

## CHAPTER 9

# Leadership and Followership



### Learning Objective

To recognize the importance of leadership, its basic functions, qualifications for leadership, the forms that leadership takes, and relationships between leaders and followers.

### Principles

Leaders are people who make decisions within organizations and cause others to support and implement these decisions. Leaders utilize rewards, imperative force, and interpretations of culture to obtain the collaboration of others. Leadership in its highest form develops a common understanding with followers and changes their basic ways of thinking. Leaders engage in distinct forms of behavior, such as

- Taking initiative
- Evaluating followers' needs, aspirations, and capabilities
- Maintaining relationships within the organization
- Founding relationships with other organizations
- Collecting and disseminating information
- Providing the resources needed to achieve success
- Representing members' aspirations and values



People recognized as leaders often have traits suggesting ability to command. These traits include drive, desire to lead, self-confidence, intelligence, and outstanding capabilities in technical areas valued by the organization. But leadership also requires being a good team member and maintaining the trust of others.

An individual's natural gifts do not alone enable him or her to become a leader. Individual capabilities must match the organization's specific needs and mesh well with its history and culture. There are many different kinds of leaders, some performing routine organizational functions, others guiding organizations through great transformations.

The outlook and behavior of followers help determine whether a leader can function effectively. Subordinates make their best contributions by being neither habitually critical nor always supportive of the leader's outlook, methods, and objectives.

## The Importance of Leadership

---

Modern observers of organizations are often dismissive of leadership. They argue, for example, that factors such as structure and culture determine much, if not most, individual action. Structure, rules, and regulations, it is contended, tie the hands of people in leadership positions as securely as they govern the lowest operative. Chapter 1 of this book characterized leaders in formal organizations as "impersonal," promoted to their positions due to standard qualifications and closely constrained by structure. Many investigations have highlighted the limits of leadership. In a classic case study, for example, Guest attributes the success of a plant manager not to his leadership capabilities but to favorable treatment by the parent company.<sup>1</sup>

This belittling of leadership represents, in part, a reaction to overemphasis on leadership in the past. Historians and the public have often attributed humankind's great achievements to great individuals. Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte of France (1769–1821), vividly depicted astride a rearing horse, personifies the "great man" of history. His genius alone, some have maintained, enabled Europe to throw off the last vestiges of the Middle Ages and enter the modern era. Every schoolchild has learned that George Washington is the "father of his country." Names like Albert Einstein, Martin Luther King, and Bill Gates are household words. In the opinion of many, these and similar giants have magically transformed the world by virtue of personal gifts.

Several factors have led to downgrading leadership as a force in organizations as well as in society as a whole. Some of the most visible leaders of the 20th century were dictatorial rulers. Men like Hitler and Stalin wreaked death and terror throughout the world. Lesser tyrants such as Fidel Castro and Saddam Hussein terrorized only their own countrymen and -women. The excesses of these individuals have bred mistrust of leaders. Americans, due to their egalitarian political culture, tend to be suspicious even of leaders who have won election by legitimate means.

As if in response to the hero worship of yesteryear, writers today often “deconstruct” the famous of past generations. *Deconstruction* in this context means critically reanalyzing the lives and achievements of history’s leaders and other important figures. Famous writers and scientists are known to have stolen the ideas, creations, and inventions of subordinates, friends, colleagues, and lovers. Political leaders have fared especially poorly in the light of such reanalysis. President Lyndon Johnson (1908–1973), for example, is alleged to have shirked military service in World War II, wronged his wife, and won a key election by smearing his opponent and stealing votes.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the distaste of some, leadership remains one of the most important subjects in the study of organizations. Books about leadership jam the management sections of bookstores and line the shelves of executive offices. The word itself creates a sense of excitement. An understanding of leadership and the criteria by which leaders should be judged is important for everyone involved in an organization: the leaders themselves, members of the organization who are not leaders, and outsiders who depend on the organization’s performance, such as government agency clients and corporate stockholders.

Leadership is clearly important to organizations. People in leadership roles carry out functions that are indispensable. Organizations may deal with routine matters most of the time, but unexpected events demand leadership. Organizations comprise integrated systems of roles, backed up by rewards, imperative force, and culture—but actual human beings determine when and how to utilize the specific resources available under these systems. Leaders evaluate how well the organization and its components are working. They take initiative in exercising oversight and developing remedies. Leaders express the organization’s purpose and often the values and aspirations of its members. Leadership gives a human voice to abstract statements of mandate, mission, and vision. The memos that issue from the leader’s office, the thoughts he or she exchanges with members of every rank, and the speeches he or she makes on important occasions enliven the organization, promoting achievement of its objectives.

Leadership is and will always remain a topic of importance for a separate reason. Many people want to become leaders. Something fundamental in human nature makes people desire to be the boss. Often, extrinsic factors impel people to seek leadership positions. In modern formal organizations, leaders typically earn more money and enjoy better surroundings at work. They receive more social contacts than followers and are more likely to have their telephone calls and e-mails returned. Leadership brings with it visibility, which increases the likelihood of promotions and competing offers from other organizations. Leaders receive the respect of others. Finally, people in leadership positions have better opportunities and more resources to carry out personal projects and move the organization in the directions they desire.

People also desire to become leaders for purely intrinsic reasons. Becoming a leader and functioning effectively in this role raises the individual’s self-esteem. Many people simply desire to be “out front.” Others feel frustrated working under the plans and agendas of others.

Leadership is important for organizations, finally, because of the conflicts and issues it may raise. Leadership struggles take place in every type of organization. Losers in corporate conflicts over leadership often lose their jobs; losers in struggles over leadership in some governments, political parties, and organized crime entities may forfeit their lives. Palace revolutions, coups, corporate takeovers, and street shoot-outs often are really contests over leadership. In more restrained settings, the succession of new leaders after a key executive's death or retirement can constitute a major challenge. The process of allocating leadership slots can be quite costly to an organization if mishandled.

An understanding of the functions and characteristics of leaders can be valuable to people who aspire to leadership positions. Perhaps more important, such an understanding allows people to recognize good leadership. Those promoted into leadership positions do not always have accurate ideas about what such roles involve. Heroes created by mass media, whether fictional or real, provide a very limited view of leadership. People in leadership positions require a more balanced picture.

People in the position of follower can also benefit from a comprehensive understanding of leadership. Those responsible for carrying out the directives of others deserve good leadership. Consistently effective leadership requires partnership between leaders and followers in a fashion that meets the needs and advances the objectives of both.

An understanding of leadership has practical importance for subordinates. In modern organizations, subordinates constantly ask questions about the competence and style of their superiors. An understanding of leadership enables followers to ask the appropriate questions and act accordingly. Pertinent issues may involve how much loyalty a follower owes his or her leaders and what level of performance the leader is entitled to request. Dilemmas of this kind are not new. A New Testament parable states, "Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's; render unto God what is God's." As emperor of Rome, Caesar was all-powerful. But people still questioned what they legitimately owed him and what they were entitled to withhold.

Leadership in a free society presents a paradox. People value liberty, yet realize that collective activity requires leadership. Constraint experienced by people in organizations becomes physically visible in conflicts with superiors. An important feature of modern organizations makes the paradox yet more vexing. Few roles in organizations today involve only leadership. Most leaders have superiors up the line. Large numbers of people today must deal simultaneously with the dilemmas of both leadership and followership.

## Who Leaders Are

---

Most people can recognize leadership without reading a textbook. Every human being has experienced the leadership of others. In any group, however, people's discussion about their leaders would reveal some surprises. Leadership occurs in unexpected places and is exercised by people who do not immediately look like leaders.

People with titles and uniforms suggestive of leadership, moreover, do not always function as leaders.

Observers of leadership often focus on hierarchy and power. A definition consistent with this view casts leadership as “a relationship between people in which influence and power are unevenly distributed on a legitimate basis.”<sup>3</sup> Legitimacy refers to the individual consenting to submit by signing a contract, recognizing a relevant tradition, or accepting a principle acknowledging the leader’s superiority.

The hierarchical view of leadership is certainly applicable to organizations. Formal organizations designate places in their structures that provide resources and opportunities for leadership. Organization charts indicate roles whose responsibilities, wholly or in part, include leadership functions. People who plan, direct, oversee, evaluate, and reward the activities of others occupy positions in which leadership may be exercised.

Other conceptions of leadership, though, de-emphasize hierarchy and control. James MacGregor Burns sees leadership in terms of awakening convictions within a collectivity and giving common direction to the desires and aspirations of individual members. A political scientist, Burns thinks of the organization as a *polity*, that is, a body whose members share resources, needs, and communal feelings. According to Burns, leadership is exercised when “persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers.”<sup>4</sup> This view of leadership downplays command structure. Instead, it emphasizes a sharing of common cause between leaders and followers.

Burns makes a strong distinction between leadership and the exercise of “naked power.” Influence, though not a true imperative force, can play an important part in the exercise of leadership. As described in Chapter 7, influence results in voluntary compliance or agreement. People of influence may persuade others but may, alternatively, find themselves looked to as references to validate decisions or endorse strategies. Influential people can change many minds in an organization.

Still, imperative force is a major asset in the exercise of leadership. So is reward. Many leaders depend on their control over the organization’s resources for cohesion and coordination.

Leadership occurs in many forms, but ultimately boils down to two capabilities: (1) selecting among alternative courses of action and (2) bringing and keeping other people on board.

Leaders accomplish these functions by

- Deciding upon objectives and means for attaining them
- Capturing the attention, energy, and commitment of others
- Expressing and representing the needs, values, and aspirations of others
- Impelling others to think and act in a desired manner through rewards and punishment

Whether conceived as exercise of power or mobilization through persuasion or through exchange of valuable things, leadership involves decision. Alone or in collaboration with others, leaders select among alternative perspectives and directions open to the organization. Then, leaders utilize their personal resources or those of the organization to involve and motivate others to implement their decisions.

This essential function of leadership can be accomplished within a wide variety of roles and through many different forms of action. People in many different positions in organizations function as leaders. Some slots offer their occupants more opportunity for leadership than others. The places where leadership occurs illustrate the multiplicity of forms this function may take. Many forms of leadership may be observed in a single organization. Within most organizations, for example, leadership of both a formal and informal nature may be recognized.

## Formal Leadership

---

People in positions of formal leadership have authority over others. Their leadership status is designated by formal titles such as foreman, lieutenant, director, chief executive officer, and president. In modern organizations, basic duties of people in these positions are specified in articles of incorporation, bylaws, and job descriptions. An earlier chapter distinguished formal from informal structure. Formal authority, which characterizes modern organizations, provides a framework for leadership in its most visible form.

Generally, people in formal leadership positions are referred to as administrators, managers, and executives. These words are often used interchangeably. Actually, they indicate positions in which different kinds and levels of leadership are possible. Administrators, managers, and executives are distinguished from each other by two properties of their positions: *scope* and *discretion*. Scope refers to the range of people and operations over which they exercise potential leadership. Discretion refers to the amount of choice they have in making their decisions and doing their work.

### Administrators

Administrators oversee operations whose objectives and methods are determined by others. Their scope of work is restricted to a specific area of organizational functioning, perhaps a single unit or subunit. Typically, administrators have little discretion over the instructions given to workers or the rewards they may distribute.

Administrators may have formal authority over workers, including operatives and professional staff. But they make few, if any, decisions about the operation as a whole. The administrator of a state prison, for example, may review the performance of guards and take action in the event of irregularities. But he or she usually operates "by the book." Civil service laws mandate personnel practices. Separate agencies determine expansion and capital improvement plans. In the event of

serious problems (such as a prison riot), higher authorities may give instruction or take over the operation entirely. George Nolan, the assistant principal at Hamilton Middle School described in Chapter 4, communicates policy to teachers and enforces rules regarding pupils but does not establish direction.

Administrators often work under the direct authority of others. Physicians in a professional partnership, for example, may hire an administrator to handle routine business matters. The administrator hires and supervises office staff such as secretaries and bookkeepers. He or she deals with issues that may arise with insurance companies and may be involved in the purchase of equipment and pharmaceuticals. But the administrator merely implements the principles established by the partners.

Administrative positions give their occupants some opportunities for leadership. Speaking for the organization, they transmit policy and express purpose. They do not, however, set direction or determine nonroutine use of resources. Administrators lack sufficient discretion to exercise much leadership.

## Managers

Like administrators, managers spend a significant proportion of their time supervising and evaluating the work of others and monitoring income and expenditures. Managers, though, hold responsibility for the achievements, prosperity, and ultimately, the survival of their units.

Unlike the responsibilities of administrators, those of managers include decision making, direction setting, and ensuring acceptable outcomes. Managers have at least partial responsibility for setting the objectives of their units. Managers engage in strategic planning. They negotiate with their superiors regarding criteria for acceptable or outstanding performance.

Managers, moreover, are heavily involved in procuring the wherewithal required to meet their objectives. Unlike administrators, they do not simply receive allocations of money and personnel. Managers negotiate with higher authorities for such resources. In the private sector and in some public agencies, managers have major responsibility for obtaining revenue. Managers meet this requirement through processes such as developing new products, influencing legislators, applying for grants, soliciting gifts, and a thousand other procedures of both ancient and recent vintage.

## Executives

The term *executive* connotes membership in upper-level management. Executives are usually thought to include division managers, vice presidents, presidents, and their aides. In day-to-day conversation, the term *executive* is synonymous with prestige and high rank.

As early as the 1930s, Chester Barnard formulated a conception of the executive that is still widely used today. Barnard was himself a high-ranking executive in the telephone industry. He defined the executive as a person whose contribution was

## The Manager of a Research and Development Department

The holder of a management position in an organization resembles that of an independent businessperson. As an example, consider the manager of a corporate research and development (R&D) unit. This unit's responsibilities include developing products for the parent company as well as carrying out advanced scientific research. The unit's dual functions are interrelated. Advanced research serves as the basis for development of future products. The parent company may manufacture these products itself or offer the technologies to other companies in exchange for financial compensation.

The R&D manager's primary responsibilities include setting objectives and procuring resources. These processes are carried out through negotiation with parent company officials. Company officials may demand that the laboratory produce a new computer component in no more than a year. Knowing that such a task will take considerably longer, the manager must persuade his superiors to accept this larger limit. Corporate officials may ask the manager to commit to obtaining significant outside funds through contracts to perform basic research for the government or develop products for other companies. The R&D manager needs to negotiate achievable objectives in this area, too.

The R&D manager must negotiate for resources appropriate to the objectives for which he or she accepts responsibility. Upper management may desire to cut personnel while adding to the unit's performance requirements. Here, too, the R&D manager must enter into hard negotiation.

Managers may achieve short-term peace by acquiescing to their superiors' initial requests. But in such acquiescence, the manager incurs substantial risk. Failure may mean loss of face, diminution of promotion chances, or termination.

Apart from negotiation with superiors, the R&D manager must direct, motivate, and inspire staff. This process requires utilization of resources provided by the organization for the achievement of cohesion and coordination in support of specific objectives. The manager allocates rewards, exercises imperative force, and appeals to organizational culture. He or she transmits the directives of the broader organization and interprets policy for local application.

It is obvious that people in management positions have more opportunity for leadership than those in administrative slots. True managers have decision-making power over objectives and exercise discretion over use of organizational resources. Even administrators whose scope of work extends over several organizational units have fewer opportunities to act as leaders.

“maintaining the organization in operation” rather than performing its production-related tasks.<sup>5</sup>

According to Barnard, the executive does not directly manage other individuals. Rather, he or she maintains the cooperative effort required to keep the organization functioning as a unified whole. The executive's key function is formulating the organization's purpose. Such formulation is a continuous process, carried out in communication with colleagues and subordinates. The executive, according to Barnard, promotes constant reevaluation of purpose and its reformulation when necessitated by changing conditions. The executive carries out these functions by hiring appropriate individuals, ensuring the continuous flow of intelligence, and making sure that managers and other executives maintain required contact with each other.



More recently developed conceptions of the executive are consistent with Barnard's. According to James MacGregor Burns, the job of the executive is to promote the unity, cohesion, order, and performance of the collectivity as a whole. In a formal organization, this includes establishing required processes, seeing that key functions are carried out, and understanding the perspectives and needs of subordinates and other executives.

To summarize, executive functions emphasize identification of purpose and maintenance of cohesion. These functions lend themselves to exercise of leadership. Identification of direction, particularly when several alternatives are available, is a key outcome of leadership. Building teamwork among management personnel and other executives is itself an important form of leadership. The executive's hierarchical position contributes to his or her leadership potential. Executives stand above the heads of multiple operating units and can command significant organizational resources.

It is important to note that people who occupy upper-level slots in an organization's hierarchy do not always exercise leadership. Administrative positions typically have little discretion over decision making and thus offer little opportunity for leadership. People in management and executive slots generally have more discretion and often greater scope. These factors present opportunities for leadership. But not everyone takes advantage of these opportunities. Not every executive and manager decides upon a specific direction in which he or she prefers to see the organization progress. Not every executive or manager captures the energies of others or uses them to advance objectives he or she supports.

Constraints in the form of organizational structure, politics, and culture inhibit managers and executives from taking leadership. Structure in some organizations leaves even top officers little discretion. Politics and culture create risks of punishment for failure, discouraging executives and managers from taking initiative. Finally, not every manager or executive desires to assume a leadership role.

## Informal Leadership

---

Just as leadership may be absent where it is expected, leadership often appears in unexpected places. Occupying a high-level position does not make an individual a leader. In fact, people who do not occupy high-level positions in the formal hierarchy sometime emerge as leaders.

Organizations, it should be remembered, encompass more than formal structure. Over and above the mandates of formal relationships, organizations host networks of informal ties. These networks add richness and complexity to organizational functioning. Informal ties give rise to primary groups, whose members share information, encouragement, and support.

As detailed earlier, primary groups develop their own leadership structure. According to ethnographies, heads of families function as leaders among the Nuer. Classical sociology records how young men willing to make sacrifices for their buddies became leaders of Boston gangs. Spontaneous social process and formation of groups among people in direct communication with each other occur within formal organizations. Primary social ties exist alongside formal ones.

It is natural for people linked by informal ties to select their own leaders. Observers of organizations have noted many types of informal leaders. A few examples illustrate the phenomenon of informal leadership within formal organizations.

### Task Leaders

Even organizational units that operate under strict rules rely on informal social ties to accomplish tasks. Generally, leaders emerge in primary groups composed of individuals connected by informal social ties. Even though they lack official position, leaders of these groups help assign tasks, set production goals, and determine the pace of work.

Some of the most cohesive informal groups in formal organizations develop among individuals occupying the same workspace and performing a common task. The Hawthorne studies cited earlier illustrate the importance of primary groups in task performance. In the Hawthorne assembly operation, groups influenced productivity within the limits acceptable to most members. Other task groups increased productivity, though, as members divided up elements of the task, faster individuals helped slower ones, and an atmosphere of mutual encouragement developed.

In the informal task group, leadership may be given to the individual with the greatest seniority, best technical skill, or most personal assertiveness. Sometimes, an individual becomes leader of a task group merely because others habitually look to him or her to initiate activity or solve problems.

### Socioemotional Leaders

Previous chapters have referred to two basic functions of human collectivities: *instrumental* and *socioemotional*. Instrumental functions refer to accomplishment of concrete tasks, carried out for creation of concrete products and services. Socioemotional functions refer to nonmaterial, though personally gratifying, communications and activities that are part of nearly every human group: personal validation, companionship, recreation, and expressions of esteem.

The task leaders described above may also be characterized as *instrumental* leaders. Similarly, people who take initiative and engage others on a social or emotional level are known as *socioemotional leaders*.

In most primary groups, individuals emerge who are especially skilled and forthcoming in personal and emotional matters. These people are socioemotional leaders—those people approached in a crisis for sympathy. They arrange birthday celebrations and department outings. They raise questions about how members of the group feel regarding speedups, cutbacks, and layoffs. They make people feel at ease about expressing themselves, drawing them out for detail. Socioemotional leaders are the first to praise others in their group in recognition of distinctions and achievements.

Though less material than that of the task or instrumental leader, the socioemotional leader's function is often crucial. Socioemotional rewards such as good

feelings and personal affirmation promote adherence to role expectations and stability of structure. Socioemotional leaders help make socioemotional rewards available in an otherwise cold-seeming, formal organization.

## Network Leaders

Networks are usually thought of as systems of personal ties maintained alongside formal structure. People use networks principally to obtain information. Networks provide intelligence regarding jobs, business opportunities, and hazards such as management changes, audits, and layoffs.

People who occupy key positions in networks are often regarded as leaders. Located at the intersection points of multiple channels of communication, these individuals are sometimes known as *sociometric stars*. The term *sociometric* refers to the type and frequency of communications in which individuals engage and the partners with whom they communicate. A sociometric star stands at the center of many communication pathways. Lines of communication radiate outward in all directions from a sociometric star, hence the name.

Professional communities both inside and outside organizations furnish good examples of network leaders. A famous study of introducing a new technology illustrates the principle of network leadership.<sup>6</sup> In this study, the researchers sought to determine which doctors first prescribed a new drug that was clearly superior to formerly used medications. The earliest utilizers tended to be those who attended national conferences and maintained contact with national leaders. These physicians were sociometric stars in their local communities. A second tier of early utilizers included physicians who maintained frequent contact with the sociometric stars. These stars exercised professional leadership by serving as conduits for disseminating technical advances. Within organizations employing physicians and other professionals, similar networks operate alongside official structure.

Network leadership operates outside professional and other high-status circles, too. An executive secretary often stands at the center of a communications network. He or she screens calls, takes notes, and regulates access to the boss. Secretaries and assistants to executives are important sources of information for people outside the executive suite. They influence their superiors either by providing direct input or by helping determine which people the boss sees, the information he or she receives, and the matters to which he or she pays attention.

## Gurus and Rabbis

Technical specialists outside formal leadership positions often exercise informal leadership. Most organizations reward their successful participants by promoting them into management. Many organizations discourage people who are not promoted from remaining in the organization. An “up-or-out” policy mandates termination of those who are not promoted. Even in the absence of up-or-out policies, those not promoted often leave, realizing that they are unlikely to

receive significant increases in pay or prestige. They also know that they will soon be surrounded by younger, more recently educated personnel, some of whom will become their new bosses. Law, accounting, and engineering firms typically function in this manner.

A few people who are not promoted, however, find viable niches in the organization. They may achieve recognition as experts in a technical area of law or a highly specialized field of engineering. These individuals do not rise in the hierarchy but retain long-term employment. Due to the advanced learning and gray hair of these survivors, colleagues often refer to them via religious titles such as “gurus” and “rabbis.”

Gurus and rabbis occupy positions ideally suited to informal leadership. Their specialized knowledge guarantees them regular contact with at least a few others. They have opportunities to influence decisions of those in formal leadership positions. They may even gather around them a “flock” of people who look to them for perspective, history, and advice.

### How Formal Organizations Capture Informal Leaders: The Phenomenon of Co-optation

The formal leaders of an organization often realize that their informal counterparts exercise significant influence. Rather than ignore or oppose this informal leadership structure, formal leaders often attempt to make use of it. Formal leaders do this by working out cooperative relationships with those who have attained leadership outside the formal hierarchy. This process is known as co-optation.

In co-optation, members of the formal leadership structure invite the informal leader to collaborate with them. The formal leader may offer resources or threaten punishment to establish collaboration. Co-optation may take the form of merely convincing the informal leader of management's perspective.

Prisons in the mid-20th century American South furnish an often-cited example of co-optation. Guards and wardens identified inmates whose strength, aggressiveness, or other capabilities enabled them to exercise influence or power over other inmates. These inmates were invited to become prison “trustees.” As trustees, they received extra privileges and resources from the administration, not the least of which included official approval of their rule. In exchange, trustees helped enforce prison regulations and helped maintain order.

Co-optation occurs in many other settings. Unions co-opt task group leaders in industry. City governments co-opt neighborhood leaders. Some organizations co-opt the leadership of others in order to achieve influence over these organizations.<sup>7</sup>

For a time, the term *co-optation* acquired a negative connotation. Informal and community-based leaders co-opted into larger, more powerful structures were said to have “sold out.” But co-optation often requires the formal leadership to make concessions to the informal leader who has been co-opted. In this light, co-optation appears as a method by which informal leaders make the needs and aspirations of their followers known to the formal leadership structure.

It is noteworthy that the capabilities that allow people to become leaders in informal settings also serve as leadership resources within the formal structure of an organization. An individual in a management position, for example, uses his or her networking skill to exchange resources and garner support for his or her projects. This informal capacity enables the manager to act as a true leader. Executives utilize socioemotional talents to determine the needs and aspirations of management personnel, thus promoting collaboration. As in many aspects of organizational functioning, formal and informal processes are not entirely segregated. They are often intermingled, mutually supporting each other.

## The “Work” of Leadership

---

Leaders perform two closely tied functions: (1) they decide among alternative courses of action open to the organization or one of its subunits; and (2) they obtain support from other people and organizations for implementing the decision. Leaders in actual organizations contribute to these functions through many concrete actions. Some leadership actions, such as firefighting and maintaining lines of communication, are routine. Others, such as meeting major crises and redirecting the organization’s mission, are extraordinary. The actual work of leaders, whether routine or extraordinary, comprises a variety of day-to-day tasks. The following examples illustrate leadership operation “on the ground.”

### Taking Initiative

Taking initiative constitutes the most fundamental task of leadership. Leaders take action in situations where action is required. They spot opportunities and convince others of their importance. They are the first to detect problems on the horizon and mobilize the organization’s resources to remedy them.

Initiative constitutes the clearest indication of leadership in an informal setting or small subunit of a formal organization. “Doc,” the street corner gang leader described in Chapter 1, often determined how the boys should spend their time. Most social groups seem to have a member who regularly suggests things to do and activities to initiate. In a more serious context, observers of military operations have commented that battles are won by the initiative of individuals on the ground who perceive opportunities to advance and urge their comrades to follow their leadership.

Initiators of action in organizations have become some of history’s most important leaders. Consider the example of Martin Luther, the 16th-century founder of Protestantism. In Luther’s time and still today the Catholic Church was an extremely large and powerful formal organization. Luther charged that the Church was malfunctioning in pursuit of its major objective, the salvation of Christian souls. He alerted large segments of the organization’s membership to the necessity of reform.

Taking initiative in detecting and remediating problems distinguishes leaders in many modern organizations. Union politics provides an example. Corruption, often in the form of mishandling of funds, has constituted a perennial problem in American unions. Reform has often been initiated by a handful of members

especially aggrieved by the corrupt practices. These individuals initiate action by running as reform candidates in union elections or banding together to support a new leadership.

Taking initiative can be much more mundane, however. Leaders detect routine problems and take steps to solve them. Leaders in business organizations detect revenue shortfalls and order economies to ensure that there are sufficient funds to meet payroll. Managers in manufacturing plants are the first to hear when a supplier fails to deliver key materials; they take action to find alternative sources. Factory floor leaders, whether formal or informal, note hazards and order their removal or cleanup.

### **Evaluating Followers' Needs, Aspirations, and Capabilities**

Leaders also achieve their objectives by assessing followers' needs and aspirations. Such action lays the groundwork for motivating members to contribute to the leader's objectives. People like to be listened to. Knowing their needs and aspirations enables the leader to develop appropriate rewards and to present his or her agenda in language reflecting the members' needs and aspirations.

Joseph Stalin, dictator of the Soviet Union for several decades during the mid-20th century, is known to history as a ruthless tyrant. But he was in fact a very good "listener." Observers of the early years of his reign tell of Stalin patiently lingering in the company of rank-and-file Communist Party members, smoking his pipe and listening patiently to their concerns and complaints. It is doubtless that in-depth understanding of his people helped Stalin maintain and exercise power as long as he did.

Understanding needs and aspirations is even more characteristic of leaders in democracies. Franklin D. Roosevelt, president of the United States during the Depression and most of World War II, was famed for broadcasting "fireside chats," which acknowledged the public's concerns and provided reassurance. Today, candidates for office spend huge sums conducting opinion polls, assessing the public mood as a tool for attaining and exercising leadership.

Understanding an organization's members also involves knowledge of their capabilities, including energy and commitment. Leaders continually assess these properties of the membership and adjust their objectives accordingly. A military officer adjusts his objectives based on the readiness of his troops. A research manager formulates objectives based on the staff's mix of technical background. While assessment of membership capacities in some instances leads to adjustment of objectives, in other instances it leads to adjustments of the membership's capabilities, by means such as targeted hiring and dismissal.

### **Fostering and Maintaining Relationships**

Promoting stable and productive relationships within the organization constitutes one of the most important leadership activities today. This is especially true in large organizations pursuing multiple objectives. Large size, complexity of

structure, and diversity of task counteract the factors leading to cohesiveness. Divergent responsibilities and objectives lower members' visibility and importance to each other. Physical distance makes face-to-face relationships almost impossible to maintain. These conditions hamper coordination between individual and subunits. The sense of common purpose upon which formal organization depends is undermined. In extreme cases, the organization may disintegrate into subunits and primary groups working at cross-purposes and characterized by mutual antagonism.

Experienced executives have said that the hardest part of their work is "getting the management team together." Modern, global business makes it especially difficult to assemble team members in a single physical place. Personnel reside in different cities and carry on operations across the world. Even when team members work in the same city or building, though, the press of meeting individual deadlines and "fighting fires" keeps people out of touch. The tendency of organizational units to maximize their own resources—referenced earlier as *suboptimization*—reduces the willingness of managers to exchange ideas.

The day-to-day actions of effective leaders include efforts to prevent such fragmentation. Some of the more visible techniques involve getting people together at social events, such as luncheons, retreats, and afternoons at the country club. Though many poke fun at "businessmen's lunches" and rounds of golf, such activities foster informal ties among managers. Many observers, among them the famous Chester Barnard, have identified establishment and nurturing of informal relationships among executives as a key leadership concern.

Less visible relationship-building activities include introducing new employees of work organizations or new members of a club. Introductions to people the new member may never directly work with are of particular importance, because they give the new member a sense of the organization's range of activities and broader mission. Simple introductions lay the groundwork for good interpersonal relationships.

Fostering and maintaining relationships constitute key leadership activities in most formal and informal settings. Leaders initiate instrumental relationships when they assign people to work in teams and task forces. They foster informal ties when they host parties at their homes.

Some of the most important actions that leaders take are intended to promote relationships across organizational boundaries. The leader's role as representative of his or her organization in many settings provides opportunities for collaboration. Conversations between leaders may have special value for thawing relationships between traditionally competing and hostile organizations. Highly visible and publicized handshakes between top executives help initiate working relationships. Joint press conferences in the White House Rose Garden between formerly warring heads of state, for example, help inform their followers that normalization is at hand. Career diplomats are then assigned the technical work of negotiating agreements. Closer to home, high profile meetings between cinema executives conclude with the request, "have your people talk with my people."

## Organizational Entropy

The term *entropy* refers to a tendency in nature for things to move from a state of organization to one of chaos. A similar process can happen in organizations.<sup>8</sup> Unless countervailing forces of sufficient power prevail, individual inclinations and needs will impel members to act in their personal interest rather than in the interests of the collectivity. Similarly, subunits of the organization will seek ways to maximize their own security and resource levels, unless centralizing forces prevail.

Rewards, imperative force, and organizational culture counteract organizational entropy. But leadership is often the most immediate force that keeps the organization's members and subunits together and concentrates their resources on achievement of the organization's objectives.

## Providing Resources

Command of resources, both material and nonmaterial, promotes the exercise of leadership. The entrepreneur who provides capital to a start-up company attains influence over its operations. The scientist achieves leadership by obtaining research funds, enabling him or her to assemble teams of colleagues and assistants and exercise leadership over them. Material resources allow people who already occupy leadership roles to function more effectively. President Thomas Jefferson, as well as "Doc," the gang leader in William F. Whyte's *Street Corner Society*, both impoverished themselves (at least temporarily) making loans and paying for good times with their friends and associates. Followers come to depend on such resources, reinforcing their loyalty.

That those who control resources also exercise power is a basic principle in organizational life. Chapter 7 demonstrated this connection by reviewing the history of hospitals in the United States. In an era when hospitals looked to private donors for key support, private donors made the most important decisions. Later, when hospital revenue came mostly from paying patients, the doctors who admitted these patients moved into the lead. Still later, solvency depended on skillful handling of government regulations and negotiation with health plans. In this era, professional managers moved into leadership positions.

It is not surprising, then, that leaders devote much effort to obtaining resources. Leading partners in law firms, for example, spend much of their time procuring business for the organization. These "rainmakers" may do no actual legal work, distributing technical responsibilities to other attorneys in exchange for a percentage of their billing. Business executives meet often with bankers to ensure the availability of capital through loans and stock offerings. The presidents of charitable organizations, universities, and other nonprofits seek out and cultivate potential donors.

Members look to leaders for resources other than material ones. Strategic plans formulated by executives also constitute resources, providing direction to the management teams that work under them. In war, strategy itself becomes a crucial resource. Napoleon commanded leadership not only because he cut a striking figure.



He also developed strategies that won battles. More routine human endeavors also illustrate the importance of nonmaterial resources. W. Edwards Deming, inventor of Total Quality Management (TQM), emphasized managers' responsibility for developing systems of technology and work organization that ensure productivity.<sup>9</sup> As directly as military strategies, such systems ensure the success of industrial enterprises and work organizations of all kinds. Leaders may procure resources of this kind by developing their own strategies and plans or hiring consultants or staff to do so.

## Collecting and Disseminating Information

The need for leaders to collect and disseminate information is similar in importance to their resource-related tasks. Information is itself a resource. Leaders often see themselves as repositories of information regarding the organization and its environment. A top executive stands out from others in his or her grasp of the total picture. People known as reliable sources of information often become leaders, as people turn to them for direction. Information about the organizational environment helps people develop other resources. Knowledge of the environment forms the basis for successful strategic plans, product development, marketing, and sales. Knowledge of the capabilities and needs of other organizations helps determine the desirability of these organizations as partners.

Leaders spend significant time reading and hearing reports from others. They meet with consultants and study marketing survey results. They attend management seminars and peruse *Fortune* and the *Wall Street Journal*.

But most also collect their own information. Executives have breakfast and lunch with managers who share information about the operation of their units. Sales managers shop at the stores of their competitors. People whose success depends on reliable delivery of materials from outside their own organizations tour the facilities of their suppliers to assess their capabilities and efficiency. Managers of manufacturing operations leave the office now and then to tour the factory floors and loading docks. They chat with foremen and operatives. This activity has been labeled "management by walking around."

Good information promotes good decision making, a core function of leadership in organizations. Historians credit Napoleon Bonaparte with mastery of huge amounts of information regarding geography, economics, and politics throughout the Europe of his time. The French emperor left colossal volumes of letters to and from his appointees and officers in the countries that he ruled and beyond. The range of subject matter and extent of Napoleon's writings are astounding in view of his era's primitive information technology. The capacity to grasp and integrate this volume of intelligence doubtlessly contributed to Napoleon's ability to formulate strategy and maintain the confidence of subordinates.

## Representing Members' Aspirations and Values

Among the day-to-day acts of leaders, one of the most consistently noted has been the expression and symbolization of their followers' aspirations and values. Pericles, statesman of ancient Athens, was characterized as the city's "first citizen"

because he held no formal power. By expressing widely shared convictions of his peers, though, the statesman guided them through the greatest war of the age. People in informal settings may attain leadership by speaking for the group. It is no accident that candidates for office in modern democracies expend vast sums on public opinion polls. They hope to garner public support by expressing sentiments they know are felt by the public.

Formal organizations of all kinds assign leadership roles to people believed to reflect the values and aspirations of members. Church and evangelical organizations provide the most visible examples. Clergy are expected to be visibly devout, as indeed the title “reverend” suggests. Parishioners look to their spiritual leaders as symbols after whom to model their own thinking and behavior. In day-to-day life, ecclesiastical leaders take pains to look and act upstanding. Religious leaders, of course, are occasionally caught in sinful acts, as was evangelist Jimmy Swaggart in the 1980s. But such misfortune often strengthens their ability to lead. As wayward clergy confess and undergo rehabilitation, they demonstrate that they share everyone’s need to now and then repent and regain divine grace.

Leaders of professional organizations also exemplify the values and aspirations of those in the ranks. At midcareer, many physicians become managers of hospitals and health plans. Significant management responsibilities make it impossible for these doctors to continue caring for patients. Still, many physician-managers do everything possible to look and act like doctors. It is not uncommon to see a high-level hospital manager striding the halls in a white coat with a stethoscope protruding from his pocket and attending grand rounds. Often, these doctors have not treated patients in years. But physician-managers feel they must demonstrate their continuing concern with the practice of medicine to exercise effective leadership.

Symbolizing values and aspirations promotes leadership functions in less elevated pursuits as well. Executives of brokerage firms go to great efforts to look prosperous, as if to symbolize the wealth their organizations specialize in pursuing. At the Mary Kay cosmetics firm, those who have risen to the top of the pyramid drive pink Cadillacs provided them by the company. The flashy opulence of these vehicles symbolizes the glamorous success striven for in the ranks. These often self-made women demonstrate to all the rewards of success.

### **George Washington as Symbolic Leader**

Every schoolchild knows that George Washington, first president of the United States, was the “father of his country.” He is famed for military exploits such as crossing the ice-filled Delaware River to surprise the Hessians at Trenton. But analysts today consider Washington’s military achievements to have been exaggerated. Washington, they say, attained the presidency and achieved mythic fame primarily because he exemplified the values and aspirations of his fellow citizens in the new republic.

Washington’s popularity seems to have arisen from the public’s trust in him. In rebellion against a tyrannical English king, the colonists hoped to found a country in which the high-ranking saw themselves as servants of the public. Along with their suspicion of power, the American

revolutionaries venerated simple virtues such as self-sacrifice, justice, sobriety, and modesty. Washington, an unassuming Virginia planter who repeatedly turned down opportunities to exercise political power, was viewed as exemplifying the new republic's aspirations.

Barry Schwartz, a modern analyst of Washington's life, observed that the first president's contemporaries praised his personal virtue rather than his military genius. People of Washington's time contrasted him with Caesar and Napoleon because Washington achieved his victories through means other than "the agonies of the human heart" and knew how to "lead without dazzling mankind." Schwartz writes that the colonists searched for a leader who they assumed had disinterested motives and respected the role of the citizen-soldier. Washington became an "absolutely credible symbol of the nation's political morality" and a "visible symbol of the values and tendencies of his society."<sup>10</sup>

A more modern example of such a leader was Robert Oppenheimer, who managed the project that produced the first atomic bomb. To other scientists, Oppenheimer seemed to symbolize scientific expertise and open collegiality.<sup>11</sup>

## Who Becomes a Leader?

Ambitious people in modern society usually want to be leaders. For whom is leadership a reasonable goal? Most organizations are hierarchical, with many people occupying lower-ranked slots and relatively few on top. This would suggest that leadership is a privilege reserved for just a few. Perhaps only a limited number of human beings have the talent to exercise leadership. Alternatively, modern organizational structure may simply not provide enough opportunities for everyone to utilize his or her leadership capabilities. There is truth to the saying that not every member of a tribe can be the chief.

Many people believe that the "natural" leadership talents of some set them apart from other human beings. Throughout the ages, people have looked for external signs by which to recognize natural leaders. An Old Testament tale tells of the search for Israel's first king. A prophecy declared that the king should stand "head and shoulders" above any man in the land. Thus King Saul of biblical fame was found. Modern organizations have sometimes sought leadership talent through informal means. A famous writer serving in World War I chronicled such a procedure. He and his fellow officers organized football games among the recruits and observed the action. Men who took charge and called plays were singled out as candidates for promotion to corporal and sergeant.<sup>12</sup> Organizations today employ formal tests and questionnaires developed by psychologists to screen for potential leaders.

Much human experience suggests that attainment of leadership is far more complex than spontaneous elevation of the naturally talented. Many people, though not officially recognized, seem to have functioned as effective leaders "behind the scenes." Writers of fiction have spun tales of humble servants who have assumed leadership in times of uncertainty and crisis. Sir James Matthew Barrie's play *The Admirable Crichton* is a well-known example. In the play, the servant Crichton assumes practical leadership when his master, an English aristocrat, is shipwrecked on a desert island. The aristocrat serves as a handyman. As soon as

the party is rescued, though, Crichton again becomes a mere butler and the aristocrat resumes his customary supremacy.

Real life furnishes many examples of nonleaders who have clear leadership talent. As in fiction, the talent of these people becomes visible in times of crisis. During battles, enlisted men have often exercised leadership when their commanders have been absent, incapacitated, or killed. Usually, these men return to their ordinary positions after official command has been reestablished.

Many people whose social position, appearance, race, or gender prevent them from attaining formal leadership titles possess considerable leadership talent. The wife of President Woodrow Wilson (1856–1924), for example, is said to have exercised actual executive power in the final years of her husband's life, during which time he was incapacitated by a stroke. Thus a woman functioned as president during an era when election of a woman to the post would have been unthinkable.

## Traits

Those who believe in “natural” leadership often attribute the required capabilities to *traits*. Traits are long-lasting features of an individual's emotional makeup, such as optimism and extroversion. Traits are thought to emerge early in an individual's life, perhaps from his or her genetic background. Traits give rise to enduring patterns of thinking and behavior. An individual's traits offer an explanation of his or her vocational selection, socialization patterns, and level of success.

Characteristics traditionally known as “leadership traits” include

- Intelligence
- Dominance
- Self-confidence
- Energy or action orientation
- Task-relevant knowledge

Although a “self over others” orientation is suggested by these traits, some authors add community-building capabilities to the mix, such as truthfulness (with special attention to keeping promises and commitments) and good judgment. Peters and Waterman, authors of the famed treatise *In Search of Excellence*, suggest that leadership traits also include the ability to develop a shared mission and a sense of common values.<sup>13</sup>

People who believe in traits tend to explain the fortunes of humankind on the basis of individual contributions and acts. In this perspective, work history has developed as it did due to the actions of “great men.” The “great man” theory is frequently used to explain the success or failure of organizations as well. In many cases, a single trait allegedly possessed by the “great man” is said to account for the success of his organization. The rise of Standard Oil as a great American conglomerate is attributed to the acquisitiveness of John D. Rockefeller. The Allied victory in World War II is laid to the organizational talents of General Dwight D. Eisenhower. The dominance of Microsoft at the close of the 20th century is credited to the genius of Bill Gates.

Research has sometimes found an actual relationship between traits and effective leadership. A series of studies has shown that intelligence, dominance, self-confidence, energy or action orientation, and task-relevant knowledge coincide with effective leadership.<sup>14</sup> However, these studies suggest a generally weak relationship of these traits to leadership. Studies of individual traits such as dominance and self-confidence have sometimes shown them as unrelated to or potentially undermining effective leadership. Dominance and self-confidence, especially if excessive, seem likely to raise followers' suspicions. More recent research suggests that traits such as honesty, integrity, and ability to arouse confidence, in addition to the traits referenced above, are particularly valuable to leaders.

According to some observers, favorable traits help people become effective leaders. They help people achieve leadership positions and acquire leadership skills. But they do not guarantee success as a leader.

### Napoleon and Kutuzoff: Leaders With Different Traits

The name Napoleon has appeared repeatedly in this chapter. One of history's best-known leaders, Napoleon clearly possessed the traits of dominance, self-confidence, and action orientation. Napoleon dressed elegantly and cut a dashing figure on a horse. The painter David portrayed him as commanding and majestic.

Drawing on historical chronicles, the writer Tolstoy provides a detailed picture of Napoleon's character in his epic novel *War and Peace*. According to Tolstoy, Napoleon was a fierce egotist. He enjoyed watching men perform needlessly hazardous feats in his honor. Napoleon rewarded the survivors with medals but did nothing to stop senseless self-sacrifice.

Tolstoy also provides a detailed description of General Kutuzoff, Napoleon's principal adversary in his attempt to conquer Russia. Kutuzoff is portrayed as short and pudgy. He rode not a heroic steed but a homely, sagging mount. According to Tolstoy, Kutuzoff preferred the post from which he had been recalled, governing a provincial city, to military command. A film portrayal of the Russian campaign shows Kutuzoff as a folksy, approachable officer, prone to scratching under his wig.

Kutuzoff's command style contrasted with that of Napoleon. Tolstoy describes an important battle in which Kutuzoff had no apparent strategy. He allowed junior officers to suggest tactical moves. Kutuzoff accepted some of these suggestions, complimenting the men who had made them. He declined other suggestions, politely thanking the officers responsible and noting that their advice might be applied later. Gradually, the accepted moves coalesced into a strategy appropriately geared to the changing situation on the battlefield.

Napoleon and Kutuzoff probably shared the traits of extreme intelligence and skill at strategic thinking. But beyond these they differed. Napoleon's most apparent traits included self-confidence, ambition, and desire to dominate. Kutuzoff's traits included flexibility, a willingness to listen, and the ability to cultivate the support (indeed the affection) of subordinates.

Despite the differences in their traits, Napoleon and Kutuzoff were both highly effective military leaders.

Kutuzoff, it should be remembered, ultimately triumphed. The French suffered disastrous defeat in Russia. French losses were stupendous for the early 19th century, numbering 350,000 dead or captured. Defeat in Russia cost Napoleon his throne and landed him in exile.

## Situational Leadership

People who possess at least some of the traits described above seem more likely to become leaders than those who do not. But traits do not tell the whole story. As demonstrated earlier, organizations mold much human behavior and thought. Structure presents opportunities to some and denies them to others. Culture helps determine the capabilities that are most valued and the traits that are considered most desirable. People come to organizations with definite traits, dispositions, and personalities. But the same personal qualities that help people advance in some organizations inhibit their advancement in others. Some organizations encourage certain human characteristics while others discourage them.

It is not surprising, then, that the same person may attain leadership in some organizations but not in others. Within the same organization, people with different traits and capabilities may be more suited to leadership roles in each subunit. Organizations in different stages of development, utilizing different technologies and facing different challenges, require different kinds of leaders.

Some researchers have developed a conception of leadership that places primary importance on the tasks and challenges facing the organization itself rather than the personal characteristics of leaders. This concept is known as *situational leadership*.<sup>15</sup> Situational leadership calls for people whose capabilities match the organization's immediate needs, that is, its changing situation. As the organization's situation changes, individuals with different capacities become leaders.

The organization's age has a crucial impact on its needs regarding leadership. As Chapter 5 indicated, organizations age just as do people. A "young" organization is usually small and has relatively few procedures and rules. Fighting to establish stability, a start-up business hustles to obtain product orders, a new public agency strives for political support, a new nonprofit aims for public visibility. Leaders appropriate to these tasks are youthful, energetic, and inclined to take risks.

In contrast, a "mature" organization may concern itself primarily with protecting its established position. People who attain leadership in such organizations are likely to be conventional and conservative. They have little to gain by taking risks and do not take many.

A well-known example of situational leadership was observed in the early days of the Silicon Valley boom of the 1980s. Steve Jobs, a young entrepreneur, founded Apple, the first large-scale manufacturer of personal computers. Apple's user-friendly devices became wildly popular and helped make the personal computer a fixture in American offices and homes.

Once established as a major American firm, however, Apple needed to maintain stable relationships with suppliers, bankers, and retailers. Technical and market innovation began to take a backseat. Steve Jobs lost his leadership position and left the management team. Still an extremely wealthy man, Jobs departed to found yet another start-up company.

In one of the ironies of business history, Jobs reassumed leadership of Apple a few years later. The invention of Windows software enabled competing computer manufacturers to offer products as user-friendly as those of Apple. Apple's sales faltered and bankruptcy seemed possible. Again, innovative product design became essential for attracting customers. Jobs was brought back to revitalize the company.

The state of the economy itself can affect situational leadership. In prosperous times, firms emphasize expansion. With money to be made by moving product out the door, people with sales expertise are invited to occupy leadership positions. When business slows, firms become more cautious, emphasizing conservation of resources. In these situations, personnel with fiscal backgrounds (accountants and comptrollers) become key leaders.

Organizations, then, require leaders with traits and skills that match their immediate needs. In addition, organizations require leaders with different leadership styles as situations change. Leaders sometimes have styles that emphasize giving explicit instructions and setting specific criteria for adequate performance. The style of such leaders may be characterized as *proscriptive*. Other leaders delegate decision making to subordinates, presenting them with objectives and allowing them to select their own means. The style of these leaders may be labeled *collaborative*. There are many additional ways in which differences in personal leadership style may be characterized.

The appropriateness of each leadership style differs according to the organization's situation. Labor force characteristics, for example, help determine whether proscriptive or collaborative leadership styles may be most effective. The proscriptive style works best in supervising inexperienced and unskilled workers. These workers have little preparation for making decisions and may be unfamiliar with the practical features of their jobs. The proscriptive style, though, would work poorly if applied to highly trained, independent-thinking professionals or managers. Accustomed to setting their own direction, such personnel would feel uncomfortable if given direct instruction. Orders might be obeyed with little enthusiasm or even, if workers have sufficient job security, be completely ignored. The desire to dominate, a trait often associated with leadership, becomes a drawback in situations that require a collaborative style.

Changing external situations can necessitate changes in leadership style. Organizations facing immediate hazards often require proscriptive-style leadership. The chief executive officer of a business with a cash-flow crisis may have to simply order his or her subordinates to cut expenditures by a fixed percentage. The director of a government agency facing special scrutiny by the president or Congress may tighten his or her control over bureau administrators, requiring explicit milestones and frequent reports.

In general, the situational approach suggests that many different people may achieve leadership and function effectively in such slots. Specific traits may help people become leaders in some organizations but not in others. Training in a given technical specialty helps qualify people as leaders in some phases of the business cycle but not in others. A given style of leadership may work well in some settings but may provoke resistance and hamper productivity in others.

## Leadership Behavior

---

People respond in diverse ways when their positions offer them the opportunity to lead. Some seize leadership with energy and enthusiasm. Others carry out leadership responsibilities cautiously, avoiding major decisions and trying not to interfere with subordinates' normal routines. Those who actually exercise leadership do so through a variety of methods. Leaders select their methods according to both personal and organizational objectives. The leader's individual inclinations and tastes help determine his or her approach to leadership. Organizational structure and history help determine the degree of leadership that individuals exercise and the methods they use as leaders.

### Avoidance of Leadership

As indicated earlier, true leaders make decisions and cause others to support and implement these decisions. People with titles such as "executive" and "manager" seem most likely to act in this fashion. People in these positions typically control rewards, imperative forces, and expression of culture. These resources enable executives and managers to promote acceptance and implementation of their decisions.

Executives, managers, and other people in formal leadership positions, though, may not in fact lead. Executives and managers decline to exercise leadership by avoiding responsibility for key decisions, such as choosing a future direction for the organization or resolving a crisis. Unwillingness by upper-level personnel to make key decisions is a frequent cause of complaint among subordinates.

Students of organizations have documented many instances where expected leadership has failed to take place. According to research, managers avoid making decisions by excessive use of the rulebook. A manager may avoid leadership by resolving all questions through direct application of organizational policies, rules, and standard operating procedure. This approach is sometimes called *managerialism*.

Managers operating in this fashion cannot make decisions regarding new or complex challenges. They may refer such issues to higher authorities. Or they may delegate decision making to a committee of subordinates or experts. True leaders, of course, utilize such panels. But they draw on them for information and advice, or utilize them as a means of learning the needs, aspirations, and opinions of members. Leaders interpret and synthesize committee findings and take responsibility for ensuing action.

Committees and panels are frequently established in government agencies. It is no accident that little or no action usually results from the committee's work. By the time the committee has completed its deliberations, the crisis that preceded its formation has blown over.

Tense or hostile organizational settings discourage managers and executives from exercising leadership. As in a case of a "failed" plant manager described by Perrow,<sup>16</sup> close surveillance by higher-ups causes managers to avoid potentially risky decision making and to allow their subordinates sufficient latitude for effective implementation. Organizational settings in which subordinates may readily dispute or ignore executive decisions discourage leadership. Universities, many of



whose employees cannot be fired, are infamous for establishing committees for issues both significant and routine.

Noting the disinclination of managers to exercise leadership under certain conditions, some observers have drawn a sharp distinction between managers and leaders. John P. Kotter, a noted business writer, characterizes managers as people skilled simply at coping with day-to-day problems and maintaining established direction. According to Kotter, the manager's job is to maintain orderly progress toward established goals through techniques such as staffing, budgeting, establishing schedules, and seeing that scheduled tasks are completed on time. Leaders, Kotter writes, distinguish themselves by creating strategies, identifying potential, and motivating and inspiring others. Kotter believes leaders are people who initiate change, while managers merely cope with changes put in motion by others or resulting from forces outside the organization.<sup>17</sup>

Other observers of organizations disagree. These observers argue that no one can effectively exercise leadership unless he or she has mastered at least some of the routine management functions. People who develop strategies need, at the very least, to appoint others to see that grand strategies are implemented. Leaders everywhere are famed for delivering speeches to the troops, employees, or stockholders. But leaders in organizations have direct subordinates, whom they supervise by communicating expectations regarding assets, objectives, schedules, and milestones.

Even the most mundane management functions may constitute tools of leadership. Budgeting, for example, may appear to be a routine practice. The process of negotiating a budget, though, can alter the staffing and reporting relationships within an organization. A budget agreement can reflect retention of some objectives and abandonment of others. A manager skilled at negotiation can sometimes invisibly ensure that his or her preferences regarding the organization's direction are accomplished.

## Transactional Versus Transformational Leadership

True leadership in fact includes several different forms of behavior. Not all resemble the heroic acts of famous figures from history. Among people who genuinely exercise leadership, two separate approaches can be distinguished: (1) transactional and (2) transformational. Both transactional and transformational leaders make decisions and motivate others, but they do so in different ways.

Transactional leadership is marked, first, by the leader's relative separation from his or her followers. Leaders of the transactional type often set objectives without discussing them with subordinates. The objectives set by these leaders may simply reflect their personal views of the organization's needs, or the transactional leader may simply pursue private objectives utilizing the organization as a tool.

More important, the transactional leader motivates others to implement his or her decisions through reward, punishment, and application of imperative force. The transactional leader achieves implementation of his or her decisions through pay, perquisites (such as coveted office and parking space), and promotion. Motivation of personnel takes place through exchange of valued things. Of course,

rewards can be negative; transactional leaders punish insubordination via techniques ranging from withholding of bonuses to murder.

Transactional leaders constitute the workaday world's supervisors and figures of authority. Transactional leadership occurs in numerous forms, many quite familiar both inside and outside organizations. Transactional leaders include small town business owners, big city political bosses, and "banana republic" dictators. Dependent on their ability to allocate valued objects (or to withhold sanctions), transactional leaders face limits to the range and efficacy of their actions. Transactional leaders take people as they are, motivating through their existing needs and aspirations.

Transformational leadership integrates the leader more fully with his or her followers and reaches further into the follower's internal motivation. Transformational leaders develop strategies if not by direct contact with followers, at least with their ideas in mind. Transformational leaders derive inspiration from the perceived needs and outlook of the people they lead. In turn, these leaders inspire their following. Transformational leaders go further than allocating valued rewards to their followers. They cause their followers to reconsider and alter what they consider valuable. At best, transformational leaders uplift their followers with new vision, a sense of shared purpose, and enhanced moral commitment.

### C. Everett Koop: A Transformational Leader

Surgeon General C. Everett Koop was one of the most visible members of President Ronald Reagan's administration (1981–1989).

A pediatric surgeon from Philadelphia, Koop was known for his conservative views on controversial issues such as abortion. The president's right-wing advisers expected that Koop would fit right in. His was an important appointment. As head of the U.S. Public Health Service, the surgeon general takes lead responsibility for the actions of federal physicians and public health workers nationwide. His office issues statements and reports that make news.

Koop surprised the administration by taking an unexpected stand. Alone among major Reagan appointees, Koop declared AIDS a significant public threat. He directed personnel and agencies under his jurisdiction to vigorously promote awareness of AIDS and take steps initially opposed by the White House to halt its spread.

Several features of Koop's leadership distinguish it as transformational. He challenged business as usual at his agency. He gave voice to the convictions of thousands of public health professionals, having almost certainly conferred with many of them while formulating his position. Perhaps most important, Koop gave Public Health Service employees a renewed sense of mission, placing them in the forefront of a powerful social movement. Bearded and imposing in his dress uniform, Koop was clearly not just another bureaucrat or political hack.

### Lower and Higher Leadership

Many different types of behavior are in fact compatible with the concept of leadership. Transformational leaders are clearly more exciting than transactional ones. Managers who exercise leadership through backroom processes such as budgeting and

agenda setting attract little attention. But reserving the distinction of leadership only to those who are transformational ignores leadership that is much more common and often of great consequence.

It makes more sense to recognize the diversity of leadership behavior than to celebrate some of its forms and ignore others. The types of behavior discussed here may be conveniently categorized as “higher” and “lower” leadership. Higher versus lower leadership is not distinguished by the hierarchical level at which leadership is exercised, but rather by how directly and extensively people use leadership opportunities.

People who exercise lower leadership maintain the status quo. Often, they rule invisibly. They offer conventional rewards, often extrinsic in nature, to their subordinates. They are often motivated by a genuine desire to promote organizational objectives rather than their own personal ones. Lower leadership tends to direct action from the top down.

People who exercise higher leadership look for new ways of doing things. They do not merely reward or punish their subordinates, but capture their imagination and mobilize their energy. They process information from below into a working consensus. They help organizations and individuals progress toward new objectives and levels of achievement.

Transactional leaders and managers who use routine techniques to set direction almost always exercise lower leadership. Higher leadership is visible and requires involving a broad range of followers. Leadership of the highest form transforms not just organizations but entire civilizations.

In real life, it is not unusual to find successful leaders who employ both “higher” and “lower” techniques. A leader may stir the consciousness of his or her followers in personal communications and public speeches. But he or she may make deals and offer rewards behind the scenes to those for whom ideological persuasion is insufficient motive.

## Charismatic Leadership

Occasionally, leaders distinguishable as *charismatic* arise in human society. Charismatic leadership has driven human history at crucial junctures. As detailed in Chapter 7, people with true charisma are believed by their followers to have powers far beyond those of individual human beings. According to their followers, the power of charismatic leaders originates from forces outside themselves. This power may reflect a political ideal, social creed, or divine presence. Famous charismatic leaders of the past have included such diverse figures as Christ, Gandhi, and Hitler.

The sociologist Max Weber, active in the early 20th century, helped introduce the concept of charisma into discussions of leadership. According to Weber,<sup>18</sup> charismatic leaders appear to have supernatural qualities derived from powers outside themselves. Followers feel duty-bound to obey these leaders because of the higher forces (such as God or the Fatherland) from which their powers derive. Weber wrote that several other features characterize charismatic leaders, including the following:

- Self-appointment: charismatic leaders feel “called” by invisible powers to a social mission.
- Independence: charismatic leaders rise to prominence outside conventional rules, structures, and institutions.
- Miraculous power: charismatic leaders demonstrate their extraordinary status by performing miraculous or at least extremely unusual feats.
- Radicalism: charismatic leaders seek fundamental change in society, necessitating destruction of conventionally accepted practice.
- Personal rule: charismatic leaders communicate directly with supporters and dispense favors on a personal basis, unrestricted by conventions and structures.

The concept of charisma used by social scientists differs strongly from the term’s popular usage. People now apply the term very broadly, to describe anyone who has great personal magnetism. One often hears the term applied to actors.

Charismatic leadership must still be acknowledged as an important if rarely encountered force. Religious organizations and political parties—particularly organizations that are radical or cultlike—may be expected to spawn charismatic leaders from time to time. Charismatic leadership is almost unthinkable in formal organizations except at the very top. Formal structure contradicts charismatic individuality. Members who act inconsistently with existing role expectations are disciplined or ejected.

Even outstanding leaders are seldom charismatic in the traditional sense. Transformational and other “higher” leaders are usually not charismatic. Figures like C. Everett Koop receive their offices through conventional political processes. According to Schwartz’s deconstruction, George Washington was nothing but a conventional Virginia gentleman who was selected by duly appointed officials to serve as a symbolic leader.

A realistic examination of the lives of charismatic leaders makes them seem less mysterious than they might at first. The rise to charismatic leadership takes place through planning, organization, and staging. Months before a march or rally, Martin Luther King sent “advance men” (trained organizers and publicists) to whip up enthusiasm and ensure a proper backdrop for his appearances. Hitler went all out. He organized youth groups and paramilitary organizations to trumpet his support. He is said to have practiced for hours in front of a mirror to perfect the proper poses. Planned dramatics have been used since ancient times to transform ordinary men into charismatic leaders. Aristotle tells the tale of how Pisistratus, a politician intent on seizing power in Athens, reemerged from exile imposed as punishment for an earlier putsch:

(A supporter) first spread abroad the rumor that Athena was bringing back Pisistratus, and then, having found a woman of great stature and beauty (actually a flower-seller from the countryside), he dressed her in a garb resembling that of the goddess and brought her into the city with Pisistratus. The latter drove in on a chariot with the woman beside him, and the inhabitants of the city, struck with awe, received him with adoration.<sup>19</sup>

## Leader-Follower Relationships

Because all leaders exercise some measure of control over followers, it is easy to forget that leaders and followers are joined in relationships of mutual dependence. Leaders can accomplish nothing unless they can induce others to implement their decisions. Modern work organizations require conscientious compliance with a leader's wishes in the absence of direct supervision. In past eras, surveillance over workers on a farm or assembly line may have sufficed to ensure productivity. Today, workers' tasks are more complex, more dependent on the worker's independent judgment, and less accessible to direct management oversight. The inclinations and behavior of subordinates toward their leaders, then, are as important as the plans and strategies that leaders develop to motivate and coordinate the actions of subordinates.

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, leadership poses a paradox for members of a free society. On one hand, most people realize that leadership is necessary for organizing any collectivity of significant size. On the other, individuals do not like to subordinate themselves to others any more than necessary. This paradox lurks in the background of many leader-follower relationships as a potential cause of dissatisfaction and mistrust.

Followers need to remember that their attitudes and behavior affect the quality of their leaders' performance. Leadership is visible and prestigious. "Followership," though, can require as much—if not more—skill, wisdom, patience, and initiative. Appropriate action by followers sometimes increases the leader's ability to impel others to carry out his or her decisions. Sometimes, though, followers must find ways to reduce the leader's power for the good of the organization. Deciding on the proper course of action may be both difficult and risky for the follower.

### Leader-Follower Relationships as Exchange

Some observers of organizations describe leader-follower relationships as sequences of exchanges. Everyone is familiar with the process by which material rewards are exchanged for services. The norm of reciprocity governs many leader-follower exchanges. Leaders allocate extraordinary rewards such as bonuses or relief from burdensome office regulations on the expectation that followers will perform better service. The *quid pro quo*, or exchange of favors, is an essential feature of social relations and tool of leadership.

Some of the most important exchanges involve nonmaterial benefits. Leaders, for example, offer subordinates entry into their networks. Access to the leader's network opens valuable opportunities for the subordinate. In business, access to the leader's network may generate sales opportunities; in science, advance information on grants; in public administration, advantageous relations with elected officials. The leader's network is likely to be more valuable to the subordinate than the subordinate's own. It may prove a key resource in the subordinate's career advancement.

In return for access to his or her network, the leader expects the subordinate's loyalty and discretion. Followers must reflect well on the leader. They must do good

work. They must not disseminate sensitive or negative information. They must not make side deals or otherwise deprive the leader of future opportunities.

For their part, followers need to view leaders objectively. Does the leader provide extraordinary rewards when they put themselves out? Does he or she open opportunities and networks? Do the leader's capabilities and achievements reflect well on subordinates? A failing leader makes even a well-performing subordinate look bad to outsiders.

Successful sequences of reciprocal exchanges create a community of interest between leaders and followers. Confidence is built on both sides of the exchange relationship. Leaders give followers assignments with more responsibility. Followers take risks with leaders, such as making suggestions and offering criticism.

### Leader-Follower Dysfunctions

A follower's action can make or break the leader. Unfavorable attitudes or behavior by subordinates who are weakly tied to the organization or who perform unimportant roles may be of little consequence. At other times, poor followership can severely damage the organization and harm those who depend on its protection or service.

Too much attention by subordinates to immediate rewards damages the leader-follower relationship. Such expectations create an atmosphere in which all parties ask "What's in it for me?" A generalized feeling that everyone will eventually benefit from contributions to the organization creates a more stable system. Repeated failure by the leader or follower to act in the expected reciprocal manner, though, damages or destroys the exchange relationship.

At the extreme, exchanges become negative.<sup>20</sup> In this situation, both follower and leader watch for each other's transgressions or mistakes and apply whatever punishments or retaliative moves may be available to them.

Higher leadership fosters a partnership between leaders and followers. Transactional leaders coexist in stable equilibrium with followers. Leader-follower relationships become dysfunctional when followers are either habitually critical or uncritically compliant.

Chronic and extreme criticism of leaders ultimately reduces the quality of leadership, causing the organization itself to become ineffective. A fictional example in novelist Herman Wouk's *The Caine Mutiny* illustrates leadership deficits that are aggravated by poor followership.

*The Caine Mutiny* illustrates the effect an atmosphere of severe criticism may have on a leader. Even a normal person becomes defensive under ostracism and ridicule. Queeg indeed had emotional problems, aggravated by severe combat experience. But an atmosphere of constructive loyalty would have allowed him to function as an effective officer.

Uncritical compliance, the opposite of events on the *Caine*, represents another form of leader-follower dysfunction. Leaders surrounded by "yes-men" lack a resource essential for becoming aware of factual error or bad policy. Habitually uncritical subordinates can permit their leader to develop delusions of grandeur and set impossible objectives for the organization.

## Leadership and Followership in Crisis

Wouk's story takes place on the Navy minesweeper *Caine* in World War II. As was typical during that period, most of the ship's officers had been rapidly trained and pressed into service.

Trouble begins when a new captain, Francis P. Queeg, assumes command. Captain Queeg exercises tighter discipline than his predecessor, displeasing both the crew and the junior officers.

As time goes by, it becomes apparent that Captain Queeg, a veteran of several years' combat at sea, suffers from emotional problems. He enforces regulations to an unprecedented degree, ordering time-consuming and seemingly absurd procedures to detect and punish minor infractions. He never admits a mistake. He has migraines. He keeps a pair of small steel balls in his pocket and fidgets nervously with them.

Many of the *Caine's* officers poke fun at Queeg behind his back. They make up derogatory names and songs about him. One ensign, a writer, introduces the notion that the captain is insane. He familiarizes his fellow officers with a Navy regulation permitting removal of a captain who has become incapacitated.

The crux of the tale takes place as the ship rolls and pitches in a severe typhoon. With huge waves crashing over the vessel, the second-in-command pleads with the captain to make a defensive maneuver. Captain Queeg refuses. Pressure mounts as the ship is tossed violently by the storm.

Suddenly, the captain falls into a stupor. The second-in-command orders the ship onto a safer heading. Regaining himself, Captain Queeg rescinds the order. The second-in-command declares that he is taking over and that Queeg is relieved under the Navy regulation regarding a captain's incapacitation. Although the ship rides out the storm, the junior officers are charged with mutiny.

At court marshal, the officers are acquitted, thanks to a skilled Navy lawyer. But in private, the lawyer castigates the men. If they had given their captain the "constructive loyalty" he deserved instead of ridiculing him, conflict would never have developed to the point it did. The argument during the typhoon would never have occurred and Queeg would not have cracked. Despite Queeg's shortcomings, an atmosphere of mutual respect and collaboration could and should have been established.

Developing shared perspectives and interests is a mark of favorable leader-follower relationships. But subordinates who are entirely uncritical can create a partnership that is dysfunctional for all concerned. At the extreme, such leader-follower relationships can develop into a psychiatric condition known as *folie à deux*, in which two or more afflicted individuals reinforce each other's delusions.

A famous example of *folie à deux* is said to have occurred in Hitler's bunker during the final days of World War II.<sup>21</sup> Hitler's forces had been reduced to a few battalions fighting desperately in the streets of Berlin. But believing that his vast armies remained intact, the Nazi leader ordered the nonexistent units into action. High-ranking officials in the bunker were unwilling to contradict Hitler and instead reinforced his delusions. On the eve of final defeat, these officials came to believe the lies themselves. In the end, all lived in a world of complete and mutually reinforced fantasy.

The two foregoing examples indicate some of the principal challenges of followership. Followers walk a fine line between excessive criticism and compliance. As indicated earlier, the best leaders develop partnerships of trust and mutual assistance with their subordinates. The best followers do their part in helping build such partnerships.

## The Complexities of Leadership

---

The essence of leadership, again, is twofold. To exercise leadership, people must decide among available options and obtain the collaboration of others. Every day, leaders in most organizations attain the required cooperation largely by allocating rewards and applying power, authority, and discipline. In its highest form, though, leadership creates commitment throughout the organization to commonly held values and objectives.

The study of organizations suggests that nearly every member can become a leader under the proper conditions. The situation prevailing in an organization determines the capabilities and traits it will emphasize in selection of leaders.

The preceding overview of leadership illustrates the dynamic nature of organizations. The fact that organizations depend heavily on structure suggests a mechanical quality. Yet, it is clear that leadership is much more complex than giving commands, allocating rewards, and exercising authority. Leaders' need to periodically negotiate new bases for collaboration and maintain favorable relations with followers indicates the fluid nature of relationships and processes within formal organizations.

It is important to note that many of the forms of leadership described in this chapter overlap. People holding administrative or management positions may not exercise leadership in a manner similar to Washington or Napoleon, yet, in restricted areas of organizational functioning, they may initiate action and motivate personnel in an effective manner. The same individual may carry out both transactional and transformational leadership. Franklin D. Roosevelt, for example, may have had charisma and become famous for articulating a new vision of America. But it is beyond doubt that he also distributed favors to his friends and patronage to his supporters. In any actual organization, individuals combine qualities that may be abstractly distinct.

Concentrating on communication and decision making, the next chapter will address subjects of particular importance to effective leadership. Communication and decision making are essential organizational processes. Like leadership, they illustrate the variable and fluid nature of human relations even within formal organizational structure.

## Issues and Applications

---

This chapter has covered the numerous forms that leadership can take. It has emphasized the diversity of qualities that enable a person to assume leadership. Participants in organizations can apply these principles to promote collective goals and their personal effectiveness. Some examples are the following:

- The manager of a production unit has been repeatedly passed over for promotion. Eager for executive rank, he feels his ability to control production costs is unappreciated. He should consider moving to a firm where production management is seen as a serious problem, a situation in which his leadership would be sought.



- A woman is appointed director of a state-level department of finance. Eager to carry out the program of the state's new administration, she assigns tasks to a key department head. Months later, little has been done. She should assess the department head's actual leadership capabilities. In addition, she should determine whether he has truly accepted her leadership.
- The leader of a community agency has missed the deadline for a grant-in-aid from a foundation. He telephones the foundation's program officer to ask for an extension. The program officer replies that he does not have the power to grant such a request. The applicant should try to contact a higher-level official who might have sufficient discretion to grant the extension.

## Chapter Review and Major Themes

---

Leadership is a key component of an organization's functioning. The essence of leadership is selecting a course of action and getting others on board. Some individuals attain leadership by virtue of the organization's formal structure, others through informal groups and networks.

Essential tasks of leadership include taking initiative, assessing followers' needs and capabilities, fostering and maintaining relationships, providing resources, obtaining and distributing information, and reflecting members' aspirations. People with quite different capabilities may become leaders. Leadership is *contingent*: the situation in which the organization finds itself determines the capabilities necessary for leadership. Leadership styles differ, as in the transactional versus the transformational leader.

Figure 9.1, which represents relations of leadership with function, conflict, and environment, is highly similar to Figure 7.1, which focuses on imperative force (see Chapter 7). This reflects the fact that leaders often have access to imperative force. Leadership can have a positive or negative effect on both function and conflict. The conditions under which a leader may have adverse effects on function and conflict include instances when the leader resorts too readily to imperative force; the leader lacks skills required by the organization; or the leader acts not according to the needs of the organization but according to personal agendas or the interests of outsiders. The organization's environment affects its leadership in a number of ways. It helps determine, for example, the style of leadership acceptable to the organization's members.

Characteristics of individual leaders and the situations in which they work affect the level of conflict within the organization. A leader who enjoys the confidence of his or her subordinates can settle disputes, reducing conflict. But competition among individuals seeking leadership status can be a major source of conflict. Rivalry between a formal and an informal leader, whether open or covert, can result in significant conflict.

A positive outlook among followers regarding their leaders generally promotes the organization's ability to achieve its goals. Negative feelings can have a variety of adverse effects, mutiny being the most extreme. Ultimately, the individual decision of the follower determines the leader's effectiveness. The individual decides

whether he or she respects the leader, carries out instructions, and helps build the leader's prestige. In situations far less acute than a ship at risk of sinking, individuals periodically experience conflict over whether to accept their leaders' judgment or question their decisions.

Both today and in the past, leaders have faced the challenge of exercising their function without an ability to control subordinates' thinking and behavior. Examples furnished by history include both Napoleon and Kutuzoff, described earlier in this chapter. Despite their differences, both commanders were able to "harness the egos" of the men under them by providing opportunities to achieve the glory or (at least as the subordinates perceived) to influence the conduct of historic battles. Modern examples might include figures as different as Presidents Ronald Reagan and Franklin D. Roosevelt, who retained enthusiastic staff support in part by symbolizing the American spirit in the face of hard times. Microsoft's prestige and ability to offer monetary rewards enabled CEO Bill Gates to exercise leadership over talented and often unconventional individuals.

Reducing perceived differences between their concerns and those of their subordinates is the mark of an outstanding leader. Such an individual exercises leadership without emphasizing control over subordinates. The most effective leader achieves the appearance of membership in the same community of purpose as his or her subordinates. As a classic comment by Follett reads, "One *person* should not give orders to another *person*, but both should agree to take their orders from the situation (facing the organization)."<sup>22</sup>



**Figure 9.1** Analytical Perspectives Applied to Leadership

### Discussion Questions

1. To what extent can the leadership role be exercised without the use of imperative force?
2. Among leaders in American organizations today, can you identify any who are truly charismatic? What characteristics give them this quality? Has their charisma enabled them to be productive in their positions?
3. In what instances do you believe opposition to an organizational leader by his or her subordinates is justified? Can an employee oppose the leader without endangering his or her own position? What type of opposing actions may be most effective?
4. Think of leaders you have known or whose careers have been widely reported. What enabled these individuals to attain their leadership positions? What lessons do these careers teach to those who want to lead?
5. Imagine yourself as the CEO of a large, formal organization. What steps can you take to avoid hazards of leadership such as losing the leadership position or performing ineffectively?
6. In a large, formal organization, how important are these personal qualities in attaining a leadership position: extroversion; industriousness; being a source of new ideas? Can any of these traits make it more difficult to become a leader?

### References

1. Guest, R. (1962). *Organizational change*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
2. Caro, R. A. (1990). *Means of ascent*. New York: Knopf.
3. Bowditch, J. L., & Buono, A. F. (1994). *A primer on organizational behavior* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
4. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*, p. 18. New York: Harper and Row.
5. Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
6. Coleman, J. S., Katz, E., & Menzel, H. (1966). *Medical innovation: A diffusion study*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
7. Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and the grass roots*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
8. Buckley, W. (1967). *Sociology and modern systems theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
9. Deming, W. E. (1991). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
10. Schwartz, B. (1982). George Washington and the Whig conception of heroic leadership. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 18–33.
11. Thorpe, C., & Shapin, S. (2000). Who was J. Robert Oppenheimer? *Social Studies of Science*, 30(4), 545–590.
12. Graves, R. (1957). *Good-bye to all that*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
13. Peters, T., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York: Random House.
14. Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.

**258** ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS

15. Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
16. Perrow, C. (1970). *Organizational analysis: A sociological view*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
17. Kotter, J. (1990). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review*, 63, 103–111.
18. Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and society* (Vol. 1). Berkeley: University of California Press.
19. Godolphin, R. B. (1942). *The Greek historians*. New York: Random House.
20. Sparrow, R. T., & Linden, R. C. (1997). Process and structure in leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 522–552.
21. Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1978). Folie a deux: Acting out your superior's fantasies. *Human Relations*, 10, 905–924.
22. Metcalf, H. C. (1926). *Scientific foundations of business administration*. Baltimore, MD: Williams & Wilkins.