opportunities to make maximal use of their own potentials (Srivatava, p. 108).

A better society would be formed if more people were self actualized, especially our leaders. The "growth" or "development" of a particular organization, or society, in the sense of making the organization larger, more numerous, more adaptive, and stronger, can be conceived as a long term strategy for survival (Heylighen, 1992). Any society with prioritized values, planned goals, high integrity, and balance lives, may create a more understanding, kinder, and more adaptable environment.

REFERENCES

Beehr, T. A., Walsh, J. T. & Taber, T. D. (1976). Relationship of stress to individuality and organizationally valued stress. Higher order needs as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, 4-47.

Chen, S., Chen, K.Y., Shaw, L. (2004). Self-verification motives at the collective level of self-definition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(1), 77-94.

Dictionary.com, (2005). Retrieved April 13, 2005, from http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=integrity

Dowson, M., McInernery, D. M. (2003). What do students say about their motivational goals?: Towards a more complex and dynamic perspective on student motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 28, 91-113.

Erikson, E. (1959). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York & London: W.W. Norton and Company.

Frick, W. B., (1982). Conceptual foundations of self-actualization: A contribution to motivation theory. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 22(4), 35-52.

Gardner, J., (1965). Self-Renewal. New York: Harper & Row.

Hall, E. G., & Hansen, J. (1997). Self-actualizing men and women – a comparison study. *Roeper Review*, 20(1), 22-33.

Heylighen, Francis (1992). A cognitive-systemic reconstruction of Maslow's theory of self-actualization. *Behavioral Science*, 37(1).

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The Philosophy of moral development*. San Francisco: Harper &Row.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Maslow, A. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Maslow, A. (1971). *The farther reaches of human nature*. New York: Penguin Books.

Piaget, J. (1969). *The psychology of the child*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). An achievement goal theory perspective on issues in motivation terminology, theory, and research. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 92-104

Smith , M. B. (1973). On self-actualization: A transambivalent examination of a focal theme in Maslow's psychology. Journal of *Humanistic Psychology*, 13, 17-33.

Srivistava, A. K., (1989). Moderating effect of n-self actualization on the relationship of role stress with job anxiety. *Psychological Studies*, 34 (2), 106-109.

Waterman, A. (2003). Predicting the subjective experience of intrinsic motivation: the roles of self-determination, the balance of challenges and skills, and self-realization values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(11), 1447-1458.

F

PRINCIPLES OF LEADERSHIP: LEADERSHIP MANAGEMENT
By Ray T. Kest, Walden University

SECTION ONE ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes and explores the principles of leadership. As components of the presentation, the following will be discussed: trait theories, University of Iowa studies, the Ohio State University studies, the University of Michigan studies, the leadership grid theory, contingency leadership theory, situational leadership theory, path-goal leadership theory, transactional leadership theory and the transformational leadership theory. These studies and theories will be analyzed and compared.

SECTION ONE

INTRODUCTION

This paper will research and discuss various leadership theories that have developed over a period of time. The theories discussed are as follows: traits, University of Iowa studies, the Ohio State University studies, the University of Michigan studies, leadership grid, contingency theories, situational leadership, path goal leadership, transactional and transformational leadership theories.

Early research into leadership began in the 1920's and 1930's. This research centered on the premise that leaders were predisposed with certain traits that non-leaders did not have. Research into this area revealed that explaining traits alone was not enough. Situations and interactions between leaders and groups also had influence in leadership theory. The doubt of researchers that traits alone explained leadership led to many other studies.

The University of Iowa studies was one of the early studies that identified leaders as autocratic, democratic or laissez-faire. The study found that the autocratic leader limited participation from the group and dictated all work rules. The democratic leader, on the other hand, allowed input from the group in making decisions. The laissez-faire leader would generally take a "hands-off" approach and group would have the authority to make decisions.

The Ohio State University studies basically separated leadership on two scales: One who initiates structure and one who uses consideration. Those who initiate the structure define the roles in order to reach the goals that are set. A leader using consideration has relationships with the group members and respects and listens to their concerns.

As with the Ohio State study, the University of Michigan study established a two dimensional scale. A leader was either employee oriented or production oriented. An employee oriented leader stresses the relationships with the members of the group. The production oriented leader deemphasizes relationships and is concerned with reaching goals and tasks at hand.

From these early studies, the leadership or management grid was established as a measurement tool. While the grid was two dimensional like the Ohio State and University of Michigan studies, the grid has 81 different categories that categorize a leader's behavior. The grid takes the two dimensions and establishes four dimensions in a box grid.

Using the task oriented vs. the relationship oriented, the contingency leadership method was established. Group performance is dictated by the match of leadership style and the interaction with the group and its members. Using this method, leadership style could be determined by a questionnaire filled out by members of the group.

The contingency theory was further refined by the situational leadership theory. The determining factor in this theory is the readiness of the followers. The more ready the followers to achieve a task, the more successful the leader. To be ready to achieve a task, the group must have the proper ability and the resolve to achieve the goals.

From the situational leadership theory, the path goal theory emerged. Followers have goals and the leader must help those underneath to attain their goals. By doing this, the overall goals and tasks of the organization can be attained. Similar to the leadership grid, the dimensions are evaluated by four leadership behaviors.

The leadership forms discussed up to this point have fallen into the category of transactional leadership. A transactional leader has task requirements and it is their role to guide the group to attain those goals. From this transactional leader, a transformational leader can emerge. In this style the leader is concerned with the individual while still being goal oriented. The transformational leader provides the intellectual needs of the members of the group.

TRAIT THEORY

The early leadership theories centered on the traits of an individual. It was thought that certain traits could differentiate those who would become leaders and those that could not. Those early studies proved to be inconclusive as to which traits were always present in an individual who was believed to be a leader. Actually, instead of focusing on the person, it was found that the process of leadership could be more definitive. Early studies did indicate that leaders varied from non leaders in traits such as intelligence, initiative, desire to take on responsibility and other traits (Stogdill 1948). Drive and its components of achievement, ambition, and energy also separated leaders from non-leaders. The problem with the research into trait theory is that the research was not conclusive into what traits could always be identified from the leaders as compared to the non-leaders. Some later research did identify various consistent traits. Having these traits make it more likely that effective leadership can occur but it is not conclusive. As Kirkpatrick and Locke explained there are seven traits linked to leadership (Kirkpatrick 1991) They are:

1) Drive. Leaders exhibit a high effort level. They have a relatively high desire for achievement; they are ambitious; they have a lot of energy; they are tirelessly persistent in their activities; and they show initiative.

2) Desire to lead. Leaders have a strong desire to influence and lead others. They demonstrate the willingness to take responsibility.

3) Honesty and integrity. Leaders build trusting relationships between themselves and followers by being truthful or non deceitful and by showing high consistency between word and deed.

4) Self-confidence. Followers look to leaders for an absence of self-doubt. Leaders, therefore, need to show self-confidence in order to convince followers of the rightness of their goals and decisions.

5) Intelligence. Leaders need to be intelligent enough to gather, synthesize, and interpret large amounts of information, and they need to be able to create visions, solve problems, and make correct decisions.

6) Job-relevant knowledge. Effective leaders have a high degree of knowledge about the company, industry, and technical matters. In-depth knowledge allows leaders to make well informed decisions and to understand the implications of those decisions.

7) Extraversion. Leaders are energetic, lively people. They are sociable, assertive, and rarely silent or withdrawn.

BEHAVIORAL THEORIES: UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

In the late 1930's studies on leadership were conducted by Kurt Lewin at the University of Iowa. These studies centered on three leadership styles: autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire (Lewin 1938). In the autocratic style, decision making was centralized with limited input and work methods rigid. Under the democratic style, participation was encouraged by subordinates and authority was delegated. In the laissez-faire style, group participation made work decisions. These studies indicated that the democratic style was the most effective. From these studies managers now had a dilemma in choosing a management style: Should a manager focus on satisfying a subordinate's satisfaction or achieving high performance. Later studies (Bass 1981) however, showed that the results varied and that the earlier research was not conclusive.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY STUDIES

Other major universities also developed leadership theories based upon their research. Ohio State University in the early 1950's developed several models to explain leadership behavior(Stogdill 1948). In trying to achieve goal attainment, leaders will attempt to define their role and the role of the other members of the group. Some leaders have job relationships that are defined by trust and respect. A leader with a high ranking in consideration and high in the initiating structure of the group was found to achieve high performance and satisfaction.

Stogdill and Coons of the Ohio State University concentrated on two dimensions: orientation to task and orientation to people(Stogdill 1957). Their study concluded that managers with an initiating structure and manager's consideration would have employees with high performance, low grievance rates and low turnover. A manager with high initiating structure but low consideration would have high performance, high grievance rates and high turnover. A manager with a low initiating structure but high consideration would have low performance, low grievance rates and low turnover. A manager with high initiating structure and low consideration would have employees with high performance, high grievance rates and high turnover. A manager with low initiating structure and low consideration would have low performance, high grievance rates and high turnover. However, these models did not take into account different factors of a situation.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN STUDIES

In other early leadership studies, The University of Michigan developed a model based on the two qualities of employee oriented and production oriented (Kahn 1960). Managers that were employee oriented took a personal interest in his or her employees and emphasized relationships of the group. In contrast, a production oriented manager emphasized the production or goal that was accomplished. This study of high productive work groups found that these managers spent quite a bit of time planning work schedules and supervising and gave their employees discretion and leeway in accomplishing the task. The

Michigan study found that employee oriented leaders achieved higher productivity and a higher job satisfaction than the production oriented manager. These studies paralleled the Ohio State studies to a great degree.

LEADERSHIP- GRID THEORY

From these early studies, management grid was developed in a two dimensional format (Blake 1984). The two dimensions were the concern for people and the concern for production. The grid went into greater detail than the Michigan studies using these factors. Blake identified five basic elements of the grid:

1) Country Club Management: (1, 9) this style satisfies relationships and the needs of the employees. This establishes a sociable work environment and work cadence. This is on the high bar for the concern of the worker. Concerns for production are secondary to the concerns of the workers.

2) Impoverished Management: (1, 1) In this model, management does not concern itself with the concerns of the worker. Minimum effort is used to maintain required production. This low concern translates for both production and people.

3) Task Management: (9, 1) Operations efficiency is established to arrange work with a minimum of human interactions. People are machines for production and the goals of production are of the highest importance.

4) Team Management: (9, 9) Productivity accomplished by employees working as team. The team concept establishes trust between the employees' stakeholders. The manager wishes to obtain high performance and high employee satisfaction.

5) Middle of the Road: In the center of the grid is common ground that produces adequate performance while maintaining morale. The manager tries to accomplish a satisfactory level of performance and employee satisfaction.

This type of analysis has been described as a style approach. The strengths of this approach have been explained by Northouse as follows (Northouse 2000): First, leadership not only encompasses personal traits but takes into account different behaviors in different situations. Second, much research conducted by the Ohio State University and the University of Michigan has concluded that the style approach is very well substantiated and provides an understanding of leadership. Third, leadership is examined from a behavioral perspective using tasks and relationships as the focus. Fourth, leadership is complex and this approach offers a framework for understanding. Under this framework leaders can critically review their approach and make changes.

Current research has shown that there are some weaknesses in the style approach. As will be discussed, the situational approach calls for using a leadership style to match the situation. On the other hand, the style approach research shows that the high, high (9, 9) approach is best for managers to achieve results and employee satisfaction. Research has shown that no one style is effective in all situations (Northouse 2000).

CONTINGENCY LEADERSHIP THEORY

Out of this early research, various contingency theories of leadership evolved.

Fred Fiedler expanded the theory of leadership that it could be measured by the interaction of the manager and the control over the situation. With Fiedler, there is no right or wrong style, the needs of leadership roles change with different circumstances. Like the grid theory, the basic premise of Fiedler was if the style was a task oriented elationship (Fiedler 1967). To ascertain a leadership style, Fiedler developed the "least-preferred co-worker (LPC) questionnaire.

The personality and behavior of leaders interact with various variables. A high score on the LPC indicates high relationship motivation. This questionnaire contained eighteen pairs of differing objectives. Based on the responses, the theory was that a basic leadership style could be determined. In order to maximize performance, leadership styles were matched with different situations to maximize results.

Fiedler then established various situational contingencies: leader-member relations, task structure and position power. The Leader-member relation is the strongest factor of being favorable. If a leader has the trust, respect and confidence from the members then the relationship will be favorable. If the members do not trust or respect the leader, the relationship will be high in tension and antagonistic. In the task structure, work conditions that are understood and are structured allow the leader to have more influence and the work conditions are more favorable. The last variable is position power. This gives the authority to the manager to punish and reward. Managers with position power have more favorable influence situations. From these three situations, eight different explanations of leadership could be established. Predictions can be made as to a success of a leadership style based on the situation.

Since Fiedler hypothesized that leadership style was fixed, he then concluded that there were only two ways to change effectiveness. One was to bring in a new leader to better fit the situation and the second was to alter the situation the leader was in. This theory also emphasizes that leaders will not be effective in all situations. In testing Fiedler's model, some research has substantiated Fiedler's findings (Schriesheim 1994). This and other research has demonstrated that it is well documented. In finding the strengths of the model, it focuses on what are the impacts of different situations on leaders. The model with its predictive feature of the situation and the leadership style is also well researched. It also acknowledges that the in different situations leaders may not be effective. Fielder's model does have some weaknesses. Why some leaders are effective in certain situations and some are not. The LPC scale can be questioned because the assessment is performed by one individual on another. The system is not easy to use because it requires the use of questionnaires and the variables must be analyzed (Northouse 2000).

SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP THEORY

Situational Leadership Theory (SLT) was developed by Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard. Readiness is a key concept of this theory (Hersey 2001) whereby the extent of the worker in willingness and ability is measured. The authors refer to it as a model and not a theory because there is no explanation of why certain actions happen. The success of the leader is measured by the actions of those he or she leads. This measurement seems to have been unnoticed in other leadership theories. Hersey and Blanchard first breakdown leadership into the following four categories:

1) Telling (high task-low relationship): The leader defines roles and tells people what, how, when, and where to do various tasks.

2) Selling (high task-high relationship): The leader provides both directive and supportive behavior.

3) Participating (low task-high relationship): The leader and follower share in decision making: the main role of the leader is facilitating and communicating.

4) Delegating (low task-low relationship): The leader provides little direction or support.

The follower readiness is then evaluated.

1) R1: People are both unable and unwilling to take responsibility for doing something. They're neither competent not confident.

2) R2: People are unable but willing to do the necessary job tasks. They're motivated but currently lack the appropriate skills.

3) R3: People are able but unwilling to do what the leader wants.

4) R4: People are both able and willing to do what is asked of them (Robbins, 2005).

Lussier and Achua have categorized leadership styles using the situational approach based on tasks and relationships as follows (Lussier, 2001):

1) Telling-high-task/low-relationship behavior (HT/LR) – This style is appropriate with followers of low maturity. When using this style, detailed instructions and close supervision is provided.

2) Selling-high task/high relationship behavior (HT/HR) – This style is appropriate when the maturity of the followers is low to moderate. When using this style, leaders provide specific instructions and oversight while explaining the need for performing tasks and answering questions.

3) Participating-low task/ high relationship behavior (LT/HR) – This style is appropriate when the maturity of the followers is high to moderate. When using this style, leaders give general directions and spend most of their time giving encouragement. Decisions are made together, or subordinates decisions are submitted for approval by leaders.

4) Delegating-low task/low relationship behavior (LT/LR) – This style is appropriate when the maturity level of the followers is high. When using this style, leaders let followers know what needs to be done, answer their questions, but provide little, it any direction.

It must be noted that as tasks and followers change, so must leader's styles change. Also as the tasks of an individual in an organization changes so must a leader's style change to meet the new circumstances.

There has been follow up research that has indicated that the model has flaws and cannot be relied upon in certain situations (Graeff, 1997). Questions as to the research methodology and the model indicate that SLT cannot always predict the component part of the model. It is not clear as to the commitment and how the competences are combined.

The situational approach does have strengths to counter act its weaknesses. The perception is that the model is credible for training leaders (Northouse, 2000). Furthermore it is easy to understand and is easy to apply. It is a flexible theory that can lead to solutions as to management style based on the situation.

LEADER PARTICIPATION MODEL

A management theory that is somewhat similar to the SLT where the focus is not on the readiness of the follower but on the style of the leader is the Leader Participation Model(Vroom 2000). Vroom breaks down styles as follows:

Decide: Leader makes the decision alone and either announces or sells it to the group. Consult individually:

Leader presents the problem individually to group members, gets their suggestions, and then makes a decision.

Consult group: Leader presents the problem to the group members in a meeting, gets their suggestions, and then makes a decision.

Facilitate: Leader presents the problem to the group in a meeting and, acting as a facilitator, defines the problem and the boundaries within which a decision must be made.

Delegate: Leader permits the group to make the decision within prescribed limits.

This model has been expanded and modified to adapt to different contingencies. Also, Vroom has adapted the model to be time-driven which evaluates in the short term.

PATH-GOAL LEADERSHIP THEORY

Another contingency theory that puts the responsibility for success into the hands of the manager is the Path-Goal model. It is the duty of the leader to help those underneath him in the management ladder to attain their goals. The theory is based upon the premise that a leader's behavior influences the performance of subordinates. This research developed by Robert House identified four basic leadership behaviors (House, 1971).

Directive leader: Subordinates know what is expected, schedules work to be accomplished, and gives specific guidance on how this is to be accomplished. This approach is successful when subordinates want authority and their ability is low.

Supportive leader: Is friendly and shows support and concern for the needs of the followers. This style is appropriate when the followers do not want dictatorial leadership and the formal leadership is weak.

Participation Leader: Consults with group members and uses their suggestions before making a decision. This style works when the follower's abilities are high and they want to make the decision.

Achievement oriented leader: Sets challenging goals and expects followers to perform at their highest level. The followers know they will be rewarded for their performance.

This theory assumes that leaders are flexible and can adapt to different situations by using one or all of the behaviors discussed. The leader will adjust depending on the environment. As Northouse has indicated (Northouse, 2000) subordinates are motivated by leaders in two ways: 1) payoffs can increase for work performed and 2) by direction and eliminating obstacles the path to the goal is made easier.

Predictions that can be extracted from House's theory are as follows (Wofford, 1993): Directive leadership leads to greater satisfaction when tasks are ambiguous or stressful than when they are highly structured and well laid out. Supportive leadership results in high employee performance and satisfaction when subordinates are performing structured tasks. Directive leadership is likely to be perceived as redundant among subordinates with high perceived ability or with considerable experience. The clearer and more bureaucratic the formal authority relationships, the more leaders should exhibit supportive behavior and deemphasize directive behavior. Directive behavior will lead to higher employee satisfaction when there is a substantive conflict within the work group. Subordinates with an internal locus of control will be more satisfied with a participation style. Subordinates with an external locus

of control will be more satisfied with a directive style. Achievement oriented leadership will increase subordinates expectations. That effort will lead to high performance when tasks are ambiguous. To lead effectively using the Path-Goal Theory a manager should do the following (Weber, 2000):

1) Diagnose the task. Is the task structured or unstructured? Are the goals clear or unclear? Structured tasks and clear goals require less direction than less structured tasks and less structured goals

2) Assess the leader's formal authority. Managers tend to have more formal authority than non-managerial employees, and top executives have more authority than middle and or lower level managers. Managers with formal authority typically should not use a directive style because it duplicates their authority, but they may be supportive, achievement oriented or participative styles.

3) Diagnose the work force. The leader should assess the group's cohesiveness as well as its experience in working together. The more cohesive the group, the less need for supportive leadership since this is redundant with the group's character. Similarly, the more experience the group has in collaborating, the less it requires directive, supportive, or participation leadership.

4) Diagnose the organization's culture. A culture that supports participation also supports a participative leadership style. A culture that encourages either goal accomplishment or results orientation reinforces an achievement-oriented style.

5) Diagnose the subordinates' skills and needs. Employees skilled in a task require less direction than those less skilled. Employees with high achievement needs require a style that helps meet these needs. Employees with social needs require a style that helps meet those needs.

6) Match the style to the situation. Match the leadership style of directive, supportive, achievement or participation to the situational characteristics.

One of the major drawbacks of the path-goal theory is that it helps one understand how leaders affect subordinates but not how subordinates affect the leaders. Also, because of the number of possible variables, it can be complex. It does, however, help in understanding how leadership behavior affects those under the leadership chain of command.

TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP THEORY

Most of the theories presented, the University studies, leadership grid, contingency theory, situational theory, and the path goal theory have been most transactional in nature. In these theories, goals and tasks have been established by the leader in order to accomplish the tasks assigned. Many of the assumptions are similar to the authoritative style that was first explored in the University of Iowa studies. With the transactional leadership style people are motivated by rewards and punishments similar to the behavior theories of Skinner (Skinner, 1965). Subordinates will respond to the leader based upon rewards and punishments with a clear chain of command. Rewards may be structured while the discipline is is understood by rules. It is the function of the subordinate to do what is instructed by the manager.

Transactional leadership is result driven by control, measurement, administration and performance (Drucker, 1993). The key directional ideas of transactional leadership are: (Robinson 2005)

Clear Boundaries – having clearly defined boundaries between role and function, technical process, span of control, decision rights, and domains of influence allow transactional leaders to control and manage interactions to drive desired results.

Order – for the transactional leader, everything has its own time, place and usefulness to the process. By maintaining a highly ordered system of interaction, transactional leaders can drive predictably uniform outcomes systematically over time.

Compliance – this aspect of transactional leadership focuses on the need to comply with mutually defined operational guidelines and methodologies in every aspect of the business system. Deviation from procedure, methodology, and process guidelines are viewed as problems to be resolved and eliminated in order to drive predictable uniform outcomes.

Willfulness – striving to impose order and control on an otherwise chaotic and uncontrollable environment is a driving force behind transactional leadership.

While there has been quite of bit of research on the limitations of transactional leadership, it is still a popular approach to management style. On a scale of leadership vs. management, the transactional style would very much be on the management end.

Strength of the transactional leadership approach is that objectives and goals are clearly defined within a structured environment. Rewards and punishments are the driving factor for subordinate compliance. A major weakness in this approach is that change is difficult to implement. Also, relationships are short term and are dictated by the task.

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Transformational leadership became popular with the research from James Burns. Burns linked the power of a position with the response to the need of the followers. In this style, the vision of the leader must be conveyed to the followers. This vision sometimes requires change in the organization. This style is becoming more important because of the demands of organizations to change in today's world of "globalization". It is important that the transformational leader motivate the followers in their vision. Transformational leaders motivate followers to be better in three ways (Burns, 1978):

1. The leader raises their consciousness about the importance of certain outcomes, such as high productivity or efficiency.

2. The leader shows the value of workers concentrating on what benefits their work team rather than on their personal interest.

3. The leader raises the workers' need levels so that they value challenges, responsibility and growth.

B.M. Bass linked transactional and transformational leadership as a continual process. Transformational leadership is developed from transactional leadership. To this end, the Full range of Leadership Model was developed (Bass, 1985). Transformational leaders give individual consideration along with intellectual stimulation. The transformational factors involve the following: Charisma or being able to influence by one's personality. For this to occur the leader must be respected and be able to articulate the vision. Inspirational motivation; the followers must be inspired by the vision and expectations must be high. Intellectual stimulation; creativity must be encouraged in followers. These leaders want the followers to challenge the beliefs that they have as well as those of the leader and the organization. Individualized consideration; a supportive atmosphere is created by the

leader. The leader acts like more like a coach and advisor to the group so that expectations can be maximized.

Lussier identified attributes that transformational leaders possess. They are as follows (Lussier, 2001):

1. They see themselves as change agents
2. They are visionaries who have a high level of trust for their intuition.
3. They are risk takers, but not reckless.
4. They are capable of articulating a set of core values that tend to guide their own behavior.
5. They possess exceptional cognitive skills and believe in careful deliberation before taking action.
6. They believe in people and show sensitivity to their needs.
7. They are flexible and open to learning from experience.

Many researchers believe that the transformational style of leadership is superior to the transactional style. Studies have found that transformational leaders are higher performers and are more likely to be promoted than a transactional leader. Furthermore, some studies have found that there is a correlation between transformational leadership and low turnover rates, higher productivity and higher employee satisfaction (Keller, 1992).

The transformational leadership is advanced because it is popular with researchers. It clearly defines the role of the leader and followers but also includes the followers in the leadership process. This style also acknowledges that leader's provide the primary means for change in an organization. Rewards and punishments may be used by the transformational leader as the transactional leader does but it goes further in that the growth and needs of the followers are acknowledged by the leader. In today's global economy, many companies look for transformational leaders in order to change an organization and to affect a new vision for the company. The shift towards transformational leaders can be seen almost daily in the financial pages of major newspapers.

Some view transformational leaders as being undemocratic but however, they are certainly more open to opinions of the followers than the autocratic, transactional leader. Also, because the transformational style is so encompassing, it is difficult to establish its parameters. One must keep in mind that as B.M. Bass stressed (Bass, 1981), transformational leadership evolves from the transactional style. It should not viewed as and either or proposition.

CONCLUSION

This paper explores the different approaches to leadership theory and discusses how the various theories evolved throughout the years. Early research focused on the traits of leaders. We have all heard the phrase a "born leader" but can't leadership also be learned? While certain traits can be identified in most leaders, not all traits are consistent and traits cannot account for all the different parameters of leadership. Because of the limitations of explaining all leadership by traits, other studies were undertaken to explore leadership theory.

The early studies conducted at the University of Iowa centered on autocratic leadership as opposed to a democratic style. The autocratic style is still very much explored even today as a style where the group or underlining workers are not involved in decision making and the leader has sole authority in all aspects of decision making. This style equates to a military type authority ladder. On the other spectrum, a democratic leader involves those under his (or her) authority in the decision making process. Participation is encouraged by the leader. This democratic style can be extended to a laissez-faire style where the leader gives complete authority to the group or to those underneath him to make any and all decisions. The University of Iowa studies indicated that in general, the democratic style contributed to better quality and quantity of work (Lewin, 1938).

The Ohio State University studies examined over 1,000 behavior factors. The researches found that two behavior qualities accounted for most of the influence in leadership: initiating structure and consideration. In initiating structure the leader's interest is to attain the goals that are set. The leader defines the roles and structure of the group. There is little or no input by members of the group. On the extreme other side of the spectrum is consideration. In this structure, the leader is considerate of the group members views and inputs; there are interactions on a personal level between the leader and the group members (Stogdill, 1948). The research indicated that leaders that had consideration and initiating structure had higher performance and job satisfaction.

About the same time that the Ohio State Universities were being conducted, behavioral research of leadership was also being conducted at the University of Michigan. As with the Ohio State studies, the researchers were also interested in identifying characteristics that could identify effective leadership. Also similar to the Ohio State studies, the Michigan researchers identified two opposing dimensions: employee oriented and production oriented (Kahn, 1960). The employee oriented behavioral model parallel the other study in that employee oriented leaders are concerned and interact with the members of the group. There are also close similarities between the production oriented leader and the initiating structure leader. The production oriented leader is concerned with accomplishing the task and has little interaction with the group members.

The Leadership Grid was developed using these earlier studies. The grid was developed as two dimensional that had 81 different categories that could relate to a leaders behavior. The grid was balanced on five different leadership styles (Blake, 1984) that conceptualized a leadership style. One of the major weaknesses of the leadership grid is that it did not answer the question of how an effective manager or leader is developed. These dimensional grids did not take into account different circumstances or situations a leader may encounter.

From these studies, researchers become interested in various contingencies of circumstances that occur in leadership. The Fielder contingency model was one of the early research models that was developed. In this model, a managers style is matched with the interaction of the group members and the degree to which the manager can control and influence (Fiedler, 1967). From this research, Fiedler developed the least preferred co-worker (LPC) questionnaire. A scale from 1 to 8 measuring the least preferred on a basis of 18 sets of adjectives would measure a leader's basic leadership style as answered by the group members. After assessing the leader style, the situation that was present would then be evaluated. From this information the research could be evaluated to conclude in which situation a leader would perform more effectively. This

theory also uses the same two dimensions used by Fiedler: the task at hand and the relationship between the leader and followers.

From these two dimensions, four different styles are then analyzed: telling, selling, participating and delegating.

Another variation of contingency leadership theory is the path-goal model developed by House. In this model it is the manager's duty to help the group members in attaining their goals (House, 1971). Furthermore, the leader must make sure that the goals of the organization are compatible with the group member's individual goals. In this theory effective leaders create a "path" to accomplish the work goals. While other theories assume that the leader is inflexible, House's theory assumes that a leader can change with the situation.

The styles discussed to this point all had qualities of the transactional leader. In this model, the leader establishes the goals and tasks needed and then guides and motivates the group members in order to attain the goals. Going back to the early studies of leadership, a leader could be autocratic, democratic or somewhere in between and this could be analyzed on several different scales. From transactional leadership, transformational leadership theory has evolved. Transformational leadership goes a step beyond transactional leadership in that the leader gives intellectual stimulation and consideration of the followers concerns and interests in order to accomplish the task (Bass, 1985). Recent studies have shown that transformational leaders are more effective than their transactional counterparts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bass, B. M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics* (Winter): 26-40.

Blake, R. R. a. M., J. S. (1984). *The managerial grid III*. Houston, TX, Gulf Publishing.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

Drucker, P. F. (1993). *Managing for the future*. New York: Truman Talley Books.

Fiedler, R. R. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Graeff, C. L. (1997). Evolution of the situational leadership theory: A critical review. *Leadership Quarterly* 8(2): 153-170.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H. (2001). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly* September: 321-338.

Kahn, R. a. K. D. (1960). *Leadership practices in relation to productivity and morale*. Elmsford, NY: Row, Paterson.

Keller, R. T. (1992). Transformational leadership and the performance of research and development project groups. *Journal of Management* (September): 489-501.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., and Locke, E.A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits really matter. *Academy of Management Executive*: 48-60.

Lewin, K. a. L., R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note. *Sociometry* 1: 292-300.

Lussier, R. N., Achua, C.F. (2001). *Leadership: Theory, application, & skill building*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College.

Northouse, P. G. (2000). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Robbins, S. P. C., M (2005). *Management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall.

Robinson, M. S. (2005). *Transactional leadership that drives results*. 2005.

Schriesheim, C. A., Tepper, B. J.,Tetrault, L. A. (1994). "Least Perferred Co-Worker Score, Situational Control, and Leadership Effectiveness: A Meta-Analysis of Contingency Model Performance Predictions." Journal of Applied Psychology(August): 561-73.

Skinner, B. F. (1965). Science and human behavior. New York, NY, Free Press.

Stogdill, R. H., Coons, A.E. (1957). Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research. Columbus.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). "Personal factors associated with leadership: A suvey of the literature." Journal of Psychology 25: 35-71.

Vroom, V. H. (2000). "Leadership and the Decision Making Process." Organizational Dynamics 18(4): 82-84.

Weber, J. (2000). The Mess at Bank One. Business Week. May 1: 162-167.

Wofford, J. C., Liska, L.Z. (1993). "Path-goal theories of leadership: A meta-analysis." *Journal of Management* (Winter): 857-76.

SECTION TWO

SECTION TWO ABSTRACT

Current literature on leadership development will be explored in this section. Annotated bibliographies of current articles and research will be presented in this paper. The paper will also focus on transformational leadership. The paper will focus on the current literature on transformational leadership issues and research. They will include: charismatic leadership, visionary leadership, the expansion of Fiedler's contingency model, servant leadership, team leadership, trust and credibility, personal behaviors, ethics and leadership, and psychological empowerment.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R.N., Menon, S.T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior 21* (7): 747-767

The research into charismatic leadership is relatively new. Most transformational leaders exhibit characteristics of charisma. In prior work by the authors they identified five characteristics that separate non charismatic leaders from charismatic leaders (Conger, 1998). These characteristics are: 1) they have a vision, 2) they are able to articulate the vision, 3) they are willing to take risks to accomplish the vision, 4) they are sensitive to environmental constraints and follower needs and 5) they exhibit behaviors that are out of the ordinary.

Through the author's research, they developed a model for charismatic leadership and a measurement scale. In this model the attributions are measured by the perceptions of the followers of the leader. A charismatic leader is separated from other leaders by two scopes: how the followers perceive the manager's desire to change and the manager's sensitivity to follower needs constraints and the environment (Conger, 2000). The behavior of the leader can influence the emotional response of the followers in regards to their task effort, their reactions to the leader and to themselves.

In this paper the authors proposed the following hypothesis:

1) Charismatic leadership behavior will be positively related to the followers' sense of reverence for the manager.

2) Charismatic leadership behavior will be positively related to the followers' trust in that manager.

3) Charismatic leadership behavior will be positively related to the followers' feeling of satisfaction with that manager.

4) Charismatic leadership behavior of a manager will be positively related to the followers' sense of a

collective identity.

5) Charismatic leadership behavior of a manager will be positively related to the followers' perceptions of group task performance.

6) Charismatic leadership behavior of a manager will be positively related to the followers' feeling of empowerment.

The research of measures of charismatic leadership and the effects on the followers involved the analysis of 252 managers. The measurement was the use of the 20-item Conger-Kanungo leadership scale which had previously undergone testing and validation

This article is relevant to my research because it further explains an aspect to transformational leadership. As to the performance of followers, the authors set up hypotheses that were supported from the tested data.

Crant, M.J., & Bateman, T.S. (2000). Charismatic leadership viewed from above: The impact of proactive personality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior 21* (1): 63-75.

The authors in this study examine the impact of being a proactive leader on subordinates and their groups. Some research has leaned towards the view that charisma cannot be learned; however, other research has shown that training can help individuals obtain some charismatic leadership skills. In this context, the authors tested the impact of the proactive personality on subordinates. The research tested two hypothesis (Crant, 2000): 1) Managers' proactive personality will be positively associated with their supervisors' ratings of their charismatic leadership and 2) Proactive personality will explain variance in perceptions of a manager's charisma over and above the five-factor model of personality, in-role behavior and social desirability.

Research has indicated that the proactive personality may be a variable predictor of charismatic leadership. Various correlations have been established between the proactive personality and criterion outcomes such as community involvement. Empirical evidence has indicated an indicator of transformational and charismatic leadership is a proactive personality. The five factor model of personality involves the following:

1) Neuroticism or emotional instability.

2) Extraversion represented as being sociable, gregarious and ambitious.

3) Openness to experience, described by tolerance of new ideas and flexibility of thought.

4) Agreeableness, or a compassionate interpersonal orientation.

5) Conscientiousness, or the degree of organization, persistence and motivation in goal-directed behavior.

This article is relevant to my research because studies have shown that transformational leadership has led to higher performance and advancement of individuals. As part of the research into transformational leadership more interest has been exhibited on exploring the charismatic leader and the proactive personality.

Conger, J.A., Kanungo, R.N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review* 12: 641

In this article the author's set forth the differences between the charismatic leader and the non-charismatic leader. The differences are as follows (Conger 1987):

1) Relation to status quo: The non-charismatic leader agrees with the status quo and strives to maintain it. The charismatic leader is essentially opposed to the status quo and strives to change it.

2) Future goal: For the non-charismatic leader the goal is not too discrepant from the status quo. The charismatic leader idealizes the vision and it is highly discrepant from the status quo.

3) Likableness: For the non-charismatic leader a shared perspective makes the leader likable. For the charismatic leader a shared perspective and idealized vision makes the leader not only likable but also an honorable hero worthy of identification and imitation.

4) Trustworthiness: A non-charismatic leader is a disinterested advocate in persuasion attempts while a charismatic leader a disinterested advocate at great personal risk and cost.

5) Expertise: The non-charismatic leader is an expert in using available means to achieve goals within the framework of the existing order. The charismatic leader is an expert in using unconventional means to transcend the existing order.

6) Behavior: The non charismatic leader is conventional and conforming to existing means while the charismatic leader is unconventional or counter normative.

7) Environmental sensitivity: The non charismatic leader has a low need for environmental sensitivity to maintain the status quo. The charismatic leader has a high need for environmental sensitivity for changing the status quo.

8) Articulation: The non charismatic leader is weak in articulation of goals and motivation to lead. The charismatic leader can strongly articulate the future vision and motivation to lead.

9) Power base: The non charismatic leader has position power and personal power (based on reward, expertise, and liking for a friend who is a similar other). The charismatic leader has personal power based on expertise, respect and admiration for a unique hero.

10) Leader-follower relationship: The non charismatic leader is egalitarian, consensus seeking or directive who nudges or orders people to share his views. The charismatic leader is elitist, entrepreneurial and exemplary who transforms people to share the radical changes advocated.

This article is relevant to my research because it explains the differences between the non charismatic and the charismatic leader. It can be seen from the differences that the charismatic leader is a transformational leader and the research expands upon the research of transformational leadership.

Lucas, J.R. (1998). Anatomy of a vision statement. *Management Review* Feb.: 22-26.

Visionary leadership is very similar to charismatic leadership in that both have goals and change is needed to accomplish the idea. A visionary leader needs to have charisma but must go beyond charisma in articulating a future that will improve upon the current situation. Organizational goals should tie into the vision and inspire the group's emotions. The image of the vision can be seen by the group and inspires the group to achieve the goal.

Visionary leaders have three qualities that allow them to be effective (Lucas, 1998): The first is the ability to explain the vision to others; second, is the ability to express the vision not just verbally but through behavior; and third, the ability to extend or apply the vision to different leadership contexts. Many of today's leaders in the technical world have been

visionary leaders i.e. Michael Dell of Dell Computers with his concept of no store sales.

This article is relevant to my research because is explains the difference and the similarities between a charismatic and visionary leader. The visionary leader is usually charismatic but goes beyond it by articulating a vision.

Miller, R.L., Butler, J, Cosentino, C.J.(2004). Followership effectiveness: An extension of Fiedler's contingency model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 25: 4: 362-374.

Fiedler developed the least preferred co-worker (LPC) questionnaire to measure a leader's style. This questionnaire measures the leaders style as either task oriented or relationship oriented. The LPC scale is set up by bipolar adjectives that describe a leaders personal attributes. The scale was modified in this research to refer to leaders situational favorability (Miller 2004).

This study was funded by US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. In this study, the US Army was interested in discovering in what situations relations-oriented and task oriented followers performed better. In this study the LPC was customized to refer to leaders as situational favorability reflected in leader member relations and follower familiarity.

The results mirrored Fielder's results in that relations oriented followers had higher performances in moderately favorable situations. Task oriented followers performed at higher levels in highly unfavorable situations which indicated that in that scenario, more structure is necessary. In a different finding than Fiedler discovered, in highly favorable conditions relations oriented followers performed better.

This article is relevant to my research in that it expands upon the Fiedler model of contingency leadership. When used in favorable or unfavorable settings, the model explains that task oriented followers give different results than relations oriented followers.

Stone, A.G., Russell, R.F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 25: 4. 349-361

While the concept of servant leadership has been studied since formulated by Robert Greenleaf in 1977, it has not been researched nearly as intensely as the concept of transformational leadership. Primarily because of the work of James Burns and Bernard.Bass, transformational leadership has been much more popular to research than the servant concept. The essence of transformational leadership is a process of building commitment to organizational objectives while the essence of servant leadership is to serve the needs of others (Stone, 2004).

Some authors have suggested that both models are very similar and that the servant leadership is merely a subset of the transformational leader. Other research has pointed towards obvious differences displayed in earlier studies such as the Ohio State University (Stogdill, 1948) and the University of Michigan studies (Kahn, 1960). Also the leadership grid (Blake, 1984), recognized the concern for production versus the concern for people.

Both the servant leadership and the transformational leadership theories have many similarities and complement each other. However, the principle difference of these theories is the focus of the leader. Both servant leaders and transformational leaders show concern for their followers however the servant leader's main focus is upon service to the followers. The transformational leader's main focus is getting the followers to support the organization's objectives and goals.

This article is relevant to my research in that it further explains transformational leadership in the context of servant leadership. While both leadership theories are very similar, the main difference is the focus of the leader. Is the focus towards the organization and does the leader's behavior create follower commitment to organization goals or does the leader shift the primary focus to the followers?

Steckler, N., Fondas, N. (1995). Building team leader effectiveness: A diagnostic tool. *Organizational Dynamics*. Winter. 19-29.

More and more companies are using a team concept within their organizations. The success of its use by Japanese companies inspired US companies to adopt its use. With this change managers need to adapt to a team concept in leadership. In being part of a team, a leader needs to learn new skills such as 1) giving up authority 2) patience with co workers 3) share information 4) trusting all co workers and 5) knowing when to intervene (Steckler, 1995).

With a team concept, there are similar responsibilities of the leaders. Communication, training, disciplining and reviewing performance are all common team leader tasks. To be able to accomplish the role of a team leader, the leader must be a troubleshooter, be a liaison with external constituencies, manage conflict and be a coach.

These new roles may change the focus of the transformational leader because his ability to control can be negated.

This article is relevant to my research in that it applies the concept of team leadership and how it interacts with the members of the team. The team and the team leader needs to adapt their management style to a new context. Being a visionary or charismatic leader is not enough for success.

Insana, R. (2005). Coach says honey gets better results than vinegar. *USA TODAY* February 21, 4B

In this story, Larry Brown the coach of the Detroit Pistons discusses his concept of being a coach of team. Many of his comments are not only relevant for sports but also in the general management of teams. Over the years he has been successful on the college as well as in pro basketball.

Brown's suggestions as to being successful are (Insana, 2005):

1) Maintain a high ratio of positive to negative comments.

2) Coaching is not criticism. It's making it clear that you care.

3) Hire star players of good character and the team will succeed.

4) Measure improvement to gauge success.

5) Fear lack of effort, not making mistakes.

6) Make decisions. Stand by them and make them work.

7) Take responsibility for losses. Credit the team for the wins.

In Brown's opinion, coaching is putting the workers where they can do their best and support them in their efforts. Don't be afraid to correct them but also shower them with praise.

This article is relevant to my research in that the team concept and the coach being successful is similar

for sports as well as industry, government, military, etc. The coach in any of these situations must be able to adapt to the personality of the team and the team members.

Mohammed, S. & Angell, L.C. (2004). eSurface-and deep-level diversity in workgroups: Examining the moderating effects of team orientation and team process on relationship conflict. Journal of Organizational Behavior 25, 1015-1039

Diversity has become a very popular word not only in politics but also in the business world. With more minorities entering the workforce, a heightened interest in diversity research has developed. Forty years ago diversity was thought to be a black/white issue but today it encompasses women, Latino's, Asians and other minorities that are part of the workforce.

These authors researched three hypothesis (Mohammed, 2004):

Hypothesis 1) Team orientation will moderate the relationship between surface-level diversity (gender, ethnicity) and relationship conflict such that surface-level diversity will be less likely to result in relationship conflict when team orientation is higher than when it is lower. The use of the term "team orientation" is the individual's tendency for functioning as part of a team and the degree to which they prefer to work in group settings. When team orientation is high, the negative effects of "being different" is less likely to occur and members of the group are more committed to the work goals.

Hypothesis 2) Teams with higher diversity on time urgency will experience higher relationship conflict than teams with lower diversity on time urgency. Time urgency is the perception of deadlines to which tasks must be performed. Time urgent workers are pre-occupied with deadlines and schedule more activities than can normally fit into a schedule. This constraint can cause conflict among the team members and can inhibit their ability to perform as a team.

Hypothesis 3) Teams with higher diversity on extraversion will experience lower relationship conflict than teams with lower diversity on extraversion. Extraversion refers to the ability to be outgoing, sociable, interactive, etc. A team with a low lever of extraversion will result in low levels of intra-team communication. For the team to perform at a high level with extraversion personalities there must also be present submissive and introverted personalities.

This article was relevant to my research in that in examining leadership concepts, especially in relation to team cooperation, diversity issues should be addressed. These researchers have attempted to prove several hypotheses that relate to diversity in team situations. This area of research is relatively new and will require much more study into this important field.

Podsakoff, P.M., Schriesheim, C.A. (1985). Field Studies of French and Raven's bases of power: Critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin*, May, 387-411.

Trust and credibility are important components that a successful leader must have. In trust the followers must have faith in the ability, the character and the integrity of the leader. In credibility the leader be perceived as honest, competent and inspiring.

The authors identified five dimensions of trust (Podsakoff 1985):

1) Integrity: Honesty and truthfulness
2) Competence: Technical and interpersonal knowledge and skills

3) Consistency: Reliability, predictability and good judgment in handling situations.
4) Loyalty: Willingness to protect a person, physically and emotionally.
5) Openness: Willingness to share ideas and information freely.

Changes in the workforce like diversity and team concepts have made the concept of trust a very important issue. Also with the corporate scandals of late, the issues of trust and credibility have reached into the highest levels of company leadership.

This article is relevant to my research in that trust and credibility are current issues that the public and employees are very concerned with. Positive job outcomes and performance have been shown to be correlated by research to the issue of trust. The current cases of Enron, World Com, Arthur Andersen, Adelphia, just to name a few, point out the importance of trust in the workplace.

Wood, A.T., Wood, C.A. (2003). Can you really mandate corporate ethics. *Internal Auditor.* 60: 1. 30.

Corporate ethics always exist at some level: functionally effective ethics create and build a morally safe environment based on care, trust, responsibility, and other core values unique to the corporation; functionally ineffective ethics create an environment of fear and chaos, or malaise and distrust (Wood, 2003). The conditions for being successful in corporate ethics are:

1) Awareness of core values of the corporation and the CEO.
2) Establishing ownership of the core values by all employees, executives, and other constituencies.
3) Democratic implementation of core values and ethical processes.
4) Clear lines of moral authority- the defined responsibility of each constituent.
5) Enhancement of moral intelligence; the active application of responsibility decision making skills.
6) Meta-cognitive, self interrogation and skill development.
7) Commitment to corporate ethics culture.
8) Vigilance and constant reminders of core ethical values.

In the author's opinion, autocratic leaders tend to be insensitive to the conditions for successful corporate ethics while democratic leaders tend to support the corporate core values.

In evaluating the current lack of ethics in some corporations, those CEO's who have been convicted and charged with various corporate crimes have tended to be autocratic leaders. They created the appearance of efficiency while they destroyed all corporate trust.

This article was relevant to my research in that ethics and moral leadership are a major topic in today's world. Everyday in the news there is an article pertaining to a corporate fraud trial or investigation. When the moral ethics of the top leadership fails in a corporation, it affects not only the stockholders but each and every employee. Lack of ethics in corporate America has cost tens of thousands of employees there jobs and their pensions.

Mastrangelo, A., Eddy, E.R., Lorenzet, S.J. (2004). The importance of personal and professional leadership." *Leadership & Organization Development Journal.* 25: 5, 435-451.

The success of the organization depends on the quality and effectiveness of the provided leadership. Effective behaviors of leadership include setting a

mission, creating a process of achieving goals, aligning processes and procedures and personal behaviors of building trust, caring for people, and acting morally (Mastrangelo, 2004).

The authors of this research studied the perceptions of organizational leadership and not personal leadership. The effects of personal and professional leadership were compared against the variable of the presence of willing cooperation and the variable of personal leadership. Both variables revealed that there was a relationship. Willing cooperation of the employees and the organization leadership which resulted in a mediated leadership model resulted in a successful result.

As the research indicated, willing cooperation of employees was influenced by personal leadership and mediated the relationship between professional leadership and employee results. The ethics and trust from the leadership team influences the amount of willing participation from the team, group or individual employee.

This article was relevant to my research in that it explored the realm of willing participation of employees and the importance of personal and professional leadership. The qualities of the organizational leadership in ethics and trust cannot be minimized. In this era of questionable ethics by corporate leaders, the question of employee willingness to follow leader's orders is a current topic.

Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., & Harding, F.D. Leadership skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. *Leadership Quarterly* 11: 1. 11-21

Studies on leadership going back to trait theories have studied the question: Are leaders born or made? The capability model that these authors have developed has interacting variables that allow for the development of leadership. Capacities of leadership can be developed by organizations if certain variables are present. The capabilities and variables were drawn from leaders who have accomplished group cohesion (Mumford, 2000)

Basic capacities for leaders to achieve success through problem solving and solution implementation are: creative thinking skills, social judgment abilities, environmental and social knowledge. Complex and dynamic organizations can help facilitate the creative problem solving that is required in today's complex global world. While the capacities discussed by the authors cannot always predict leadership success, the model shows that organizations can help foster leadership skills in their management.

The article is relevant to my research in that it discusses the organizations role in

nurturing leadership qualities in their management. Using a model with interacting variables, leadership qualities can be made to a certain extent. There are many new complex social issues that leaders must be made aware of and become sensitive to.

Leban, W., Zulauf, C. (2004). Linking emotional intelligence abilities and transformational leadership styles." *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 25: 7, 554-564.

In today's global economy, new demands are being made on companies if they want to be able to compete. These new economic forces are causing companies to continually look for ways to cut costs, increase quality, find new markets and satisfy existing customers. The authors examined six organizations with 24 project managers from various industries. These companies have utilized project management to put into practice strategic initiatives on a global basis (Leban, 2004).

As with other studies, the authors found that transformational leadership has a strong positive impact on project performance. Another strong variable for success is emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence contributes to the transformational leadership style and also to project performance. Emotional intelligence encompasses various aspects of emotional behavior as well as learned intelligence on different aspects of project management. Companies competing in the global economy are interested in their managers understanding the "big picture" to help appreciate and analyze how system components interact.

This article is relevant to my research in that it expands upon transformational leadership theory. It explores the concept of transformational leadership in the context of global competition and analyzes the concept of emotional intelligence. Companies must be able to implement new strategies in a timely manner therefore putting new demands on managers. Leadership in this context has to continually evolve in order to be successful.

Fairholm, M.R. (2004). A new sciences outline for leadership development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal.* 25: 4. 369-383.

Traditional theory has given way to social scientists recognizing that organizational behavior can be measured by observable realities. The assent of the global economy has forced companies to adapt to an ever changing environment. This new sciences is having organizations re-examine how we conceptualize organizations. Relationships and culture have taken a more important role than control and measurement. This new sciences approach has allowed one to see leadership in original, more precise ways (Fairholm, 2004).The author defines the concept of "autopoiesis" as information, interaction and issues of trust. In this concept individuals can act independently and yet still contribute to the unified goals of the organization. The concept of autopoiesis demonstrates how open, independent systems can contribute into a better, more complex organization.

The new sciences recognize that the free flow of information is essential to the success of the organization and that feedback loops must be established between the internal and external company environment. Relationships among the groups, teams, individuals and leadership are an essential focus. The followers must have a trust in the leadership and the leadership must encourage trust. Leadership must rise above the daily pressures to see the "big picture" of the global environment which the author called "getting on the balcony." Values and an organization vision are important concepts in leadership development. An organization must adopt company values which are translated into a company vision. Teaching and coaching of the followers of the vision and values contributes to the success of the organization.

This article contributed to my research in that it further defines and explores the concept of leadership. The author proposes that the new science approach provides a better structure to explain leadership than past theories. The goal of the new science approach is to have workers organize and work in synchronization with shared goals. This process evolves from the growth of the individual and the organization in an

environment of mutual trust.

Ferrazzi, K. (2005). Never eat alone: And other secrets of success, one relationship at a time. Currency/Doubleday: New York.

In today's world, business is driven by interpersonal relationships. The focus should not be networking per say but in relationship building. With this approach meeting and learning about people is essential. The personality of the individual and how they relate to caring, mentoring and goal setting are just as important as business acumen. Managers and leaders need to have these traits in order to be successful.

The author suggests the following (Ferrazzi, 2005):

1) Do your homework. Before meeting new business contacts do as much research as you can to learn about the person even going on the internet.

2) Never eat alone. Reach out to people at meals and meetings. Being invisible can lead to failure.

3) Health matters. One has to take of their body, mind and spirit in order to be at your best.

4) Create your life quilt. All experiences and people we interact with allow us to weave together a life long quilt. Use the lessons learned in the quilt to help become a "people" person.

This article is relevant to my research because it reinforces the concept of successful leaders who tend to be caring and have personal relationships with the group or individuals. Most research has shown that a leader who is employee oriented and has interpersonal relationships as compared to a production related leader has higher productivity and job satisfaction.

Avolio, B.J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 25: 8. 951-968

Organizational commitment has been linked to transformational leadership but there has been little empirical research on the facet of transformational leader's influence on the followers' level of organizational commitment (Avolio, 2004). Psychological empowerment increases the inherent task motivation shown in a workers role of competence, impact, meaning and self-determination.

As the authors explain, "impact refers to the degree to which and individual's work makes a difference in achieving the purpose of the task and the extent to which an individual believes he or she can influence organizational outcomes. Meaning refers to the weight individuals place on a given task based on individual's standards, while self-determination or choice refers to feelings of autonomy in making decisions about work. "

A main mechanism of building commitment to an organization is empowerment by the transformational leader. It is the transformational leader who gets the followers to accept the vision and builds team spirit by enthusiasm, trust and moral leadership.

Empowered employees think of themselves as more capable and being able to influence their organization in a positive way. Psychological empowerment will also mediate the relationship between employees' organizational commitment and the transformational leader.

This article was relevant to my research in that it further explained the relationship of the follower and transformational leader in terms of psychological empowerment. An important component of organizational commitment and the transformational leader is psychological empowerment. As the authors' explained much more research needs to be devoted to this concept.

Giuliani, R. (2002). *Leadership*. New York: Hyperion.

One of the better known transformational leaders is Rudy Giuliani. While he made his reputation as a federal prosecutor, his leadership skills helped New York City not only recover from 9/11 but also years earlier remake its image.

Giuliani fits the definition of a transformational leader in that he is inspiring, he has charisma, he is trustworthy and he has provided moral leadership (except in the affair issue). Before taking over as Mayor of the City of New York, the crime rate was very high and the city in general had an undesirable image to some degree. Homeless people were on every corner and garbage at times piled up on the streets. Giuliani made some controversial decisions that not all agreed with but did improve the image of the city. He hired a police chief that ordered the arrest of homeless individuals. Gangs and high crime areas were targeted by the police. The mayor also changed the work hours of the refuse collectors, having them work in the early morning hours in picking up garbage and placing heavy fines for littering (Giuliani 2002).

His finest hours as a leader were in his strength and resolve to lead New York City after 9/11. He was inspirational as a leader and even though the police and fire fighters had many labor issues with Giuliani they followed him as their leader. Giuliani states that there are three critical stages of leadership: First you must develop beliefs. Next you have to communicate them. Finally, you must take action (Giuliani, p. 80).

This book is relevant to my research because it discusses a well known transformational leader. Whether you like Giuliani personally, it is hard to argue against the point that especially after 9/11 his leadership helped the City of New York get through an extremely difficult time. His vision and charisma led the New York and n some cases the nation as a whole in a resolve of pride and accomplishment.

Welch, J. (2005). *Winning*. New York: HarperBusiness

Jack Welch is one of the best known former CEO's in America. Welch retired in 2001 as Chairman and chief executive officer of General Electric after a 40 year career. During his tenure the stock price of GE increased dramatically but he was also known as "Neutron Jack." He got the nickname because during his first five years as CEO, 118,000 went off of the GE payroll.

His trade mark management philosophy was let people know where they stand in the organization. He stated that the top 20% of executives would go on to higher jobs, the bottom 10% would be terminated and the remaining 70% could stay in the same positions to assist the company but really did not have a future of advancement. The top 20% he considered "stars" and they were given incentives to excel. The company would identify the bottom 10% to be "weeded" out. In most cases his policy did not call for firing individuals but they would be informed that they were not measuring up to the task and would leave on their own.

Candor is a word that describes Welch's leadership philosophy. He writes (Welch, 2005) "Lack of candor basically blocks smart ideas, fast action, and good people contributing all the stuff they've got." As CEO he urged his management to exude positive energy. His

attitude was to never be negative but be firm and know exactly what goals need to be achieved.

This book is relevant to my research because it was written by one of the better known CEO's in the 1980's and 1990's. While Jack Welch was autocratic in some regards, he was also a transformational leader because he provided individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation to his top managers. His management style is studied and copied by many top CEO's throughout America.

BACKGROUND

The definition of leadership is not always clear. It is one of those qualities you know when you see it and know when it is not there. Many people associate leadership with one person leading. In order to lead one must be able to have influence over others. Obviously in order to lead there must be followers. Especially during times of crisis leaders step forward and the qualities can be easily recognized. Usually leaders have a vision or a clear idea of what needs to be done. Leaders can influence other's beliefs and the followers have trust in the leadership.

There have basically been four major theories of leadership that have been researched. The trait theories basically began the research into leadership during the 1920's and 1930's. There has been some current research that has identified which traits are needed for effective leadership. These basic traits identified are (Kirkpatrick, 1991): drive, the desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self confidence, intelligence, job related knowledge and extraversion. Many studies have tried to identify personality traits that differentiate the leader from the follower. Stogdill was one of the early researchers that used surveys to identify leaders by linking clusters of various traits (Stogdill, 1948).

The trait theories came up short in predicting leadership in all situations and did not take into account situational and behavior differences. Research could not identify all traits or characteristics that made one a leader. This led to researchers into looking for what leaders did and how they behaved which led to the behavioral studies.

Some of the earliest studies were conducted at the University of Iowa and were concerned with three basic leadership styles: autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire (Lewin, 1938). A leader with autocratic tendencies centralizes authority and limits employee participation. A democratic leader tends to include employee in decision making and encourages employee feedback. A laissez-faire style leader is one who gives the group or team complete freedom to make decisions. The research showed than generally better results were achieved by the democratic style of leadership.

Another significant study of leadership behavior was researched at the Ohio State University. In studying over 1000 dimensions of behavior, the researchers narrowed behavior down to two that accounted for most of the descriptions (Stogdill, 1948). Initiating structure describe a leader who was likely to define the structure and the roles of the group in order to attain the goals of the organization. This behavior was contrasted with leader's who exhibited consideration. A leader with consideration had job relationships with the members of the group and is considerate of group members' feelings and ideas.

The University of Michigan studies also developed two behavior dimensions of leaders: employee oriented and production-oriented. Employee oriented was similar to the OSU studies in that interpersonal relationships were important in recognizing the needs of the followers. Contrasted to this was the production-oriented leader who's main concern was the accomplishment of the task. The research showed that the employee oriented leader obtained higher results (Kahn 1960).

The final major behavioral study constructed the management grid. Eighty one categories were established on a scale of 1 (low) to 9 (high) (Blake, 1984). On the scale the corners consisted of the following: Country club management, Team management, Task management and Impoverished management. In the middle of the grid was middle of the road management. Research using the grid showed that managers performed at a higher level when using the team management concept.

The research into the behavioral sector can be broken down into four categories:

1) Concern for the task. Productivity and organizing followers to achieve the goals is the emphasis of the leadership.

2) Concern for people. Leaders are interested in the followers needs and input.

3) Directive leadership. Leaders make decisions for others and the subordinates follow the instructions of the leader.

4) Participation leadership. Decision making is shared by the leader with the followers.

From the behavioral theories emerged the contingency approach. This research focused on the theory that leadership changed from situation to situation. Leaders emerge from changing circumstances that are presented. The main idea of the contingency approach is that effective leadership depends on many variables.

Fred Fiedler researched the hypothesis that effective leadership depends on the leadership style and the degree to which the situation allows the leader influence (Fiedler, 1967). His research determined that when the leaders are liked and respected the more likely the leader will have the followers' support. If the task is clear and the followers know the performance standards that need to be met, it will more likely that the leader will be able to exert influence over the group. Also if the group or organization gives certain power to the leader to get a task accomplished, then it is more likely that leader will have the influence needed to accomplish the task

As part of the contingency theory, the situational leadership theory was developed. Four different leadership styles could be drawn upon to deal with a different situation (Hersey, 2001):

1) Telling (high task/low relationship behavior). This style is characterized in giving a lot of direction to followers and by also giving attention to define the roles and goals of the organization. This approach is recommended for new employees or when followers are viewed as not able or capable of attaining the goals on their own.

2) Selling (high task/high relationship behavior). This a coaching approach whereby direction is given by the leader in attaining the goals of the organization. The followers in this scenario are motivated and willing but lack the ability on their own to accomplish the organizational goals.

3) Participation (high relationship/low task behavior). The main role of the leader is to facilitate and communicated but the decision making is shared between the leader and the followers.

4) Delegating (low relationship/low task behavior). The responsibility of accomplishing the task or goals is that of the followers. The leader only identifies what needs to be accomplished.

Most of the research of the trait, behavioral and contingency theories was concerned with the transactional type of leader. The transactional type of leader guides and motivates the followers in the direction of established organizational goals. The leader clarifies the roles and the goals of the organization. Some researches began to distinguish between transactional and transformational leaders (Burns, 1978). A transformational leader is seen as a change agent who can provide intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration to the members or followers.

Research into the transactional and transformational leadership styles further refined the definitions. Bass defined the differences as follows (Bass, 1985): The transactional leader:

1) Recognizes what it is that we want to get from work and tries to ensure that we get it if our performance merits it.

2) Exchanges rewards and promises for our effort.

3) Is responsive to our immediate self interests if they can be met by getting the work done.

And the transformational leader:

1) Raises our level of awareness, our level of consciousness about the significance and value of designating outcomes, and ways of reaching them.

2) Gets us to transcend our own self-interest for the sake of the team, organization or larger policy.

3) Alters our need level and expands our range of wants and needs.

It has been argued that transformational leadership is built upon transactional leadership and that they should not be viewed as opposing leadership theories (Bass, 1985).

The conclusion will discuss new research as it pertains to the transformational style of leadership.

CONCLUSION

The research into transformational leadership has expanded into the following areas: charismatic leadership, team leadership, visionary leadership, trust, empowerment leadership and leadership issues in the 21st century. The research into these aspects of transformational leadership has further defined and refined the study of leadership in general.

Generally, transformational leaders are charismatic in character. A charismatic leader is one who is enthusiastic and self confident. These qualities transcend into a leader being able to influence and affect the behavior of followers. Conger and Kanungo researched charismatic leadership on a measurement scale that looks at the followers perceptions of the leader (Conger, 2000). They found that charismatic leadership had positive effects on the followers' perceptions. The Crant research examined the impact of the charismatic, proactive personality and subordinates and groups. In this context, the proactive personality is a viable predictor of charismatic leadership (Crant, 2000). In another research project, Conger outlined a behavioral theory of the charismatic leader as opposed to a non-charismatic leader (Conger, 1987). This research defined the charismatic leader in behavior patterns.

Visionary leadership is similar to charismatic leadership but goes beyond the charismatic definition. The visionary leader is charismatic but also articulates a future that improves upon the current circumstances (Lucas, 1998). The visionary leader can not only express the vision but can project it through behavior. Examples of visionary leaders can not only be found in the political spectrum but also in the technical business world.

Fiedler's contingency model has been researched in different contexts. This theory proposes that effective group performance is related to a match between the situation and the interaction of the leader and the followers. Miller studied the model based on the degree of the situation as favorable to unfavorable (Miller, 2004). The study produced a different finding than Fiedler in that in highly favorable conditions, relations oriented followers performed better.

The question of servant leadership as compared with transformational leadership was researched by Stone. While servant and transformational leadership have many similarities, they are different in that the essence of transformational leadership is a process of building commitment to organizational goals while the essence of servant leadership is to serve the needs of the followers (Stone, 2004).

More and more companies are using work teams. This has the context of the leader from a traditional leadership role. Steckler researched the team concept of leadership and the skills necessary to be successful (Steckler, 1995). Being a transformational, charismatic, visionary is not enough to lead in a team context.

To accomplish the organizational goals, team leadership demands communication, troubleshooting, liaison roles with external constituencies and general coaching. In a story in USA TODAY, the coaching style of Larry Brown was discussed and many of his philosophies as a coach can be related to the business and political world (Insana, 2005).

The issue of diversity in team work groups was examined by Mohammed on a level of surface and deep level diversity (Mohammed, 2004). The issues presented in this study are very relevant in today's work environment and it is an area that is ripe for further research.

The studies of trust and credibility have become very relevant topics in the area of transformational leadership. Podsakoff examined five dimensions of leadership trust (Podsakoff, 1985). Positive job outcomes are closely correlated to the issue of trust. The question can trust and ethics be mandated by an organization was researched by Wood. In this context the style of leadership was also examined as it related to ethics and trust (Wood, 2003). This topic has received much discussion due to the failures of such companies as Enron and WorldCom to name a few. In a global economy where the pressures of success of the leader are tied to many factors, some out of the leader's control, the issue of trust and ethics sometimes become blurred.

The personal behavior of the leader is important to professional leadership of the organization. Personal behaviors include building trust, caring for people and acting morally (Mastrangelo, 2004). The ethics and trust of the leader influences the willing participation of an individual or a group. In the context of a complex changing world, leadership skills can be learned and developed to some extent (Mumford, 2000). Capacities of leaders to have creative thinking skills, social judgment abilities and environmental and social knowledge can be expanded by the organization with

training.

Links have also been made with emotional intelligence and transformational leadership styles (Leban, 2004). Emotional intelligence involves not only behavior but also what is learned.

The globalization phenomenon has forced social scientists to recognize that organizational behavior can be measured by observable variables. Relationships between the groups' members in an atmosphere of trust and open communication is a focus of the new sciences (Fairholm, 2004). The goal of this theory of leadership is to have the team or group have similar goals and work in synchronization. Relationship building and interpersonal relationships are more important than ever in a global economy. Personality and one relates their relationship into caring, mentoring and goal setting are important factors for success (Ferrazzi, 2005). Psychological empowerment with the transformational leader the extent of organizational commitment was the focus of research by Avolio. Empowered employees are more capable and believe they can influence the organization in a positive way (Avolio, 2004).

In the perspective of researching the transformational leader in this new global society, Rudy Giuliani in a political context and Jack Welch in a business context exhibit qualities that have warranted examination. Giuliani is better known for his leadership of New York City after 9/11, but he was a charismatic, visionary leader prior to that disaster (Giuliani, 2002). He was innovative in his management decisions as Mayor of New York City and led the city as a transformational leader. From the business organization perspective, Jack Welch has also exhibited a controversial transformational leadership style. His most current book outlines his leadership method and he defends how and why he made the leadership decisions that he did (Welch, 2005).

The depth section of this paper examines the current research of transformational leadership. It has taken into account the changes to society and organizations due to globalization and world events.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, A., Koh,W., Bhatia,P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 25(8): 951-968.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership: Good, better, best. Organizational Dynamics*(Winter): 26-40.

Blake, R. R. a. M., J. S. (1984). *The managerial grid III*. Houston, TX, Gulf Publishing.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R.N. (1987). Toward a behavior theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review* 12: 641.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R.N. (1998). *Charismatic Leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R.N. and Menon, S.T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 21(7): 747-767.

Crant, J. M., Batemen, T.S., (2000). Charismatic leadership viewed from above: The impact of proactive personality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*(February): 63-75.

Fairholm, M. R. (2004). A new sciences outline for leadership development. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 25(4): 369-383.

Ferrazzi, K. (2005). *Never eat alone: And other secrets of success, one relationship at a time*. New York, Currency/Doubleday.

Fiedler, R. R. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York, McGraw-Hill.

Giuliani, R. (2002). Leadership. New York: Hyperion.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H. (2001). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.

Insana, R. (2005). Coach says honey gets better results than vinegar. *USA TODAY*: 4B.

Kahn, R. a. K. D. (1960). *Leadership practices in relation to productivity and morale*. Elmsford, NY: Row, Paterson.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., and Locke, E.A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits really matter. *Academy of Management Executive*: 48-60.

Leban, W., & Zulauf, C. (2004). Linking emotional intelligence abilities and transformational leadership styles. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 25(7): 554-564.

Lewin, K. a. L., R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note. *Sociometry 1*: 292-300.

Lucas, J. R. (1998). Anatomy of a vision statement. *Management Review*(Feb.): 22-26.

Mastrangelo, A., Eddy, E.R., Lorenzer, S. J. (2004). The importance of personal and professional leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 25(5): 435-451.

Miller, R. L., Butler, J., Cosentino, C.J. (2004). Followership effectiveness: An extension of Fiedler's contingency model.. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 25(4): 362-368.

Mohammed, S., Angell, L.C. (2004). Surface- and deep-level diversity in workgroups: Examining the moderating effects of team orientation and team process on relationship conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 25: 1015-1039.

Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S.J., Harding, F.D. (2000). Leadership skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. *Leadership Quarterly 11*(1): 11-21.

Podsakoff, P. M., Schriesheim, C.A. (1985). Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin* May: 387-411.

Steckler, N., Fondas, N. (1995). Building team effectiveness: A diagnostic tool. *Organizational Dynamics* Winter: 20-21.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A suvey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology* 25: 35-71.

Stone, A. G., Russell, R.F., Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 25(4): 349-361.

Welch, J. (2005). Winning. New York, HarperBusiness.

Wood, A. T., Wood, C. A. (2003). Can you really mandate corporate ethics? *Internal Auditor 60*(1): 30.

SECTION THREE

SECTION THREE ABSTRACT

This paper will explore organization culture as to the organization's actual position on a dimension and where it should be ideally. The dimension questionnaire is from Kolb, Osland, Rubin (1995) *Organizational Behavior: An Experimental Approach*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall. This survey was given to Lucas County, Ohio employees to ascertain if the leadership was providing the kind of organizational culture that the employees expected. The followers' perception of actual to ideal on a seven scale questionnaire is analyzed in the context of leadership and the culture of the office. Regression models were used to test the strength of the variables.

BACKGROUND

Many people are elected to political office by projecting to the public a charismatic personality along with a vision. The reality of managing the office and the leadership exhibited to the employee can be quite different from the public image. Employees or the followers can have a completely different image of the leadership style of the elected official than the public.

This research is conducted using a county government in Ohio. The county has a population of approximately 450,000 and the main administrative responsibilities are with a three member county commission board that is elected. Many of the employees work in a city/county building in the

downtown area. County employees are generally paid less than the private sector but have a superior benefit package. Employees are appointed by the appropriate elected official. In some cases employees are represented by a union.

While generally employees are protected by Ohio civil service, the top management serves at the pleasure of the elected official. When a new elected official takes office and is from a different political party, although employees are in theory protected by civil service, the reality is that the new management team can find ways of dismissing unwanted employees. In this atmosphere, the skills of the employee sometimes become secondary to the loyalty of the leadership.

Throughout the United States, most elected officials have little management experience prior to their election. Very few have taken general business courses or have had instruction in leadership or management. While they may project themselves as a transformational leader, many actually use a transactional, autocratic style.

PURPOSE

A transformational leader is one who provides consideration to followers on an individual basis, have charisma and provide intellectual stimulation to the group (Bass 1985). Many researchers have found that transformational leadership is built upon transactional leadership. A typical transactional leader guides and motivates the employees in the direction of goals of the leader while also defining the roles and the tasks desired.

For the transformational leader to be successful, the culture of the organization must be one that allows the leader to transform the organization with the followers as partners in the new arrangement. An organization needs become dynamic with the following cultural processes (Hatch 1993):

1) Manifestation. The perceptions, cognitions, and emotions of workers reveal cultural assumptions. Assumptions about how to attain success translate into behaviors of working hard.

2) Realization. Perceptions, cognitions, and emotions are transformed into tangible artifacts. Artifacts can include rites, rituals, myths, and stories. Stories about the elected official can create perceptions about their attitude toward the workplace.

3) Symbolization. Particular artifacts take on a specific symbolic significance.

4) Interpretation. People inside and outside the organization determines the meaning of various symbols. Employees may value the services they receive from others.

The culture of the organization directly reflects the organizational philosophy of the elected official. Generally cultures can be created by the leader and his top management or can be created by employee initiated. Rarely in a political environment is a culture created by the employees.

The elected official can control the culture of the by initiating new practices and rules to the existing employees and can new employees can be acclimated to the culture by the following (Van Maanen 1978):

1) Putting new employees through a common set of experiences as part of a group rather than training them singly and in isolation from other new hires.

2) Segregating newcomers from regular organizational members.

3) Requiring the new hires to move through a series of discrete and identifiable steps to achieve a defined role, such as specialized training.

4) Treating all new hires as similar, regardless of their education or experience.

5) Giving recruits a complete knowledge of the time required to become a functioning employee rather than offering an ambiguous timetable.

6) Providing experienced employees as role models for the newcomers to follow.

7) Stripping away any personal characteristics of the recruits rather than treating them as individuals.

In a culture like a political office, employees usually must have active acceptance in order to survive. Employees unquestioningly agree to and participate in the culture that the leader installs.

With an autocratic leadership style, the leader centralizes authority, dictates work methods, limits employee participation and makes work related decisions (Lewin 1938). This seems to be the prevailing behavioral style of elected officials. Another dominate behavior is that the elected leader initiates the structure with little concern for the followers. In this context the leader defines the structure and the roles of the followers in attaining his or her goals (Stogdill 1957).

In this context, the followers may have a very different assessment of the organizational culture dimensions from the actual to the ideal. While the elected official may be satisfied with the organizational culture, the followers may have a very different perception.

In order to analyze the culture in a political office context, I am interested in testing several hypothesis:

1) HO. Members accept and reward leadership based on expertise and is not significant in the context of rewards and support.

2) HI. Members' leadership is not rewarded and is significant in the context of rewards and support.

3) HO. Members accept and reward leadership based on expertise and is not significant in the context of organizational clarity, standards, responsibility and conformity.

4) H1. Members leadership is not rewarded and is significant in the context of conformity, responsibility, standards and organizational clarity.

METHOD

Kolb, Osland and Rubin developed a questionnaire for employees to respond to seven organizational culture dimensions in order to ascertain if the actual culture was similar to the ideal culture (Kolb 1995). In an environment of a political office, the actual culture may be quite a bit different from the ideal. While the elected official may profess to be a transformational leader to the public, the working of the office may be not the ideal and actual quite autocratic. In order to test the hypothesis presented, the questionnaire was distributed to 250 county employees who are under the umbrella of the three member county commission.

The questionnaire was returned by 53 employees or a response rate 21% which resulted as my sample and testing. Each question was answered twice in the context of how the employee assessed the actual position and what the employee thought the ideal position should be. These questions helped test my null hypothesis in that the leadership was associated with the dimensions asked. In testing the data, the research required an examination of what is the perception of the employee from the actual to the ideal. The normal demographic questions were not included in the survey because the research was specific as to the hypothesis

tested. The seven dimension criteria were: conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organizational clarity warmth and support and leadership (see Exhibit 1). The actual and ideal were answered on a scale of 1 to 10 as a feeling barometer. Both the actual and ideal were tested using leadership as the dependent variable and rewards and support as one set of independent variables and conformity, responsibility, standards and organizational clarity as the other set of independent variables. The equations tested were $Y=B1+B2+u$ and $Y=B1+B2+B3+B4+u$.

RESULTS-ACTUAL

In the first set of data, leadership was regressed against the variables support and rewards. For leadership, a one on the 10 scale was that leadership is not rewarded and members are dominated or dependent and resist leadership. A ten on the scale indicates that members accept and reward leadership based on expertise. An answer on the lower end would indicate that transformational leadership is not present. The lower end of the rewards variable indicates that members are ignored, punished or criticized while the upper end of the scale indicates that members are recognized and rewarded positively. The lower end answer to the rewards indicates a lack of transformational leadership. The second variable regressed against was warmth and support. A lower end result indicates that there is no warmth and support in the organization and an upper scale result indicates that warmth and support are very characteristic of the organization. The lower end result indicates a lack of transformational leadership.

The means of the variables were as follows: leadership-3.32, support-3.26, and rewards-3.20; all very low means which indicates a lack of transformational leadership is present. The standard deviations were all very close, 1.78, 1.66, 1.72 which indicates how much the value deviated from the mean. The Pearson correlation indicated that all the variables are closely correlated due to the fact that all the numbers were .953 or higher. In the Significance 1-tailed test, all of the variables are significant in that they were less than .05 (they were all .000).

In the model summary, the R Squared was .933 which shows that the independent variables chosen for this model are explained by the variables 93% of the time which is very high. The adjusted R Squared was .930 which indicates that the independent variables explain 93% of the error in the model. The Sig. F Change is .000 which is the estimated sum of the squares which indicates that the null hypothesis should be rejected that there is no relationship between leadership and support and rewards.

Examining the ANOVA table shows that the ESS or the explained sum of the squares was 154.45 and the TSS, the total sum of the squares is 165.547. This is a quantification of the errors and indicates the explained value of the model which is 93%. The F statistic of 347.94 is well above the F stat of 3.23 which again indicates that the null hypothesis should be rejected. Again the ANOVA table has a sig. of .000 which is the probability to reject at the .05.

The coefficients indicate that the equation is as follows: $Y=$constant $B1+B2+B3$ or $Y=-1.856E-02B1+.644B2+.386B3$. The t values are all higher than .05 (-.129, 4.345, 2.693) so we fail to reject the null to satisfy B1 or B2 could be equal to zero so their might not be a relationship between the dependent and independent variables. On the significance level both

independent variables were very low (.000 and .010). the lower the value the more significant the coefficients or the probability of rejecting a true hypothesis. Using a 95% confidence interval, if zero is between the range, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship is rejected. In this case zero is not between, thus

the null is accepted. The residual statistics are the stats for the residuals which are used to check violations of the regression model.

The histogram in this model indicates the frequency of the dependent variable and the standardized residuals. The histogram answers the question of do we have a sample with a perfect standard deviation and variance. This tells us if our standardized errors of the population are normally distributed. In this model the standard deviation is .98 which makes the variance .96; very close to 1.0 which is indicates that the standard errors are normally distributed. Both the normal P-P plot and the Scatterplot indicate a pattern so there is not a normal distribution of the standardized residuals. This indicates that the residuals have not biased the model.

The next actual leadership results are regressed against clarity, standards, responsibility and conformity. In these results the means are very low (3.16 to 3.35) and close for all the variables except conformity (7.69). All of the standard deviations are very close. The Pearson correlation indicated that there were correlations of the variables except for conformity. It should be noted that the correlations were weaker in this model. The explanation of the model was also weaker with an R squared of .833 and an adjusted R squared of .819. the significant F change is .000 for the model so the null hypothesis for the model should be rejected the analysis of variance (ANOVA) has an F value of 9.857 which is greater than the F value of 3.83 therefore this also indicates the null should be rejected for the model.

The model equation is $Y=B1+B2+B3+B4+B5+u$ or $Y=-.898B1+.283B2+.145B3+.655B4+9.151E-02B5+u$. The t test revealed that perhaps several of the variables should not be included in the model. The 2-t rule of thumb states that if the degrees of freedom is 20 or more (which it is in the model) and if the level of significance is set at .05, then the null hypothesis can be rejected if the t value is more than "2' (Gujarati 2003). In the model, both standards and conformity are below the 2.0 threshold to reject the null. As to the significance values, they also conclude that conformity and standards should not be part of the model because they exceed .05 (.435 and .23; clarity is right on the border of the analysis).

The analysis using the 95% confidence intervals reveals mixed results as to rejecting the null. In the responsibility variable, zero does not fall between lower and upper bounds so in that case the null would not be rejected. The histogram shows a close to natural curve with a standard deviation of .96. The normal plot and scatter plot both reveal a linear relationship.

Results-ideal

The means for leadership, support and rewards were very close (7.52, 7.51, and 7.54) with very close standard deviations. The Pearson Correlation showed that the variables were closely correlated. The model summary showed that the R squared was .996 and the adjusted R squared was also .996. This indicates that the independent variables chosen explained by the variables were 99.6% and the 99.6% of the error was xplained by the model. The significant F change was

.000 which indicates that at .05 the null should be rejected.

The ANOVA showed an F value of 6260.47 which is well above the critical F, therefore one should reject the null that B1=0. The coefficients yield a linear equation of Y=2990E-02B1+.496B2+.500B3+u. For the t test both support and rewards are well above "2" so the null can be rejected. This finding is also supported by the significance of the coefficients. For variables, zero is outside the interval so each variable is rejected that Ho+B2+0. In rejecting it indicates a relationship between the variables.

The histogram has a near perfect standard deviation at .98 and is evenly distributed. Both the normal P-Plot and the scatter-plot indicated a linear relationship. Therefore the all of tests analyzed indicated a strong relationship of the variables and the model is very strong and be relied upon.

Leadership regressed against the variables clarity, standards. Responsibility and conformity yielded weaker results overall. Except for conformity, the means of the other variables in this model were very similar (7.47 to7.52). In the Pearson correlation, all were closely related except for conformity. Actually, if the scale for conformity were reversed, the results would have showed that conformity was also similar in the mean and in the correlation. Both the R squared and the adjusted R squared were very high at .996. In the change statistics the sig. F change was .000 indicating the null should be rejected.

The ANOVA produced a very strong F value at 3011.056 and the sig. factor was .000 both strongly indicating the null hypothesis should be rejected. The model of the coefficients yielded the following equation: Y=-1.156E-02B1+ .501B2+.493B3+5.793E-03B4+5.278E-03B5+u. The values and the significance of the coefficients indicate that for the variables clarity and standards the null should be rejected but for responsibility and conformity it is failing to reject the null. This indicates there might not be a relationship between these variables and the dependent variable of leadership. Also, the 95% lower and upper bound indicates that we cannot reject the null for the same variables. Both the Histogram and the normal P-Plot and scatter plot indicate linear relationships of the variables and that standard deviation of .96 to very close 1.0 with a normal distribution of the standardized errors.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of the survey was to examine how the employees of a large county organization assessed the organizations culture. The same questions were asked on an actual scale then on an ideal scale. All of the data indicated that there are wide discrepancies between how the employees evaluate the actual state and how they perceive what the ideal should be. The central question as to leadership showed that leadership is not rewarded on an employee level and that the members are dominated by an autocratic style. This indicates that what is projected to the public in many cases as progressive, transformational leadership is not translated to the employees.

On a scale of 1 to 10, the differences of all the tested variables (leadership, support, rewards, organizational clarity, responsibility, and standards) were approximately "4" means for the actual from the ideal which translates into a large difference. This indicates large employee dissatisfaction with the style of management of the elected officials. The

transformational qualities that are imbedded in the culture of the organization are for the most part not present. These lacking qualities are:

1) Members accept and reward leadership based on expertise.

2) Warmth and support are very characteristic of the organization.

3) The organization is well organized with clear defined goals.

4) Members are recognized and rewarded positively.

5) High challenging standards are set in the organization.

6) There is great emphasis on personal responsibility in the organization.

7) Conformity is not characteristic in the organization.

In order to test the strength of the variables and their relationship to each other, leadership was regressed against support and rewards for actual and ideal results. Leadership was again regressed against organizational clarity, standards, responsibility and conformity. In the case of actual and ideal, the regression tested results were very strong and indicated that the null hypothesis should be rejected. The null hypothesis that members accept and reward leadership based on expertise and is not significant in the context of rewards and support should be rejected. While the tested results were not as strong as the first null hypothesis, the null hypothesis that members accept and reward leadership based on expertise and is not significant in the context of organizational clarity, standards, responsibility and conformity should also be rejected.

REGRESSION

Notes		
Output Created		30-JUN-2005 14 45 04
Comments		
Input	Data	A actual sav
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	53
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on cases with no missing values for any variable used
Syntax		REGRESSION /DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N /MISSING LISTWISE /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS CI R ANOVA CHANGE ZPP /CRITERIA=PIN(05) POUT(10) /NOORIGIN /DEPENDENT leadersh /METHOD=ENTER support rewards /SCATTERPLOT=(leadersh) *ZPRED) /RESIDUALS HIST(ZRESID) NORM(ZRESID)
Resources	Memory Required	1436 bytes
	Additional Memory Required for Residual Plots	904 bytes
	Elapsed Time	0 00 00 06

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
LEADERSH	3 3208	1 78426	53
SUPPORT	3 2642	1 66584	53
REWARDS	3 2075	1 72491	53

CORRELATIONS

Correlations

		LEADERSH	SUPPORT	REWARDS
Pearson Correlation	LEADERSH	1.000	.961	.953
	SUPPORT	.961	1.000	.964
	REWARDS	.953	.964	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	LEADERSH		.000	.000
	SUPPORT	.000		.000
	REWARDS	.000	.000	
N	LEADERSH	53	53	53
	SUPPORT	53	53	53
	REWARDS	53	53	53

VARIABLES ENTERED/REMOVED(B)

Variables Entered/Removed(b)

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	REWARDS, SUPPORT(a)	.	Enter

a All requested variables entered.

b Dependent Variable: LEADERSH

Model Summary(b)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.966(a)	.933	.930	.47111	.933	347.943	2	50	.000

a Predictors: (Constant), REWARDS, SUPPORT

b Dependent Variable: LEADERSH

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	154.450	2	77.225	347.943	.000(a)
	Residual	11.097	50	.222		
	Total	165.547	52			

a Predictors: (Constant), REWARDS, SUPPORT

b Dependent Variable: LEADERSH

Coefficients(a)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Correlations Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	-1.856E-02	.144		-.129	.898	-.307	.270			
	SUPPORT	.644	.148	.601	4.345	.000	.346	.942	.961	.524	.159
	REWARDS	.366	.143	.373	2.693	.010	.098	.673	.953	.356	.099

a Dependent Variable: LEADERSH

Casewise Diagnostics(a)

Case Number	Std. Residual	LEADERSH
6	3.969	7.00

a Dependent Variable: LEADERSH

Residuals Statistics(a)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	1.0112	8.2191	3.3208	1.72342	53
Residual	-1.2994	1.8700	.0000	.46196	53
Std. Predicted Value	-1.340	2.842	.000	1.000	53
Std. Residual	-2.758	3.969	.000	.981	53

a Dependent Variable: LEADERSH

EXHIBIT I, SURVEY

For each of the seven organizational culture dimensions described, place an (a) below the number that indicates your assessment of the organization's actual position on that dimension and an (i) below the number that indicates your choice of where the organization should ideally be on this dimension.

1.   Conformity. The feeling that there are many externally imposed constraints in the organization: the degree to which members feel that there are many rules, procedures, policies, and practices to which they have to conform rather than able to do their work as they see fit. Lowest number: conformity is not characteristic of the organization. Highest number: conformity is very characteristic of this organization.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

2.   Responsibility. Members of the organization are given personal responsibility to achieve their part of the organization's goals: the degree to which the members feel that they can make decisions and solve problems without checking with superiors each step of the way. Lowest number: no responsibility is given in the organization. Highest number: there is a great emphasis on personal responsibility in the organization.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

3.   Standards. The emphasis the organization places on quality performance and outstanding production, including the degree to which members feel the organization is setting challenging goals for itself and communicating these goal commitments to members. Lowest number: standards are very low or nonexistent in the organization. Highest number: high challenging standards are set in the organization.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

4.   Rewards. The degree to which members feel that they are being recognized and rewarded for good work rather than being ignored, criticized, or punished when something goes wrong. Lowest number: members are ignored, punished or criticized. Highest number: members are recognized and rewarded positively.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

5.   Organizational clarity. The feeling among members that things are well organized and that goals are clearly defined rather than being disorderly, confused, or chaotic. Lowest number: the organization is disorderly, confused and chaotic. Highest number: the organization is well organized with clearly defined goals. 1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

6.   Warmth and support. The feeling that friendliness is a valued norm in the organization, that members trust on another and offer support ot one another. The feeling that good relationships prevail in the work environment. Lowest number: there is no warmth and support in the organization. Highest number: warmth and support are very characteristic of the organization.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

7.   Leadership. The willingness of organization members to accept leadership and direction from qualified others. As needs for leadership arise, members feel free to take leadership roles and are rewarded for successful leadership. Leadership is based

on expertise. The organization is not dominated, or dependent on, one or two individuals. Lowest number: leadership is not rewarded; members are dominated or dependent and resist leadership attempts. Highest number: members accept and reward leadership based on expertise.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

Source: From Kolb, Osland, Rubin, "Organizational Behavior: An Experimental Approach". 6/E, pp. 34.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*(Winter): 26-40.

Gujarati, D. N. (2003). *Basic econometrics*. Boston, McGraw Hill.

Hatch, M. J. (1993). The dynamics of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Review* 18: 657-693.

Kolb, O., rubin (1995). *Organizational behavior: An Experimental approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.

Lewin, K. a. L., R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note. *Sociometry 1*: 292-300.

Stogdill, R. H., Coons, A.E. (1957). *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*. Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research. Columbus.

Van Maanen, J. (1978). People processing: Strategies of organizational socialization. *Organizational Dynamics* 7(1): 19-36.

F

THE UTILITY OF CONSTRUCTIVE INQUIRY IN ORGANIZATIONAL ALIGNMENT
By Michael Duane Schuler, Walden University

ABSTRACT

Many different organizational development models deal with human behavior and relationship-building capacities, but most can be cumbersome and exhausting to use. The challenge for the manager is to facilitate alignment between employee behaviors and organizational values, which in turn can improve the overarching effectiveness of the enterprise.

The focus of this study investigated the relationship between an inquiry technique and an organizational development framework. Constructive inquiry (CI) is a change-agent that is easy to facilitate for the manager who has daily operational duties. The methodology included three measures: self aligned with organization (SOA), manager practices aligned with organizational values (MPAOV), and productivity (P) that served as dependent variables and explored the extent to which (percentage of change) employee behavior is aligned with organizational values. In summary, the three data sets revealed that CI did two things very well. First, it maintained and sometimes increased the capacity for an improved relationship between manager and employee. Second, it improved productivity in a cross-functional work environment.

CI has implications for employees, managers, and organizations. The ease with which it is facilitated and the changing nature of the social demographic in the United States may transcend social barriers such as race, ethnicity, gender, and religion.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this study is to investigate the relationship between an inquiry technique and an organizational development framework. Constructive inquiry (CI) is a change-agent that is easy to facilitate for the manager who has daily operational duties. Based on human behavior theories, CI strengthens relationship among employees (members of an organization) so that the organization may increases productivity. A model like CI is socially relevant, especially given the highly competitive marketplace of a global economy and the need for an operational organizational change model.

This chapter identifies the problem, background, purpose, significance, theoretical base, assumptions and limitations, research questions, and key terms in this study. Chapter 2 introduces theories and current literature relevant to the components of CI such as appreciative inquiry and cooperative inquiry. Chapter 3 discusses the quasi-experimental methodology used in this investigation, including qualitative and quantitative measures. Chapter 4 reports the data from alignment measures: (a) self with organization alignment (SOA), (b) managerial practices aligned with organizational values (MPAOV), and (c) increased productivity (P) in the manufacturing line. Chapter 5 interprets, analyzes, and addresses the social relevance of the model.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Many different organizational development models deal with human behavior and relationship-building capacities, but most are cumbersome and can be exhausting to use (Bowers, 2002; Schundt, 2000; Secretan, 1997; Wesorick, Shiparski, Troseth, & Wyngarden, 1997). The challenge for the manager is to facilitate alignment among employee behaviors and organizational values, which in turn can improve the overarching effectiveness of the enterprise. The problem, then, is that many managers do not have the time to participate in lengthy training sessions to learn a new facilitative or leadership technique.

CI, by utilizing teachable moments and asking three simple questions, can address the needs of the modern-day manager. Limited by time and financial restrictions, managers can use CI to build relationships among their workgroup. At the same time, the manager understands the varying degrees of alignment between employee behavior and organizational values.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Alignment of employee behavior and organizational values is a critical expectation of many organizational development models (Hansen, 2001; Johnson, 1993; Kaplan & Norton, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 1995). How a company facilitates this alignment can either affirm (Johnson, 1996; Secretan, 1997) or damage organizational development initiatives (Mele, 2001; Mouzelis, 1995). A technique is needed that facilitates alignment within an organization, promoting human relationships in the workplace (Gardner, Csikszentmihalyi, & Damon, 2001).

Organizational change is the only constant in today's workplace. Therefore, the need to continually realign employee behaviors and organizational values also becomes a constant. Constructive inquiry (CI)--a