transactional theories. Chapter 4 compares charismatic and transformational theories of leadership. Chapter 5 reviews leadership when it is distributed more broadly, such as with informal leaders and teams. Chapter 6 focuses on the relationship of ethics and leadership. Chapter 7 covers the topics of power, world cultures, diversity, gender, complexity, social change, and strategy. Chapter 8 focuses exclusively on competency approaches in order to prepare readers for the competency framework that organizes Part II of the book.

The applied model used in the second half of the book is called the leadership action cycle. Readers, instructors, and trainers can easily reverse the order for various purposes (essentially starting with the competencies of leadership in Chapter 9). The book features one or two substantial hypothetical scenarios at the end of every chapter (except the last chapter, which contains a historical case study), along with questions for discussion and analysis. The book also features a leadership assessment instrument (Appendix A) that is in the public domain so that it can be freely copied and used. Because the assessment instrument is modeled on the book, debriefing and development based on the instrument are relatively easy. The use of the assessment instrument by students in writing original papers about leaders has been extraordinary. When I ask students to produce an analytical paper on an actual leader they know, they can supplement their

interview with a data-rich self-assessment by the leader, and use assessments by subordinates and colleagues.

In this third edition not only is the text updated, but it includes more references to e-leadership—that is, leadership mediated by information and communication technologies, as well as the roles leaders play in selecting them. Another important addition to the text is an extensive nonprofit management leadership example in Chapter 8 that discusses the modest but very significant differences in public and nonprofit sector curricula in leadership.

The academic audience for this book is upper-division college students and general master's-level students. *Leadership in Public Organizations* is primarily designed as the principal text for classes on leadership, but it may be used as an auxiliary text in introductory classes in which a competency review is desired, in Management classes to provide a practical self-help guide to improvement, and in Organizational Theory classes balancing organizational perspectives with a text focusing on individual development.

Trainers should find the text particularly attractive because of the versatility of the public-domain leadership assessment instrument and the matching "guidelines for improvement" incorporated in the discussion for each competency. Instructions for the assessment instrument are provided in Appendix B. Instructors should note that the very substantial scenario in Chapter 8 is intended not only as an analytical exercise illustrating integrated leadership theories, but also as an opportunity to demonstrate the instrument used in this book—Assessment of Organizational Conditions and Leader Performance.

I hope that you find this third edition of *Leadership in Public Organizations* a useful text and reference, and I encourage instructors to contact me if they have questions regarding the text or suggestions for the next edition.

Monty Van Wart
Riverside, California

Introduction

Although the serious study of leadership is only about a hundred years old, interest in leaders and leadership dates back thousands of years. In addition to the enormous power that leaders have had over their people—literally life and death—leaders often attained godlike status themselves.

Despite modern efforts to curb excessive powers of all leaders—political, financial, religious, and so on—many leaders around the world continue to wield incredible amounts of power. In countries where democratic institutions are weak, political leaders may be as powerful as they were in ancient times. Nor should one think that leaders in wealthy democratic states have been emasculated of their power; they simply must use it more deftly. In the United States, presidents still send troops into battle without declarations of war and governors spare the lives of those on Death Row. Billionaires like Sam Walton changed the face of rural commerce, forcing tens of thousands of country businesses to reinvent themselves or go out of business, while Bill Gates dominated the world of computers as powerfully as Charlemagne ruled Europe. The rise of religious activism around the world has allowed the Dalai Lama to become a political force and icon even outside his own followers, evangelical leaders in the United States to increasingly affect social policy, and ayatollahs in Iran to largely direct the affairs of the country. One determined "leader," Osama bin Laden, was able to simultaneously destroy the largest buildings in the world and damage the Pentagon, bringing the United States to an unprecedented standstill. He successfully encouraged hundreds of his followers to sacrifice their lives for the glory of their cause in suicide bombings. While considered a demonic mass murderer in the United States, in most Arab countries, he gained grudging admiration even among political moderates for his ability to project such a powerful anti-American statement which ultimately led to the founding of a new caliphate in the Middle East. Given the tremendous impact and divergent personalities of leaders around the world, it is nearly impossible to read, watch, or listen to any news source and not be inundated with issues related to leadership, just as the topic is enormously common in the stories and topics relayed in entertainment.

Ultimately, then, there are two major reasons for the enduring human interest in the topic of leadership. First, the effect of leaders on our lives is omnipresent. Leaders affect us on a grand scale in that they determine the success or failure of our societies, countries, and localities. Hitler destroyed Germany, while Churchill saved Great Britain. The leaders of the accounting firm of Arthur Andersen destroyed a highly successful company with their unwise profiteering, while CEO Lee Iacocca saved Chrysler from economic implosion. Social leaders as disparate as Jerry Falwell (the evangelical Christian movement), Ralph Nader (the environmental movement), Gloria Steinem (the women's movement), Sarah Palin (the conservative movement), and Jesse Jackson (the minority rights movement) fight for, or against, our most deeply held convictions. In China, Mao Zedong used his political position to reshape the social landscape, and more recently Liu Xiaobo, the 2010 Nobel Peace Prize winner, has agitated for greater democracy in a country whose communist system is now allowing enormous disparities of wealth. Leaders affect us just as much in our daily settings. A bad supervisor sends us scurrying for a new job. A good team leader makes a difficult assignment seem easy because of good organization and encouragement. The personal problems and lack of discipline of a father cause him to be a bad role model for his children. Second, we are compulsively fascinated by people in leadership positions, or those who assume the roles of leaders. No matter whether the leader is a spiritual saint like Joan of Arc or a demonic despot like Joseph Stalin, a great success like the Duke of Wellington, who defeated Napoleon at Waterloo, or a flawed ruler like the mythical Oedipus, we are equally mesmerized.

There are several reasons for the importance of leadership in our current study. Since leaders affect us so profoundly on a grand as well as a personal scale, it is important to understand how leadership functions. We should be able to recognize the types of leaders we have in terms of their strengths and deficiencies, and also assess the types of leaders we need and the particular competencies they should possess. Another important reason for studying leadership is that all of us function as leaders from time to time. To achieve professional success, managers need to be good leaders, and the study of leadership can help all of us be at least marginally better—and in some cases it can have a dramatic impact. Indeed, because of the complexity of leadership and the myriad situations in which leaders find themselves, the study of leadership cannot help but improve the rate and degree of success. It is true that great leaders often start with great talents, but these abilities rarely find expression without study, mentoring, and practice. It is an explicit purpose of this book to help readers become both better analysts of leadership and better practitioners in organizational settings.

Because leadership is such a large subject, we next distinguish among the major types of leadership and identify the type of leadership on which this book focuses.

MAJOR TYPES OF LEADERSHIP

Leadership is such a broadly used concept that it can be ambiguous if not defined more narrowly. One way to define types of leadership is by the kind of "followers" being led, and another is by the nature of the work that is the primary focus of the leader. Some leaders spend most of their time with followers over whom they have authority, such as employees; other leaders primarily represent their followers, such as constituents (e.g., voters); and still others do not have authority over or direct authority from followers, but nonetheless have intellectual sway over adherents as role models, based on the leader's creativity or ideological clarity. Additionally, the work of leaders can vary in fundamentally different ways. Some people are leaders because they are in charge of getting things done (execution); others are leaders because they are in charge of determining policies; and still others are leaders because they come up with new ideas or well-expressed ideologies that others emulate or admire. In mature organizations and systems, these roles are often quite distinct, but in some special cases, such as new entrepreneurial organizations, the roles are merged, as was seen in the case of Steve Jobs at Apple and Mark Zuckerberg at Facebook. The impact of strong initial leaders can be profound in the public sector too, when they are able to bridge multiple functions, such as the lasting influence of the first U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, and the first major head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), J. Edgar Hoover.

The main focus of this book is organizational leaders who have a primary or sole focus on employees. The best examples of organizational leaders who focus on execution and implementation are managers. Managers have programs to run, projects to complete, and deadlines to meet. Organizational leaders who focus on the policies that their employees execute and are empowered either to make exceptions or to recommend policy changes to legislative bodies are either management executives or political executives. For example, a city manager routinely provides policy alternatives to the city council, and a strong mayor (one who acts as the chief executive officer) still hires and fires department heads in addition to their role as policy leader. The organizational leader focused on new ideas is a transformational leader who could be found at any level in the organization where the planned change efforts are being attempted.

Leadership also occurs outside organizational settings, relying primarily on paid employees. Many leaders hold their formal or informal positions by satisfying constituents. The ability to reward and punish is usually negligible, but they do rely on their position, expertise, and personal popularity. Such leaders who are interested in getting things done generally have volunteers rather than employees; community leaders such as those in charge of the local PTA or a volunteer community project director function in this way. Legislators are an example of leaders who have constituents and focus on

policy, as are advisory board members. Lobbyists and policy entrepreneurs represent constituents and bring new ideas to legislators and executives.

Finally, some leaders have neither much formal power stemming from a formal position nor the ability to reward or punish; nonetheless, they have a powerful influence on others. Such leaders rely primarily on their expertise or force of personality alone. A small group of people who are thrown together for the first time and yet must get a project done quickly will find that one or two people will emerge as leaders. On a broader scale, some leaders without organizations actively encourage specific social change (policy change) by some combination of reason, passion, and personality. Think of the influence of Mahatma Gandhi (nonviolent resistance), Ralph Nader (consumer protection), or Rachel Carson (author of *The Silent Spring* and a philosophical founder of the clean water environmental movement). Finally, some leaders focus on the newness of ideas rather than working on specific policies that might need to be changed; examples in this category include philosophical zealots (e.g., historical figures such as St. Francis of Assisi, Adam Smith, and Karl Marx) and social trend setters (e.g., Jacqueline Kennedy in fashion or the Beatles in musical tastes in the 1960s). Exhibit 1.1 identifies these different types of leaders.

EXHIBIT 1.1

A Simplified View of Different Types of Leaders

		Types of work		
		Execution	Policy	New ideas
Types of followers	Employees	Managers	Executives with policy responsibilities	Transformational leaders
	Constituents	Community leaders of volunteer groups	Legislators and advisory board members	Lobbyists and policy entrepreneurs
	Adherents	Small-group leaders	Leaders of social movements	Philosophical zealots and social trend setters

Of course, leaders often cross these conceptual distinctions because they carry out several types of leadership simultaneously or change their leadership roles over time. Political executives who may emphasize employees or constituents depending on their preferences and background are an excellent example of dual leadership types. Presidents and governors are both the putative heads of enormous organizations and, at the same time, recommend legislative initiatives and enact laws by signing them.

George H.W. Bush (Senior) was a bureaucrat by training, kept a close eye on the morale of the federal bureaucracy, and was personally responsible for several personnel initiatives. George W. Bush (Junior) and Barack Obama both have relied more heavily on their legislative background and focused almost solely on their constituents and policy. Trump started his presidency with enormous business experience but without either policy or administrative experience. In terms of changing the type of leadership over time, leaders of social movements often acquire formal status. Famous examples in the twentieth century include Nelson Mandela (South Africa), Lech Wałęsa (Poland), and Kim Dae-jung (Korea), who ended up as the leaders of their respective nations. Candy Lightner of Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) started out as an outraged mother and ended up heading an organization that influenced legislative agendas across the country.

   The reason for making these distinctions, despite the fact that the lines can get blurred and some leaders practice multiple types, is that different competencies are involved. Good legislators do not necessarily make good managers, and good managers frequently do not have the skills necessary to become elected officials. Different skills are needed to motivate workers versus voters. Managerial executives may have little taste or ability to stimulate social action, and leaders of social movements may find themselves much criticized for their awkward management style when they do successfully create formal organizations. Our focus on organizational leaders allows us to be more specific in our analysis and leadership guidelines than if the text were focused on all types of leaders. Even though a focus on organizational leaders provides an opportunity for more powerful generalizations, important distinctions among organizational leaders are worth reviewing next.

VARIATIONS IN ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Even though this book focuses on all organizational leaders with an emphasis on those in public and nonprofit settings, many important distinctions can be made that affect the situations in which organizational leaders must operate. These distinctions can make a difference in what framework one uses in theoretical terms (e.g., classical management theory, transformational leadership theory, or self-leadership) as well as in practical competencies accentuated. Business leaders will tend to focus on market-driven needs and profits, public sector leaders on publicly authorized needs and legal accountability, and nonprofit leaders on unmet public good needs and charity. For the purpose of this book, all those who lead others, no matter whether they are frontline supervisors or the heads of organizations, have leadership roles. Indeed, even lead workers can have important leadership roles. However, the type of leadership practiced will vary. The

frontline supervisor will tend to focus on task completion, while at the other extreme the executive will focus on intellectual tasks such as policy planning and systems design. The frontline supervisor will need good one-on-one interpersonal skills, while the chief executive may need excellent public speaking skills (Katz 1955).

Another important distinction is between the types of leadership exhibited in different fields or even in different parts of a large organization. Agencies (or parts of agencies) that focus on regulation have slightly different emphases than those focusing on service, and both of these are a bit different than the emphasis of a self-funded or entrepreneurial agency or department. Commanders in law enforcement agencies and managers in accounting divisions tend to have different styles than managers in park services, public gaming agencies, or self-funded public fairgrounds. Such distinctions should not be exaggerated since most of the basic principles of public-sector leadership still apply; nonetheless, it is important to realize that nuanced differences do exist.

Another important difference affecting leadership competencies is the amount of change in the environmental context. Examples of environments calling for change in public agencies include calls for resource reduction (e.g., tax cuts), demands for service increases with or without resource increases, perceptions of poor management or scandal, opportunities to improve through major technological changes, mandated mergers or separations of agencies or divisions, and impending management crises, such as declining recruitment standards and increasing turnover. With a more turbulent public-sector environment, as well as enormous growth in the nonprofit sector, change management skills have become far more important since the 1990s.

Other useful distinctions to keep in mind when analyzing the situations of leaders are the maturity of the organization, the differences among line and staff, the differences in resource levels, and the size of the organization. Older organizations tend to have more established policies and a more delineated culture that must be followed, unless the needs for rejuvenation have become explicit and widely accepted. Line leaders (e.g., department heads) will focus on employees, and staff leaders (e.g., deputy directors not in charge of a department) will function more as extensions of their boss. Some agencies are well funded and expected to function at a state-of-the-art level; other agencies are poorly funded and may be expected to "get by." Leadership challenges in poorly funded agencies are generally more acute. Finally, the scope of leadership will vary significantly for leaders in large versus small agencies. Leaders in small agencies will need a wide array of skills, but may not be expected to be extremely sophisticated in their use. The city manager of a small town may be directly involved in most hiring, budget planning, public relations, and policy recommendation. The city manager of a large city will have specialists in each of these areas and will spend more time coordinating their functions and presiding as a liaison between departments and the city council and as a figurehead to the community.

In summary, organizational leaders as a class have a great deal more in common than, say, legislators or community leaders do. Nonetheless, organizational leaders work in different situations, and those differences are important in analyzing their specific leadership roles and thus the competencies they need to emphasize.

Next we turn to organizational leadership history. This will provide a brief introduction to the major schools of thought on the subject, which will be expanded upon in later chapters.

HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Although the modern scientific study of leadership dates only from the turn of the twentieth century, interest in leadership defines history from its earliest writings. Indeed, one can even go back further by examining the biological antecedents of leadership.

Most higher-level animals exhibit patterns that can be recognized as rudimentary to advanced behaviors related to leadership. The popular reference to the "pecking order" comes from Murchison (1935), who investigated social status in *Gallus domesticus* (roosters). By placing roosters in successive pairings and establishing their relationships, he identified a clear and consistent pattern of dominance—a primitive form of leadership. Douglis (1948) found that hens follow suit and that they can recognize exact status differentials among a group of up to twenty-seven individuals. In primates, the similarities to human conceptions of leadership become more pronounced. Early studies of primates established strict pecking orders or dominance hierarchies, with additional similarities too. Dominant males eat sooner and better, thus maintaining their strength and status. They also have preference in mating, thus ensuring a Darwinian selection bias. The presence of dominant males reduces intragroup fighting, while leadership succession temporarily increases it. Significantly, a strong dominant male substantially increases the group's territory, establishes the direction that the group takes in its meandering, and regulates the group's interactions with outside groups.

Characteristics associated with leadership typify all human societies, from nomadic to urban (Lewis 1974) although they become more pronounced in "advanced" societies with greater role specialization (Bass 1990). Historically, Egyptians had hieroglyphics representing *leadership*, *leader*, and *follower*; pharaohs were exhorted to be authoritative, perceptive, and just. Early Chinese philosophers such as Confucius focused on the instruction of emperors, enjoining them to be fair and focused on the needs of the people. The Bible is replete with discussions of and advice for leaders (e.g., Moses, David, and Solomon), as are many other major religious texts, such as the Upanishads and the Koran. Most of the great early stories of the world—the Babylonian *Gilgamesh*, the

Homeric *Iliad*, the Norse *Beowulf*, the French *Chanson de Roland*, and the more recent Spanish classic *Don Quixote*—are about the virtues and weaknesses of leaders. Greek and Roman philosophers focused a great deal of attention on leadership. Plato, in *The Republic*, examines the traits of the ideal philosopher king, Aristotle examines the need to cultivate virtue and encourage education for good leadership, and Plutarch shows the similarities between great Greek and Roman leaders in *Parallel Lives*. In writing about leadership in his military campaigns in Gaul, Julius Caesar explained that it was important *both* to be highly task-oriented and simultaneously to create a sense of concern for the well-being of the troops, a finding that was empirically reestablished in the human relations leadership theories of the 1960s. Machiavelli's fascinating study of leadership, *The Prince*, is still a must-read in leadership studies because of its complex blend of idealism and practicality. According to the medieval commentator, leaders need to maintain order, continuity, and political independence, preferably through the esteem of the people and fairness, but should be willing and able to use guile, threats, and violence as necessary.

The nineteenth century was dominated by the notion of the "great man" thesis. Particular great men (women were invariably overlooked despite great women in history, such as Joan of Arc, Elizabeth I, and Clara Barton) somehow move history forward due to their exceptional characteristics as leaders. The stronger version of this theory holds that history is handmaiden to men; great men actually change the shape and direction of history. Philosophers such as Friedrich Nietzsche and William James firmly asserted that history would be different if a great man were suddenly incapacitated. Thomas Carlyle's 1841 essay on heroes and hero worship is an early popular version of this theory, as is Galton's 1869 study of hereditary genius (cited in Bass 1990, 37–38). Such theories have an implicit class bias. A milder version of the theory is that as history proceeds on its irrevocable course, a few men will move history forward substantially and dramatically because of their greatness, especially in moments of crisis or great social need. This sentiment was expressed by Hegel, who thought that the great man was an expression of his times. Economic determinists such as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, although not theorizing about leadership per se, implied that great men overcome the obstacles of history more effectively and quickly than do lesser individuals. Although these lines of thinking have more sophisticated echoes later in the trait and situational leadership periods, "hero worship" is certainly still alive and well in popular culture and in biographies and autobiographies. It has as its core a belief that only a few very rare individuals in any society at any time have the unique characteristics to shape or express history. Although this thesis may serve sufficiently for case studies (essentially biographies), it is effectively nonrefutable and therefore unusable as a scientific theory, and it is equally unsatisfying as a leadership-teaching tool.

The scientific mood of the early twentieth century fostered the development of a more focused search for the basis of leadership. What traits and characteristics do leaders seem to share in common? Researchers developed personality tests and compared the results of average individuals with those perceived to be leaders. By the 1940s, researchers had amassed very long lists of traits from numerous psychologically oriented studies (Bird 1940; Jenkins 1947). This tactic had two problems. First, the lists became longer and longer as research continued. Second, and more important, the traits and characteristics identified were not powerful predictors across situations. For example, leaders have to be decisive but they must also be flexible and inclusive. On the surface, these traits are contradictory. Without situational specificity, the endless list of traits offers little prescriptive assistance and descriptively becomes nothing more than a long laundry list. In 1948 Ralph Stogdill published a devastating critique of pure trait theory, which subsequently fell into disfavor as being too unidimensional to account for the complexity of leadership.

The next major thrust looked at the situational contexts that affect leaders, and attempted to find meaningful patterns for theory building and useful advice. One early example is the work that came out of the Ohio State Leadership Studies (Hemphill 1950; Hemphill and Coons 1957; Shartle 1950). These studies began by testing 1,800 statements related to leadership behavior. By continually distilling the behaviors, researchers arrived at two underlying factors: consideration and the initiation of structure. Consideration describes a variety of behaviors related to the development, inclusion, and good feelings of subordinates. The initiation of structure describes a variety of behaviors related to defining roles, control mechanisms, task focus, and work coordination both inside and outside the unit. Coupled with the humanist/human relations revolution that was occurring in the 1950s and 1960s, these and similar studies spawned a series of useful, if often simplistic and largely bimodal, theories. Argyris's maturity theory (1957), Likert's motivational approach (1959), and McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y (1960) implicitly encourage more consideration in all leadership behavior. Maslow's eupsychian management (1967) recommends that leadership should be assigned based on the needs of the situation so that authoritarian tendencies (excessive structure) can be curbed. This line of thinking was advanced and empirically tested by Fiedler, who developed a contingency theory and related leader-match theory (1967; Fiedler, Chemers, and Mahar 1976). Blake and Mouton's managerial grid (1964; 1965) recommends that leaders should be highly skilled in both task behaviors (initiating structure) and people-oriented behaviors (consideration). Hersey and Blanchard's life cycle theory (1969; 1972) relates the maturity of the followers (in terms of both expertise and attitude) to the ideal leader behavior—telling (directing), selling (consulting), participating, and delegating. (For an early example of this insight, see Exhibit 1.2.)

EXHIBIT 1.2

The Administrator as Leader

If administration is to be leadership and not command, then it were well that the high echelons of hierarchy were Escoffiers or Rembrandts, sensitive to the flavor and shades of coloring in the group relationships. Such leadership requires not just an understanding of the organizational interrelationships of the hierarchy. It requires some knowledge of the psychological dynamics of group behavior, of belief systems, of status values, and of the learning process itself. The administrator who is a leader must also be a teacher. For such leadership he requires not only formal education in administration but also apprenticeship and on-the-job training.

Source: Marshall (1953, 13).

These early situational theories were certainly useful as antidotes to the excessively hierarchical, authoritarian styles that had developed in the first half of the twentieth century with the rise and dominance of large organizations in both the private and public sectors. They were also useful as teaching tools for incipient and practicing managers, who appreciated the uncomplicated models even though they were descriptively simplistic. As a class, however, these theories failed to meet scientific standards because they tried to explain too much with too few variables. Of the major theories, only a decision-making model by Vroom broke out of this pattern because it self-consciously focused on a single dimension of leadership style—the role of participation—and identified seven problem attributes and two classes of cases: group and individual (Vroom and Jago 1988; Vroom and Yetton 1973). Although the situational perspective still forms the basis of most leadership theories today (Vroom and Jago 2007), it has largely done so in a strictly managerial context (i.e., a narrow level of analysis) on a factor-by-factor basis, or it has been subsumed in more comprehensive approaches to leadership at the macrolevel.

Although ethical dimensions were occasionally mentioned in the mainstream literature, the coverage was invariably peripheral because of the avoidance of value-laden (normative) issues by social scientists. The first major text devoted to ethical issues was Robert Greenleaf's book *Servant Leadership* (1977). He was ignored by mainstream theorists, who were dominated by positivists, despite his affiliation with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard, Dartmouth, and the University of Virginia, and he ultimately founded the Center for Applied Ethics. In contrast, James MacGregor Burns's book on leadership burst onto the scene in 1978 and had unusually heavy ethical overtones. However, it was not the ethical dimension that catapulted it to prominence but its transformational theme, which is discussed below. Both Greenleaf (a former business executive) and Burns (a political scientist) were outside the usual leadership academic circles, whose members came primarily from business and psychology backgrounds.

A number of contemporary mainstream leadership theorists, both popular and academic—such as DePree (1989); Gardner (1990); Rost (1991); Block (1993); Bennis, Parikh, and Lessem (1994; in contrast with Bennis's other work); Zand (1997); Fry (2003); Trevino, Weaver, and Reynolds (2006); and Newman, Guy, and Mastracci (2009)—have continued in this tradition, to one degree or another. For an example of the profound difference this one element can make, however, see Exhibit 1.3. This theme was covered earlier and more frequently (at least in terms of ethical uses of discretion) in the public-sector literature and will be discussed separately.

EXHIBIT 1.3

Two Great Visionary and Entrepreneurial Leaders in the Public Sector—with One Big Difference

Great cities must occasionally reinvent themselves or else they get stuck in the notions and needs of past ages. Two public servants—Austin Tobin and Robert Moses—thoroughly reinvented New York to make it the greatest city (at least in terms of population, wealth, and power) on earth in the latter part of the century.

Austin Tobin (1903–1978) joined the Port Authority of New York in 1927 and became its executive director in 1942. Although a lawyer by training, he mastered the internal and technical dynamics of leading a large organization. He inherited an agency that was largely independent because it was self-funding through fees; he was able to expand his legal purview over the years through his political connections and knowledge of the law; and he was able to use the variety of projects and responsibilities of the Authority (later called the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey) as a great source of power. During his tenure as executive director, Tobin was responsible for the inclusion of all three major airports in his agency—Newark, LaGuardia, and Idlewild (now Kennedy)—added the Newark seaport, created the Elizabeth seaport, added terminals in Brooklyn, two tubes to the Lincoln Tunnel, and a second tier to the George Washington Bridge, built the largest bus terminal in the world, and set the stage for the building of the World Trade Center. His vision of New York as the leading commercial center in the world was not diminished by the extraordinary challenges of managing across the various jurisdictions of many mayors, borough presidents, and two very powerful governors. His entrepreneurial flair helped him create massive projects that were brilliantly executed and stood the test of time.

Robert Moses (1888–1981) had no less impact on New York than his sometimes rival Tobin. Moses became the chairman of the State Council of Parks in 1924, and in 1933, he went to work in New York City as the city parks commissioner. He went on to become chairman of most of the major bridge and tunnel authorities in New York (which ultimately included the Triborough Bridge, Brooklyn Battery Tunnel, and the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge) with their immense revenue base. He further added to his power later on by becoming the city construction coordinator and a member of the City Planning Commission. During his career he masterminded and built the immensely successful Jones Beach State Park, the East Side Highway (FDR Drive), the crucial Cross-Bronx Expressway, the 1964 World's Fair, and many of the modern port facilities. Just as Tobin's vision was New York as a commercial powerhouse, Moses's vision was New York as a great metropolis of fluid movement and great parks. A genius of detail and the creation of timeless projects, he was a virtuoso of power, able to defy mayors and governors with relative ease.

Plutarch noted that "the most glorious exploits do not always furnish us with the clearest signs of virtue or vice in men; sometimes a matter of less moment informs us better of their character and inclinations." So it

can be argued about these two "great" men. Tobin was known for his stand on diversity in an age when such notions were not popular. He promoted Jews and women in the mid-1940s (over opposition) and fought extremely hard for the integration of the trade unions in the 1960s. He provided internal development programs, had a widespread reputation for equitable treatment of the rank-and-file employees, and inspired great loyalty despite his toughness and occasional rigidity. Finally, his tenant relocation programs were considered models of compassion and integrity. On the other hand, Moses was a thoroughgoing elitist in the worst sense. His staff was as ethnically pure and male dominated as any other of his age. He worked with the white-dominated labor unions to keep Puerto Ricans and African-Americans out. Lastly, his tenant relocation programs—affecting tens of thousands of citizens over the years—were legendary uses of brutal state force that provided no state assistance, even in an era of severe housing shortages.

So we are left with a question about the greatness, and perhaps even about the leadership, of these two extraordinary men. Both were technically brilliant entrepreneurial geniuses; both had great visions that they were able to execute. Both transformed the New York City miniregion into a leading world commercial and community center. Yet, Tobin's personal side reveals a caring for employees, a sense of social fairness, and a compassion for those affected by his projects that is totally lacking in Robert Moses. It is unlikely that anyone would argue that Austin Tobin was not a great leader, but do you consider Moses a great leader, just a leader, or neither?

Until 1978, the focus of the mainstream literature was on leadership at lower levels, which was amenable to small-group and experimental methods with simplified variable models, while executive leadership (with its external demands) and more amorphous abilities to induce large-scale change were largely ignored. Burns's book on leadership dramatically changed that interest by introducing the notion that only transactional leadership was being studied and that the other highly important arena—transformational leadership—was largely being ignored. This claim struck an especially responsive chord in the nonexperimental camp, which had already been explicitly stating that nationally there was an abundance of managers (who use a "transactional" mode) and a serious deficit of leaders (who use a "transformational" mode) (Zaleznik 1977). Overall, this school agreed that leaders have special responsibility for understanding a changing environment, they facilitate more dramatic changes, and they often energize followers far beyond what traditional exchange theory would suggest. Overstating for clarity, three subschools emerged that emphasized different aspects of these "larger-than-life" leaders. The transformational school emphasized vision and overarching organizational change (e.g., Bass 1985; Bennis and Nanus 1985; Burns 1978; Tichy and Devanna 1986). The charismatic school focused on the influence processes of individuals and the specific behaviors used to arouse inspiration and higher levels of action in followers (e.g., Conger and Kanungo 1998; House 1977; Meindl 1990). Less articulated in terms

of leadership theory was an entrepreneurial school that urged leaders to make practical process and cultural changes that would dramatically improve quality or productivity; it shared a change emphasis with the transformational school and an internal focus with the charismatic school (Champy 1995; Hammer and Champy 1993; Peters and Austin 1985).

The infusion of the transformational leadership school(s) led to a reinvigoration of academic and nonacademic studies of leadership as well as a good deal of initial confusion. Was the more transactional leadership that the situationalists had so assiduously studied really just mundane management? Or was the new transformational leadership an extension of more basic skills that its adherents were poorly equipped to explain with more conventional scientific methodologies? Even before the 1980s, some work had been done to create holistic models that tried to explain more aspects of leadership (Winter 1979). Yet it was not until the 1980s that work began in earnest and conventional models routinely incorporated transactional and transformational elements. Bass's work is a good example in this regard. Even his original work on transformational leadership (1985) has strong transactional elements (transformational leaders being those who not only master transactional skills but also are able to capitalize on transformational skills), which were strengthened in later work (Bass 1996; Bass and Avolio 1990). In the third edition of *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, Bass was able to assert that the field "has broken out of its normal confinement to the study of [leader group] behaviors" to more studies on executives, more inclusion of perspectives from political science, and more cross-fertilization among schools of thought (Bass 1990, xi).

Not surprisingly, then, scholarly cross-fertilization and new economic, social, and philosophical trends brought new perspectives to the study of leadership. First, fresh efforts to find integrative models were common, starting in the 1990s (Chemers 1997; Hunt 1996; Van Wart 2005; Yukl 1998). There was a tremendous need to find ways of conceptualizing the different schools of thought as complementary rather than mutually exclusive. Second, there was an enormous resurgence in looking at leadership as less hierarchical and more distributed (Manz and Sims 1991; 1993; Pearce and Conger 2003), with ramifications for structures such as teams, training focusing on empowerment and self-leadership, and acculturation leading to tighter cohesion and less internal competition. Finally, postmodern perspectives emphasized leadership as a process rather than an event and as a group dynamic rather than the artifact of individuals (Kiel 1994; Uhl-Bien 2006; Wheatley 1992). (See Exhibit 1.4 for a summary of the eras of mainstream leadership theory and research.)

EXHIBIT 1.4

Eras of Orthodox Leadership Theory and Research

Era	Major time frame	Major characteristics/examples of proponents
Great man	Pre-1900; continues to be popular in biographies	• Emphasis on emergence of a great figure such as Napoleon, George Washington, or Martin Luther who has substantial effect on society • Era influenced by notions of rational social change by uniquely talented and insightful individuals
Trait	1900–1948; resurgence of recognition of importance of natural talents	• Emphasis on the individual traits (physical, personal, motivational, aptitudinal) and skills (communication and ability to influence) that leaders bring to all leadership tasks • Era influenced by scientific methodologies in general (especially industrial measurement) and scientific management in particular (e.g., the definition of roles and assignment of competencies to those roles)
Contingency	1948 to the 1980s; continues as basis of most rigorous models but with vastly expanded situational repertoire	• Emphasis on the situational variables with which leaders must deal, especially performance and follower variables. Shift from traits and skills to behaviors (e.g., informing and delegating versus consulting and motivating). Dominated by bimodal models in its heyday • Era influenced by the rise of human relations theory, behavioral science (in areas such as motivation theory), and the use of small-group experimental designs in psychology • Examples emphasizing bimodal models include Ohio, Michigan, Hersey–Blanchard, managerial grid; leadership theory involving maximal levels of participation (generally with three to seven major variables) includes Fiedler, House, Vroom
Transformational	1978 to present	• Emphasis on leaders who create change in deep structures, major processes, or overall culture. Leader mechanisms may be compelling vision, brilliant technical insight, and/or charismatic quality

Era	Major time frame	Major characteristics/examples of proponents
		• Era influenced by the loss of American dominance in business, finance, and science, and the need to reenergize various industries that had slipped into complacency • Examples (academic and popular) include Burns, House, Bennis, Iacocca, Kouzes and Posner, Senge, Tichy and Devanna, Bass and Conger
Servant	1979 to present	• Emphasis on ethical responsibilities to followers, stakeholders, and society. Business theorists tend to emphasize service to followers; political theorists emphasize citizens; public administration analysts tend to emphasize legal compliance and/or citizens • Early proponents include Greenleaf and Burns. Contemporary and popular proponents include Covey, Rost, Gardner, Bryson and Crosby
Multifaceted	1990s to present	• Emphasis on (a) integrating the major schools, (b) distributed and horizontal leadership, and (c) postmodern perspectives emphasizing process and groups • Era affected by the need to provide a more sophisticated and holistic framework for leadership, more democratic models, and theories relevant to contemporary notions of a diverse and rapidly evolving society • Proponents include Yukl, Hunt, Chemers, House, Van Wart, Pearce and Conger, Uhl-Bien

Given such brief space, this cursory review cannot do justice to the wealth of perspectives on specific leadership topics, such as the types of leaders, leader styles, the types and effects of followers, and the relevance of societal and organizational cultures on leadership.

PERENNIAL DEBATES IN LEADERSHIP THEORY

Another way to analyze the leadership literature is to examine major debates that have shaped both leadership paradigms and research agendas. For simplicity, only four of the