Open Research Online

Open Research Online

CHAPTER 2

CHANGING THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP AND LEADERSHIP

DEVELOPMENT

John Storey

Extract from the book:

John Storey (editor) <u>LEADERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS: CURRENT</u>

<u>ISSUES AND KEY TRENDS</u> (3rd Edition)

(ROUTLEDGE 2016)

CHAPTER OUTLINE

This chapter:

- Explains the multiple and evolving theories of leadership
- Presents a conceptual framework to help organize your thinking about leadership issues
- Scrutinises current trends in the practice of leadership and in the thinking about it

---

It was suggested at the end of the previous chapter that certain new themes and concerns are emerging in leadership research and practice. These grapple with a number of vital questions including the kind of leadership behaviours now thought to be required (and, conversely, those which are deemed worthy of discouragement); the allocation of leadership responsibilities across organisational members; and the kind of leadership training and development methods which are deemed to be appropriate in new contexts. Although important, these are not the only issues. Leadership is attracting increasing serious academic interest. A range of perspectives and

approaches are now in play. These include, for example, critical perspectives, historical perspectives, cross cultural perspectives and a number of approaches which explore cultural representations of leadership as expressed in film, fiction and architecture (Storey, Hartley et al. 2016).

In large part, these current issues and concerns in leadership and leadership development reflect key changes in the environment within which organizations have to operate, for example, global economic uncertainty, climate change, massive trade imbalances, shorter product life cycles, debates about re-regulation versus deregulation, increasing uncertainty, globalisation of competition, turbulence in markets and technologies, and higher expectations from public services in a context of cuts in funding. They also reflect structural and cultural changes within organizations themselves such as devolved, delayered and downsized corporations alongside more permeable organizational boundaries if not outright 'boundaryless' enterprises. It has been suggested that it is the increased complexity of society and its faster pace which explains the demand for leadership. Thus, as argued by Fullan, 'The more complex society gets, the more sophisticated leadership must become' (Fullan 2001) (p.ix). In today's context, one might add that the challenge is heightened because of the numerous instances of spectacular corporate failures.

Consequently, as was pointed out in the previous chapter, a number of interconnected issues and key questions are moving to the forefront of current debate about leadership, echoes of which can be found across the world. It was noted that the list of critical issues centre on recent shifts in understanding of what constitutes appropriate modes of leadership. Doubts about the transactional and charismatic model of leadership are growing and these concerns merit analysis (Dinh, Lord et al. 2014)

(Mumford et al 2008). Closely associated with this issue is the increasing interest in the ideas of 'servant leadership' and integrity as crucial dimensions of leadership along with 'Authentic leadership' (Avolio and Gardner 2005, Diddans and Chang 2012), 'distributed leadership', 'followership' and diversity (Riggio et al 2008; Sendjava et al 2008; Liden et al 2008; Spillane 2006).

In addition, on a wider front, the whole set of 'competences' associated with leadership require robust critical reassessment. A further critical issue identified in that chapter was the need to make a dispassionate and frank assessment of the raft of ways in which leadership training and development has been attempted - both in public and the private sector organisations and the outcomes to date of such interventions.

Against that agenda, the purpose of this particular chapter is to locate these emerging elements in the context of the extensive literature on leadership and leadership development. In particular, the chapter will offer a summary guide and, from this, will draw out those elements deserving of the future attention of organisational decision-makers and organizational theorists. This chapter will also seek to make sense of the range of alternative 'theories of leadership' and to point a way forward. A key part of the argument will be that the corpus of writing which is normally understood to constitute evolving or competing theories of leadership is in fact made up of studies, speculations and hypotheses about a variety of different things. In this chapter we are as much interested in the obsession with leadership as a phenomenon, as with the subject of 'leadership' as a presumed real social practice or thing. The purpose of the chapter is in fact to theorise the theories of leadership. Why has leadership been

defined in different ways at different times? Why have different models of leadership achieved plausibility, acceptance and popularity at different times? To put this point another way, the objective of the chapter is not simply to offer yet another description of the literature to date but rather to explain its existence and nature.

The chapter is organised into three sections. The first section offers an overview of the way in which theories of leadership are conventionally approached and understood. The second section presents a conceptual framework in order to help interpret current issues and enduring themes in an organised way. The third section examines the proposition that understandings and attitudes to leadership have entered a new phase - one which is increasingly wary and sceptical of the prescriptions for charismatic and transformational leadership which have dominated the subject for the past couple of decades. This third section therefore in the main focuses on current trends.

THE MULTIPLE AND EVOLVING THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP

The mass of literature and experiments on leadership are illustrated rather well by the periodic surveys by Stogdill and his successors in the *Handbook of Leadership* (Stogdill 1974; Bass 2008, 4th edn*).* The original edition (1974) was subtitled 'A Survey of Theory and Research' and this is precisely what the volume and its subsequent editions have offered. The Handbooks seek to provide a systematic review of the literature on leadership. Over five thousand abstracts were prepared for the first edition and only those which were judged to be based on competent research were included - the 'inspirational and advisory literature was ignored' (p.viii). And it is

interesting to note, that Stogdill also stated that, for similar reasons, at that time he had purposely excluded 'charismatic leadership'. This was because the literature was largely based on 'numerous biographical studies' which provide 'comparatively little information that adds to the understanding of leadership' (p viii). Even the first volume noted the 'bewildering mass of findings' which had 'not produced an integrated understanding of leadership' (1974: vii). To a considerable degree much of this observation remains valid today. However, a more positive assessment of the pattern of progress in more recent times can be gleaned from two extensive reviews of the academic research on leadership (Gardner, Lowe K.B. et al. 2010, Dinh, Lord et al. 2014).

For many years, the focus of leadership studies derived from a concern in organizational psychology to understand the impact of leader style on small group behaviour and outcomes. Moreover, the focus was further directed to just two main dimensions 'task focus' versus 'people orientation' and there were various re-workings of this theme eg (Blake and Moulton 1964) (Vroom and Yetton 1988).

In the 1980s, attention shifted dramatically to the elaboration and promotion of the concept of transformational, charismatic, visionary and inspirational leadership. This school was labelled the 'New Leadership' theories (Bryman 1992). This has shifted attention to leadership of entire organizations rather than the leadership of small groups. While on the face of things, much of the debate over the past two decades appears to have been about 'styles of leadership' in reality, the sub-text was mainly about a propounded dichotomy between 'leadership' versus 'management'. This message was extolled graphically and influentially in a *Harvard Business Review*

article by Abraham Zaleznick (Zaleznik 1992) - originally published in HBR 1977. This article argued that 'It takes neither genius nor heroism to be a manager, but rather persistence, tough-mindedness, hard work, intelligence, analytical ability and perhaps most important, tolerance and goodwill' (p. 127). Since that time, a huge management consultancy industry has grown around this notion of 'leaders' rather than 'managers'. More recently, the importance of the distinction has been downplayed by the suggestion that organisations need both leaders *and* managers. However, Zaleznick (1977) had anticipated that kind of response and he argued that,

> 'It is easy enough to dismiss the dilemma … by saying that there is a need for people who can be both. But, just as a managerial culture differs from the entrepreneurial culture that develops when leaders appear in organizations, managers and leaders are very different kinds of people. They differ in motivation, personal history and in how they think and act' (p127).

Allegedly, leaders 'think about goals, they are active rather than reactive, shaping ideas about ideas rather than responding to them'. Managers, on the other hand, aim to 'shift balances of power towards solutions acceptable as compromises, managers act to limit choices, leaders develop fresh approaches'. (Zaleznik 1992)p. 128). Evidently, the controversy about the essential differences between leadership and management will continue for some time. The essence of the debate however is switching to the key task requirements and the contribution of leaders/managers. This more practice-oriented agenda is itself evolving.

For example, one significant development has been the linking of the idea of leadership with that of strategic management (Westley 1989; Tichy and Devanna 1986; Pettigrew, et al. 1992). The problematic is clearly very different if one is contemplating the capabilities required to be a 'team leader' in contrast to the capabilities required to lead a large-scale organisational transformation – and indeed whole-system change across multiple organizations (a theme attracting much current interest in the NHS).

Drawing on his influential work on '*From Good to Great*' Jim Collins (2005) illustrates, in a compelling way, the idea of a maturation model of leadership in his article "The 5 Levels of Leadership". The lower levels refer to basic team leader attainment; but levels 4 and 5 reach new peaks of achievement and capability. Thus *Level 4 the Effective Leader* "catalyses commitment to and organises pursuit of a clear and compelling vision; stimulates the group to high performance standards". This expresses succinctly what many people have been trying to say about the meaning of leadership. But, Collins posits an even higher plane: *Level 5 Executive Leadership* 'Builds enduring greatness through a paradoxical combination of personal humility and professional will'.

In order to gain broad oversight of this and other main trends in leadership theory it will be useful to view the summary of leadership theories shown in **Table 1**. Much of this chronology will be familiar to many readers of this volume and so there is no intention to work through the details of the 'story' of the journey from trait theory through style theory and contingency theory and so on again here. Readers looking for such coverage can find useful summaries elsewhere (for example: Gill, 2006; Grint 1997; Yukl 2009) and indeed in most textbook coverage of the subject of 'leadership'.

Our purpose here however is not to describe each 'stage' in this supposedly linear pathway but rather to note the underlying trends and to identify the echoes and connections with the key current issues discussed throughout this volume.

Insert table 2.1 here

There are some recognisable trends and patterns in the history of leadership research. A great deal of the early theory took a rather 'essentialist' perspective - that is viewed 'leadership' as a concrete phenomenon, a thing which could be measured as if it were a natural physical phenomenon. Also, much of the early research focused on the leadership of small groups - the early experiments with styles of leadership in boys' groups exemplify this. There was much less research on the leadership of large organizations though the small group research was often extrapolated as it if applied more widely.

Recent research and theory has paid much more attention to non-essentialist forms of analysis. Thus leadership is more likely to be seen as a 'meaning-making' activity. There are two variants.

The first focuses on the meaning-making behaviour of leaders. Here, 'leaders' are those who interpret the complexities of the given unit within the environment on behalf of the followers. Leaders thus make sense of the plight of the collective - weighing up threats and opportunities in the environment, and evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the unit within that environment. The capabilities required are those frequently described in recent transformative literature: clarity of vision;

environment scanning and interpretation, ability to condense complex data into simple compelling summations; and ability to communicate clear messages. The training and development implications stem from these required capabilities. They relate therefore to opportunities for plentiful exposure to the 'big picture'. This might mean, for example, attendance at a corporate 'Academy' where global issues are discussed (see Chapter 7 in this volume for more detail).

The second variant, the 'constitutive' approach, is also concerned with meaning-making but this time with more attention to the part played by the 'followers' and the wider audience being rather more to the fore. Individuals celebrated as leaders under this interpretation are those who enact the behaviours and articulate the messages which are in tune with the preferred and desired requirements of those who can confer the status of leader. To illustrate the point, one can refer to the case of one of the most famous great leaders - Winston Churchill the Prime Minister of Britain during the Second World War. The constitutive approach is able to make better sense of his rise and fall than seems possible from an essentialist perspective. The latter sees leadership as something embodied in individuals which simply awaits 'discovery' through the appropriate psychometric instrument. While Churchill is now one of the most frequently instanced examples of an indisputable great leader, for much of his career this most-cited figure (for example, Bennis, 1994; Gardner 1996) was adamantly rejected by his party and his fellow parliamentarians. Far from being accepted as a leader he was marginalised and even isolated. However, when the previous consensus about the preferred leadership collapsed with the onset of war, the Churchill proposition became acceptable and increasingly pre-eminent. The oratorical skills, decisiveness, and other like attributes which have been so frequently cited as

quintessentially so evident of leadership were exploited to impressive effect. But it needs to be recalled that the 'followers' were rather less impressed by these same skills just a short time previously - and indeed these skills and attributes were nullified once again when the war ended. The case helps to illustrate the constructivist interpretation: leadership was 'recognised' or *constructed* within the confines of a specific set of social circumstances - it was not a phenomenon unambiguously existing independent of the social context.

The lesson from the Churchill story carries across into the corporate and work organisation domain. Preferred styles of leadership evidently vary across time and place. On the time dimension, there may even be varying degrees of reaction to previously experienced approaches. Leadership style is thus path-dependent. A style may be more relatively acceptable precisely because it appears to correct for the perceived excesses of a previously experienced style.

Leadership effectiveness therefore depends upon (a) the extent to which people follow and give legitimacy (this can be termed internal validation), and (b) the extent to which the unit or organisation succeeds and survives (this may be termed external validation). There must also be a time dimension to the judgements - it may be short, medium or long term. It further implies that the judgement of the effectiveness of leadership may fluctuate (see Weick, 1993).

While a review of leadership theory based on the chronological development of the literature can be useful, it also has a number of limitations. The chief problem is that the evolutionary accounts tend to imply that previous theory has been refuted and

superseded. In reality, questions concerning leadership qualities and characteristics, appropriate styles, contingent conditions, and transactional, as well as transformational relations, continue to perplex and prompt debate. An example is the reworking of the trait theory of leadership by Judge et al (2009) using an evolutionary psychology perspective. For our purposes in this volume therefore, it is more appropriate to focus on emerging and continuous themes and issues. In the next section these are identified and a conceptual framework is developed.

A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR CURRENT THEMES

Current debates, as we saw in the first chapter, reveal a series of paradoxes and contradictions within the dominant accounts. For example, one strong narrative strand centres on the idea of current environmental 'uncertainty and instability'. This, in turn is seen to require and justify the search for a strong, responsible, organisational leader able to handle difficult and ambiguous conditions through the exceptional use of 'envisioning and energising' capabilities. This strand therefore focuses attention on the vital need for exceptional, decisive, and charismatic leadership. Exceptionality is further seen to justify unusual and generous ('internationally competitive') reward packages. And yet, another strand of contemporary narrative highlights and emphasises the need for 'distributed leadership' and empowered co-workers and associates. The tensions created by these competing perspectives reoccur in much contemporary discourse – but the potential contradictions are usually insufficiently examined or even acknowledged.

A clear example of a contemporary attempt to come to terms with the tensions between the idea of the exceptional individual on the one hand, and changing values and norms on the other, can be found in the work of Warren Bennis, an established authority on leadership. Bennis argues that leadership can be understood as deriving from a mixture of time, place, predisposition and potential (Bennis and Thomas 2002). Taking a long view by studying today's leaders (from the allegedly laid-back and informal high technology world) and comparing and contrasting them with a cluster of interviewees from the immediate post war world of half a century ago, there is an explicit acknowledgement of the difference which time (captured here in the concept of 'era') can make in the meaning of leadership. None the less, Bennis is reluctant to let go of the idea of 'leaders' as inherently special people with unique qualities – indeed this is the underlying assumption of his approach. The research method (interviewing individuals *qua* leaders and asking how they explain their biographies) seems highly likely to reinforce this bias.

Bennis's most recent work thus reflects a continuing essentialist interpretation of the nature of leadership – its essence in other words is to be 'discovered' within the attributes – one might say the 'traits' - of exceptional individuals found to be occupying leader positions. In this particular instance, the methodological device used to identify and catalogue these attributes of the accomplished leader is to 'uncover' the different ways in which people deal with adversity. He claims that one of the most reliable indicators and predictors of 'true leadership' is an individual's ability to find meaning in negative situations and to learn from trying circumstances. Bennis calls these experiences that shape leaders, 'crucibles'. He provides a variety of examples to explore the idea of the crucible in detail. From these examples, essential skills are

derived which, he believes, great leaders possess. The first three of these are familiar restatements of what leadership is frequently understood to be as well as its apparent prerequisites. These essential skills are the ability to engage others in shared meaning, a distinctive and compelling voice, a sense of integrity (including a strong set of values). The fourth, is identified as 'adaptive capacity'. This turns out to be 'an almost magical ability to transcend adversity, with all its attendant stresses, and to emerge stronger than before' (p. 121). It is of course this final aspect which the narratives of informants were most able and willing to illuminate.

The underlying 'new model' is that *leadership competences* are *outcomes* of these formative experiences. The key competences are said to be adaptive capacity, an ability to engage others in shared meanings, voice, and integrity. Tellingly, 'adaptive capacity' is said to be exemplified through the case of Jack Welch, the famed erstwhile Chief Executive Officer of General Electric. This capacity enabled him to 'transform himself from staff-slashing Neutron Jack to Empowerment Jack as the needs of the corporation shifted' (p 122).

This example is illustrative of the partial nature of much literature and thinking about leadership. In order to progress theory in a more systematic manner it is necessary to stand back and appraise the *range of factors* which influence our understanding of the leadership phenomenon.

In fact, analysis of contemporary organisational discourse, and of recent literature, reveal a large number of critical factors which, on closer examination, reflect a cluster of core, enduring, themes. There are five in particular, which are essential in any

systematic analysis of organisational leadership. As shown in Figure 2.1., these five factors are: context, perceived leadership need, behavioural requirements, capabilities, and development methods. Moreover, as also illustrated in the figure, each of these key factors interrelates with all of the others. Together they form the leadership constellation.

[FIG 2.1 HERE]

Fig 2.1 The Leadership Constellation

We will describe and assess each of these in turn beginning at the top of Figure 2.1 with context, and then proceeding clockwise around the figure.

Context

Despite the seemingly unabated search for the essential attributes of leaders, there is also abundant reference to the importance of context in current leadership research. There are extensive literatures exploring the importance of international cultural differences, industrial sector differences, organisational structural differences and other contextual variables.

For example, various researchers have explored the idea that concepts of leadership may differ between different *national cultures* (Jepson 2009). Sometimes even regional groupings are contrasted. Thus the differences between the understandings of leadership between Anglo-Saxon, Arab and Asian traditional cultural values has been

studied (Mellahl 2000). This and other studies have challenged the idea of the universality of leadership values and themes. The findings carry implications for the content and methods of leadership development and training.

Similar findings emerged from an extensive twenty-two country study across Europe which revealed cultural variation in notions about leadership (Brodbeck 2000). The study suggests that there are pre-existing leadership 'prototypes' or expectations about leaders in the different cultures, these affect the willingness of followers to go along with certain roles and styles of leaders. Brodbeck identifies a set of dimensions which reveal core differences in leadership prototypes. Cultural differences in the understanding of and attitudes to leadership have also been explored in another study by Brodbeck in the even more widely variant comparative contexts of Europe and Africa. These differences, he notes, carry important implications for leadership development methods (Brodbeck, et al. 2002).

Yet, despite cultural differences between countries, the prevailing influence of American assumptions, values and ideas may also help to explain the increased attention given to leadership across much of the world. The American Dream and the focus on individualism and the can-do attitude have permeated international teaching and development in relation to how organisational leadership is viewed. The critique of, and challenge to, 'Anglo-Saxon' business values (see for example, (Mayer 2014) has served to question the dominance of this model but has not yet undermined it.

This individualised interpretation is fuelled by the media. Business magazines such as *BusinessWeek, Fortune* and the *Director* are especially prone to focus on the

supposed crucial impact of top managers. Even serious financial newspapers such as *The Wall Street Journal* and *The Financial Times* tend also to 'profile' and give huge prominence to individual personalities and attribute to them special importance. News about corporations tends to be translated all too readily into human dramas in the boardroom.. Certain chief executives become lionised and company fortunes are deemed to be closely linked to the actions of these figures. The media, for example, regularly tell the story of great enterprises in terms of the characters at the top. Thus, Marks & Spencer regularly features as a battleground between rival leaders with figures such as Stewart Rose, Paul Myners and Philip Green. Those in top positions also evidently strongly believe that their leadership is the critical factor which therefore merits paramount attention. Hence, ten years before his retirement, the chief executive of General Electric, Jack Welch declared that 'From now on [choosing my successor] is the most important decision I'll make. It occupies a considerable amount of thought almost every day' (Peston 2008: 109). This statement expresses clearly the deep-seated belief in the importance of leadership as a property of the leader. Other key stakeholders such as shareholders seemingly share the same view: share prices rise and fall simply on the announcement of newly appointed or newly-displaced leaders. For example, when Kodak's performance came under criticism in the 1990s, Wall Street analysts and the media focused blame on the chief executive, Kay Whitmore. Eventually the board bowed to pressure and Whitmore was replaced with a high profile recruit from Motorola. The share price rose by nearly $5 simply on the receipt of this news (Khurana 2002a:5). None the less, the lack of competitiveness continued and by the end of the decade the share price had lost two thirds of its value. There are numerous other examples of this phenomenon (Khurana 2002b).

Collectively, these cases illustrate the huge significance of context in shaping the agenda and meaning concerning leadership - and its perceived importance and nature.

In addition to national context differences, other studies have pointed up the importance of industry sector as a factor influencing receptivity to types of leadership. For example, the leading analysts of transformational and charismatic leadership (Bass 1985) (Avolio and Bass 1988) have noted how sector plays a part in the way these roles are performed, how effective they are and how they are perceived. There are numerous other studies which reveal the particularities of leadership in different sectors. These include a growing number of studies of headteachers as leaders - most notably tracking the headteachers leadership programme(s) in the UK (for example (Blandford and Squire 2000). There have also been studies drawing comparisons and contrasts between headteachers as leaders in the US and in the UK (Daresh and Male 2000); (Brundrett 2001).

In addition there are many other sector specific studies of leadership and leadership development. Overall, they tend to emphasise the critical importance of sector context when it comes to leadership development interventions. Beyond the level of industry sector, other studies have drilled down and focused on variations in *organisational context* as a governing independent variable. Indeed, one major analyst has made the point that "the theory of leadership is dependent on the theory of organization" (Selznick 1957)page 23. In similar vein, Charles Perrow observed "leadership style is a dependent variable … the setting or task is the independent variable" (Perrow 1970:6). In other words, each of these theorists emphasises that leadership behaviour is extensively shaped by organizational characteristics.

And yet much leadership discussion and research is conducted as if the organizational context did not matter. One strong attempt to link contextual features with transformational leadership is revealed in the work of (Pawar and Eastman 1997). He showed how a combination of four factors: different organisational emphases on efficiency or adaptation; the relative dominance of the technical core versus the boundary spanning units; the type of organisational structure; and the mode of governance, impact on organisational receptivity to transformational leadership. Likewise, organisational cultures can limit the potential for leadership: 'adaptive' organisational cultures, Pawar suggests, give more opportunity to charismatic leaders.

Perceived need

Early work on context often tended to adopt a rather mechanistic approach. This was characterised by a simplistic notion of 'fit' – that is, a proposition that different types of context could be matched with appropriate types of leadership. But contemporary approaches to leadership research are more alert to the interpretist perspective which allows insight into the socially constructed nature of perceived 'need'.

We saw in chapter one that there have been a number of attempts to explain why the topic of 'leadership' is so especially salient at the present time. Usually, the argument is that the nature of the contemporary competitive environment – with high uncertainty, a need for agile and speedy response to customer expectations and client demand – necessitates a shift from the orderly, planned and bureaucratic mode to a more adaptive and entrepreneurial mode. The perceived 'need for leadership' deriving

from this kind of analysis thus reflects a perceived shift in the environment-response

equation. There are, however, also other accounts which lead to different

interpretations.

For example, a very different form of explanation, both in terms of the focus on

leadership as a priority and for the kind of leadership solution seen as appropriate, can

be found using 'institutional theory' (DiMaggio and Powell 1983). From this

perspective, the frenetic activity catalogued in chapter one, can be viewed as a record

of managerial responses to perceived informed action by their competitor or

comparative reference point organisations. There does indeed seem to be more than a

little emulation taking place among the impressive array of organisations queuing up

to 'do something' about the leadership question. This is seen most clearly in the

phenomenal growth in 'corporate universities' and 'academies' (see Paton et al, this

volume) but is replicated more generally in relation to leadership 'interventions' and

'programmes' of all kinds. Senior executives themselves are not unaware of this

element of 'me-too-ism' as they often term it. The ones I have interviewed in a range

of different countries have often been willing to admit that a key driver upon them has

been a sense of anxiety among their colleagues that their organisation must be seen to

be responding in some way to a general trend. A related perspective is found in the

theory of organisational symbolism. Organisational action - such as an emphasis on

leadership - can be interpreted as a 'representation'. These representations reflect a

symbolic meaning which organisational actors and their 'audience' of stakeholders

read and interpret (Pondy, Frost et al. 1983).

The perceived 'need for leadership' and hence for leadership development can be interpreted in a different way when viewed from a sociological perspective. One major approach is to explain the phenomenon from the angle of interpreting 'authority'. The classic works of Reinhard Bendix (Bendix 1956) and of John Child (1969) illuminate the ways in which occupants of elite positions – and their 'spokespersons' - seek to legitimize authority, power and privilege. As Bendix and John Child both point out, virtually all accounts of the contributions and roles of managers and leaders contain dual aspects – that is, they express *ideological* as well as technical dimensions (Child 1969). As Bendix observed 'Wherever enterprises are set up, a few command and many obey. The few however have seldom been satisfied to command without a higher justification even when they have abjured all interest in ideas, and the many have seldom been docile enough not to provoke such justifications' (p. 1).

The specific circumstances of commercial and industrial power and authority are addressed in detail by Bendix:

'Industrialization has been defended in terms of the claim that the few will lead, as well as benefit, the many … industrialization has been defended by ideological appeals which justified the exercise of authority in economic enterprises. Qualities of excellence were attributed to employers or managers which made them appear worthy of the positions they occupied. More or less elaborate theories were used to in order to explain that excellence…' (p2).

This sociological perspective is taken up by Miller and Form (Miller and Form 1964) p. 186) who describe this ideology of top leaders and management:

'A highly self-conscious group whose ethnocentrism leads them to believe that they have special gifts and attributes not generally shared by the population. The greatest of these is the ability to manage and organise people …Top management is an authority-conscious group. Men at the top of the supervisory structure are consumed with decision making and commanding. Yet they do not like to believe that men obey them because they have power … they want to feel they command because they are gifted to lead'.

Bendix echoes this theme: 'Like all others who enjoy advantages over their fellows, men in power want to see their position as 'legitimate' and their advantages as deserved … All rulers therefore develop some myth of their natural superiority' (Bendix 1956)p. 294).

Drawing on this sociological insight, one can readily explain the tremendous appeal to, and the receptiveness of, the burgeoning population of leaders and managers in subsequent decades, to the idea of charismatic leadership. Consultants and authors elaborating the charismatic paradigm could be regarded as fulfilling the ideological function as spokespersons for power holders. Likewise, it is hardly surprising that occupants of top roles have been so willing to collaborate with researchers in 'uncovering' and cataloguing the array of special attributes, traits, qualities and competences which they uniquely possess - and which help 'explain', and thus legitimize, their privileged position.

Turning now to a strategic management perspective, another interpretation of the recent emphasis on leadership can be found, though it is one not necessarily in conflict with, but arguably complementary to, the sociological view just described above. From a strategic management perspective, the need for leadership is currently often addressed in terms of the *'reputational capital'* which a celebrated leader can bring to an organisation. This is a very interesting and revealing concept because it highlights the importance of *stakeholder perception*. In the case of a company, the stakeholder perceptions which would matter most would be those of City analysts, brokers and investment fund managers. As we noted earlier, loss of faith by these actors in a chairman or chief executive can have disastrous consequences on a company's share price and ability to raise funds. To this extent at least therefore, the critical importance of 'leadership' is hard to overstate.

In the case of a voluntary sector organisation or non-governmental organisation (NGO) such as Oxfam, the significant stakeholders whose perceptions would matter will include the donors, and the commentators whose opinions will influence the donors, such as the press. In public sector organisations such as a local authority, a school or a health trust, important stakeholder perceptions will be those held by central government fund allocators and by clients and other sponsors. Each of these can influence the fortunes – for good or ill – of these institutions. The rapid change in fortunes and reputation of the charity Kids Company, and its charismatic founder Camila Batmanghelidjh, in 2015 illustrates the power and the vulnerability of reputational capital (see the National Audit Office Report:

https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Investigation-the-governments-funding-of-Kids-Company.pdf).

What is of further interest is that the significance of leadership can increase dramatically in response to prevailing political, social and economic circumstances. During those periods when government, for example, determines that leadership in the public services is to be treated as of crucial importance then, as a self-fulfilling prophecy it indeed becomes so. Funds and reputation will flow in accord with the contours of this initial determination. Other actors in the system, even those of a more sceptical disposition, are prevailed upon to play by the new rules of the game. Thus, when the Cabinet Office (2001) (Cabinet Office 2000) discussed the crucial importance of leadership in the context of its 'modernising agenda', it was not merely reflecting a state of affairs but constructing them.

Reputational capital is thus found to have an important bearing on the understanding of leadership. By extension, 'leadership', under certain cultural and economic conditions, becomes a vital *intangible asset* to an organisation. It becomes virtually a component of the brand and is potentially just as valuable. It is accordingly easy to appreciate why organisational chiefs feel compelled to play along with the leadership mystique. Being seen to have a competent leader, and indeed *being seen to be attending to* the task of building a constantly replenishing 'leadership pool' is virtually *de rigeur* for any self-respecting organisation. The symbolic presence of these attributes is arguably of even more importance than whether there is any evidence of their impact on organisational outcomes. It is the accomplished performance of leadership, and the accomplished performance of leadership-building, which matters.

So far, we have looked at the context of leadership and the different perceived needs for leadership, which emerge at different times and in different places. But the ultimate heartland of leadership comprises a set of behaviours and capabilities. It is to an analysis of these that we now turn.

Behavioural requirements and competences

Research has continued unabated on the subject of the behaviours and capabilities required of leaders. To be adjudged a competent leader, an individual would usually be expected to possess a range of capabilities. In addition, leaders are also expected to make a series of 'accomplished performances' – that is, to display requisite behaviours. These latter usually depend on the former. Thus, capability and behavioural requirements are intimately intertwined. Hence, competency frameworks normally express both required skills and required behavioural accomplishments.

The capabilities or 'attributes' of leaders have proved to be a source of endless fascination. We noted earlier Warren Bennis's recent description of what he believes are the central hallmarks – the ability to find meaning in negative situations, a compelling voice, integrity, and adaptive capacity. But other researchers, practitioners, trainers and consultants have emphasised different attributes. The continuing variation in the competency frameworks thus echoes the problems of the early work on leader traits which also suffered from multiple and non-congruent profiles of leaders. However, some have argued that beneath the variety there are a number of more or less commonly agreed core capabilities. For example, numerous

surveys reveal that large numbers of respondents identify leaders as having and displaying vision, strategic sense, an ability to communicate that vision and strategy, and an ability to inspire and motivate (Council for Excellence in Management & Leadership 2001).

To what extent respondents to such surveys are truly capturing respondents' own interpretations of their direct experience of leaders or simply reflecting conventional wisdom about accomplished leadership is very hard to determine. But there does seem to be evidence that the stylised preferred account of the nature of leadership does change over time – and, as we saw earlier, varies also by culture. Of course, leadership may still be important even though, as the literature reveals, it derives from, and varies with, social context.

Recent years have witnessed increased usage of targets. But findings from a three-year research project by Tamkin and colleagues from The Work Foundation (Tamkin et al 2010), suggests that 'outstanding leadership' is a subtle process. It is, they conclude, more effective when it is people-oriented in the sense of being able to elicit commitment from people than it is when based on cruder forms of target-setting and measurement.

Current work on behavioural requirements and capabilities is very varied but it can be organised within three main categories – or what might be termed meta-capabilities. These are shown in Figure 2.2.

Insert figure 2.2. here

The first meta capability shown in Figure 2.2 emphasises ***big picture sensemaking***. This includes the ability to scan and interpret the environment; to differentiate threats to, and opportunities for, the organisation; to assess the organisations' strengths and weaknesses; and to construct a sensible vision, mission and strategy. As is constantly emphasised in the literature and in the dominant mode of thinking over the past couple of decades, the result of this big picture work may entail a transformative agenda for the focal organisation. Indeed, the distinct impression is easily gained that in modern perception, leadership work is of this nature almost by definition. Steady-state maintenance, it often appears, is not so much one variant of leadership as one might logically suppose, but rather is a function of that 'other' subordinate position, namely, management. What this expresses of course is that leadership is closely identified with change-making. The crucial capability here then is to correctly discern the direction of change.

This inevitably then points next to the second meta-capability – ***the ability to deliver change.*** This capability hinges on a cluster of constitutive skills such as mobilising support, communicating, energising and inspiring followers, active listening, adopting a supportive stance, enabling others through investing in their training and development, and empowering them to take decisions. An element within this meta-capability which has received a great deal of attention in recent years is that of 'emotional intelligence' (Goleman, Boyatzis et al. 2002; Humphrey 2002; Vitello-Cicciu 2002; Wolff, Pescosolido et al. 2002). This is a catch-all construct designed to

capture a number of inter-personal skills such as self-awareness, self-management and social awareness (such as empathy).

There are two levels to this behavioural attribute and therefore to this capability. The first level includes team or group leadership – or as it is sometimes termed, 'near leadership'. At this level inter-personal skills are at a premium. The second level is termed 'distant leadership' and it refers to those situations where the leader is not in direct personal contact with the followers – perhaps because of their large number – and so has to lead through the multiple tiers using means other than inter-personal skills. Different kinds of leadership capabilities are needed for the accomplishment of these different roles. It is also worth noting that there may be misalignment of the perceptions between distant and near group followers (Waldman 1999).

These two levels of distant and near refer of course to the conventional idea of the hierarchical leader – that is a leader who occupies some position of authority. Other skills will be required of those exercising lateral leadership. The necessary skills in such circumstances have been identified by (Fisher and Sharp 1998) who explains 'how to lead when you are not in charge'.

The third meta-capability concerns inter-organisational representation and the ambassadorial role. While this is a vital capability for a chief executive in a private sector company it is one which has reached special prominence in the public sector as a result of the increasing requirement for inter-agency working. Indeed, the cluster of capabilities required to 'lead' in a network context is one of the key current themes in the leadership debate. Skills such as coalition building, understanding others'

perspectives, persuasion, and assessing client needs in a holistic rather than a single agency manner become the premium requirements.

The competency perspective has been critiqued by Salaman (2004), Bolden and Gosling 2006) and Carroll et al (2008). The formal descriptions of competency frameworks, many of them derived from functional job analysis, tend they argue, not to reflect the reality of the practice of leadership.

Leadership development methods

As will be very evident from the review above, much of the literature on leadership is about the nature, the types, the qualities and the need for leadership. However, a certain segment of the literature also attends to the methods for *developing* leaders. The general case is as expressed by Robert Fulmer 'Leaders who keep learning may be the ultimate source of sustainable competitive advantage' (Fulmer, Gibbs et al. 2000)p.49. But, as the periodic worries and campaigns suggest, there is a concern that there is an insufficient supply of high quality development opportunities. From time to time, this concern becomes wrapped-up in the even wider agenda, held by some, that the business schools are not fully delivering what businesses 'need'. This criticism is variously expressed: university business schools are 'too academic'; they do not make enough efforts to tailor their products to the needs of their clients; and/or that they pay too little attention to the 'real-world' skills of managers.

There is often a hidden agenda to such critique and, not infrequently, also an anti-academic stance. The truth is, that outside the business schools, there is already huge provision for 'training for leadership'. The important question here therefore is not so

much the alleged 'neglect' of leadership but rather how to evaluate the quality and relevance of the overall provision already available.

Most of the training and development interventions which are available both in-house and as offered by external providers can be classified in terms of four main types:

1. Learning 'about leadership' and understanding organisations. This includes study of the work of Maslow, McGregor, Hersey and Blanchard, and (Kouzes and Posner 1997). This kind of traditional education is made available to a wide range of audiences. It comprises the basic fare for many leadership workshops.

2. Self-analysis, team analysis and exploration of different leadership styles. These interventions are usually based on psychometric questionnaires and instruments. These 'getting to know yourself' sessions usually also involve feedback, coaching, and sensitivity training.

3. Experiential learning and simulation. This mode of provision is very popular. It usually takes place in mountainous locales or in close proximity to the sea and small boats. Courses of this type operate on the basis of action learning or learning by doing. The work of John Adair (Adair 1983) often provides the basic underlying framework. The residential courses offering this approach are built around a series of outdoor tasks and challenges. The trainers act as facilitators and feed back information about behaviour patterns, from these participants embark on a journey of self discovery.

4. Top level, strategy courses. For the highest level managers it is more commonly the practice to send them either individually or in groups to prestige business schools for short 'executive courses'. These are invariably very expensive, exclusive and much valued by the participants. American business schools such as Harvard and Wharton are especially favoured but certain European schools such as INSEAD are also part of the perceived magic circle.

In addition to the above four types of courses, there is a whole array of leadership development activities within companies. These include leadership coaching (Robertson, 2009); on-line learning for leadership (Ladkin et al 2009; Vicere, 2000); 360 degree feedback (Alimos-Metcalf, 1998) , action learning for leaders (Dotlich and Noel 1998); accelerated development programmes and special project assignments (Giber et al 2000); seminars and career planning for so-called 'high potentials' (or Hi-Po's); courses to align with critical transition moments (such as first and subsequent leadership tier promotions), secondments, and various combinations of these approaches (London 2002; Avolio and Bass, 2000; McCauley, et al. 1998; Conger and Benjamin 1999; Hollenbeck and McCall 1999).

There is a fundamental dilemma that haunts many leadership development events. Because leadership is perceived as fundamentally about 'doing' rather than 'knowing' there is an inherent bias towards activity-focused and indeed briskly-paced encounters. The hours are long and the programme is normally packed. Participants, clients and providers often collude in fulfilling the prior expectation that events must be exciting and fast moving. In consequence, there is little time for reflection or

strategic thinking. These characteristics of leadership development events are self-evidently in tension with the kind of clear thinking supposedly required of top leaders.

So far in this chapter, we have taken an overview of the different ways in which leadership has been approached and understood, and we have introduced a basic conceptual framework which helps to locate the relevant key variables. In the following section we turn to an examination of the proposition that there is an overall trend towards a new theory of leadership.

POST-CHARISMATIC AND POST-TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP?

To what extent is there evidence that the enthusiasm for heroic, charismatic and transformational leadership is waning? In this final section of the chapter this is the issue which will be assessed.

The terms 'charismatic' and 'transformational' are used more or less interchangeably in much of the literature. However, it is possible to make a distinction between the two. Distilling a large literature on the 'charismatic leader' (Rowold and Laukamp 2009; Bass 1985; Bryman 1992; Conger and Kanungo 1998 and 1997; Sankowsky 1995) the notion can be broadly captured by reference to six elements:

i)   an heroic figure (usually with attributed past success stories);

ii)   a mystic in touch with higher truths;

iii)   a value-driven individual rather than one who is apparently purely self-serving;

iv)   someone who is perceived to 'know the way';

v)   an individual who has a vision of a more desirable and achievable future;

vi)   and finally someone thought to be capable of caring for and developing

        followers

It is evident from all six points that they reflect attributes of personality and behaviour. The construct of the 'transformational leader' on the other hand, although closely related in many ways, is distinct in that it refers to an approach to leading which aspires to significant organisational change through engaged and committed followers. It was John McGregor Burns who emphasised the meaning and significance of transformational leadership by contrasting it with transactional leadership (Burns 1978). This theme was picked up and elaborated by Bass (Bass 1985). According to Bass *transformational* leadership has four components:

i)   Individualised consideration (the leader is alert to the needs of followers and

        also takes care to develop them)

ii)   Intellectual stimulation (the leader encourages followers to think in creative

        ways and to propose innovative ideas)

iii)   Inspirational motivation (energising followers to achieve extraordinary things)

iv)   Idealized influence (offers followers a role model)

The component which most centrally captures the idea of transformational leadership is that of 'inspirational motivation'. This notion is decidedly change-focused. It holds forth the idea of ordinary people achieving extraordinary things through the influence of the leader. This kind of leader reduces complexity, doubt, cynicism and ambiguity by cutting through to the 'essential' elements and these are expressed in simple, readily understandable language. Moreover, these simple truths are expressed with

conviction. The goal - or better still the vision - is rendered clear and it is made to seem both desirable and achievable. Organisational members are asked to forsake mediocrity and routine and aspire instead to reach a future state of such high achievement that it deserves the willing expenditure of extra discretionary effort and commitment. (Bass 1985a; Bass 1985b; Bass 1990)

Thus, there are evident overlaps between the notions of the charismatic leaders and the transformational leader. In brief, transformational leaders usually require many of the attributes of charisma. But conversely, charisma alone is not enough to enable transformational leadership.

However, for the purposes of the present analysis, we are rather less interested in the distinction or the differences than in the way in which the general notion of the charismatic and transformational leadership captured the imagination of analysts, observers, consultants, trainers and organisational decision makers at the end of the twentieth century. In general, these and other players were mobilised behind the prescribed shift from the old and supposedly discredited transactional approach, to the new supposedly transformational approach. The campaign – urged along by management consultants and trainers – sought to explain and persuade a wide audience of the advantages and the elements of the 'new' approach. Especially influential - mainly because they were widely used by consultants - were the works of (Tichy and Devanna 1986) and of (Kouzes and Posner 1997). These, and similar works, emphasise the work and skills of transformational leaders in recognising the need for change - even when an organisation appeared to everyone else to be enjoying continued success; the creation of a new vision - developed and refined most probably

with others in the organisation; and the embedding or institutionalising of changes within the organisation.

Much of this message is amplified in the influential general works on leadership, management, marketing and business by management figures such as Tom Peters, one of the most successful management gurus of all time. For example, a key part of his constantly reiterated message was;

'You have got to know where you are going, to be able to state it clearly and concisely - and you have to care about it passionately. That all adds up to vision, the concise statement/picture of where the company and its people are heading, and why they should be proud of it' (Peters and Austin 1985: 284)

Given the extraordinary reach which the Tom Peters message achieved among the management populations of the western world, it is hardly a matter of surprise that surveys of managers find these attributes readily reflected back when questions are asked about the nature and 'meaning' of leadership. Similar powerful messages were diffused by management consultants using the works of (Bradford and Cohen 1984) and (Kouzes and Posner 1997) (Kotter 1988; Kotter 1990). Transformational leadership was part of the wider message of 'excellence' and 'high performance' which was - and to a large extent still is - so pervasive since the 1980s.

For example, it has been argued that the inspirational leadership style of Steve Jobs at Apple Computer, in the 1980s created

a corporate culture that has become widespread. In this new organisation, employees were supposed to work ceaselessly, uncomplainingly, and even for relatively low pay not just to produce and sell a product but to realise the vision of the messianic leader' (Khurana 2002a:4).

This kind of idea took a knock with the events surrounding Northern Rock and RBS. Our argument here is that the profile of 'transformational leadership' mirrored and reinforced other wider themes of the late twentieth century. 'Change management' was also very much to the fore for a whole array of reasons - not least because of concern about fierce competition from fast-growing economies in various parts of the world. Large proportions of public and private sector organisations were persuaded that they had to embark on significant restructuring and revitalisation. Increased global competition and deregulation of markets led senior executives to feel less secure. Traditional formulas such as large scale, market dominance and mass production seemed to offer far less reliable answers. New technologies and new forms of consumer behaviour made the large industrial and commercial bureaucracies seem slow, out of touch, and vulnerable. Many of them embarked on extensive downsizing, delayering and outsourcing. Employees were less likely to be offered long term careers or jobs for life. Employment contracts became looser as part-time, short term, and fixed term contracts appeared to proliferate. The challenges were huge and numerous. Who could divine which of the radical paths should be chosen? How were the new and far reaching uncertainties to be confronted? Who could explain to organisational members the imperative to change and at the same time convince them of the need for new behaviours and the need for a 'new deal' in their relations with their employing organisation?

Under these sorts of conditions, it is no surprise that the idea of the transformational leader became so appealing. The introduction of a *deus ex machina* figure became almost formulaic. Health Trusts were prevailed upon to bring in larger than life chair figures from the private sector and to parachute in 'interim managers' as Chief Executives. The government and the health trust non executives wanted 'Leader' figures – people who would exude confidence, energy, and enthusiasm. These were in effect 'interim managers' whose role was seen as temporary 'experts' parachuted in at the top with a mission to bring about significant change before they went native and became embroiled in local culture and assumptions. The same concept was extended to 'failing schools' where 'superheads' from successful schools were parachuted in to effect dramatic transformations. (But now the educational world seems to have move beyond this model. The superheads initiative has encountered a number of harsh realities and the concept appears to have been quietly de-emphasised in favour of a new accent on communities of learning).

There are now increasing signs of disenchantment with the concept of the assertive, no-nonsense leader whether of the charismatic or transformative variety. Some of this discontent and doubt we have already noted. But there is more, and it is increasing.

The 'shadow side of charisma' has been noted by a number of writers (Conger and Kanungo 1998) and by Howell and Avolio (Howell and Avolio 1992) (Sankowsky 1995). The dangers of narcissism and the associated misuse, and even abuse, of power were thus known about even at the height of the period when charismatic and

transformational leadership were being celebrated. There were even specific case analyses where malign effects had been experienced in corporations such as Peoples Express, Polaroid-Kodak and Disney (Garrett 1986); (Berg 1976; Sankowsky 1995). But overall, against the cacophony of general applause, they were inconspicuous spectres and ones very much in the background at this time.

Sankowsky explored the problems of exploitation of dependency among the followers of charismatic, narcissistic leaders. And Manfred Kets de Vries has been especially notable for his clinical reflections on some of the dysfunctional aspects of leadership (de Vries 1989; De Vries 1994; de Vries 2000). But these isolated warning signs have been brought together in a far more developed way in recent times to such a degree that the charismatic- transformational model itself is now being questioned. The research has also become more systematic and critical. For example, following a study of CEO successions in the US, Khurana (2002a) found that the widespread faith in the power of charismatic leaders had resulted in a number of problems. There was an exaggerated belief in the impact of CEOs on companies because recruiters were pursuing the chimera of a special 'type' of individual. There was a further tendency for companies to neglect suitable candidates while entertaining unsuitable ones. Finally, appointed charismatic leaders were problematic because it was found they 'can destabilise organisations in dangerous ways' (2002a: 4).

A common trait in the charismatic leaders studied was their willingness to deliberately fracture their organisations as a means to effect change. The destructive impact of a charismatic leader is exemplified by the case of Enron. Its CEO Jeff Skilling, 'induced blind obedience in his followers', and while his abilities as a 'new economy

strategist were overrated' (he instigated the shift to an asset-light position for the company), what he excelled at was 'motivating subordinates to take risks to think outside the box – in short to do whatever pleased him' Khurana (2002a:7). The case illustrates the dangerous downside of charismatic leadership – the dismissal of normal checks and balances and the impatience with, if not complete disregard of, convention and rule. These are of course the qualities which prompted their appointment and which helped shape their remit in the first place. As Khurana observes (2002: 8) the recent display of 'extraordinary trust in the power of charismatic CEO resembles less a mature faith than it does a belief in magic.'

A similar critique, albeit from a different perspective, was mounted by Michael Maccoby (2000). Writing prior to the burst of the dot.com boom and the corporate scandals which burst on to the scene in 2001 and 2007/8, Maccoby warned presciently of the risks and downsides of the eager search for, and celebration of, corporate leaders with charismatic qualities. He argued that the 1980s and 1990s provided fertile ground for the rise to prominence of the type of personality which Freud termed 'narcissistic'. Narcissists were one of Freud's three main personality types. Unlike the popular stereotype, the term as used in clinical psychology denotes a set of orientations which have positive as well as negative attributes. Among the important positive aspects, such people help disturb the status quo and stimulate change.

However, Freud also noted the negative side to narcissism. Narcissists are distrustful, suspicious and even paranoiac. Their achievements feed tendencies to arrogance, and 'feelings of grandiosity' (p70). They are poor listeners and tend to have an over-blown sense of their own good judgement even in the face of opposition. They thrive on risk

and are prepared to destroy current practices and strategies. They seek power, glory and admiration. They present a persona of supreme self-confidence and hubris. They suggest to themselves and others that they can do no wrong.

Maccoby's case is that the last two decades of the twentieth century provided the environment which allowed an unprecedented number of narcissistic personalities to occupy prominent leadership positions.

> 'With the dramatic discontinuities going on in the world today, more and more organisations are getting into bed with narcissists. They are finding that there is no substitute for narcissistic leaders in an age of innovation. Companies need leaders who do not try to anticipate the future so much as create it. But narcissistic leaders - even the most productive of them - can self destruct and lead their organizations terribly astray. For companies whose narcissistic leaders recognize their limitations, these will be the best of times. For other companies, these could turn put to be the worst. (Maccoby 2000: 77).

For RBS, Lehman Brothers, Andersen, Marconi and many other companies these proved to be prophetic words. But have the dramatic events of the past few years been enough to signal the end of the love affair with charismatic and transformational leaders?

People are beginning to look for alternatives to the charismatic transformational leader. There is a growing realisation that there are no easy answers and that an alternative mode of leadership must be one which promotes learning and is more

capable of being sustained than the Quixotic heroic concept normally allows. Michael Fullan's (2001a and 2001b) work presents an implicit model of post-charismatic leadership based around embedded learning, devolved leadership in teams and learning as a product of conflict, experimentation and false starts. That incipient leadership model has been refined and developed by many of the contributors to this volume.

Looking to the future

The campaign for a shift from transactional to transformational leaders which dominated the leadership and management agenda for at least two decades from the late 1970s or early 1980s has evidently run into some choppy waters. But has the model of the charismatic and transformational leader truly been abandoned? There is certainly much more caution, suspicion and scepticism of the kind of overblown claims which were relatively unquestioned at the height of the charisma boom. This caution and scepticism carries consequences for modes of leadership development.

However, even now in the period of aftershock following corporate collapse and salutary lessons in stock market fluctuations, it seems unlikely that all of the ideas surrounding the idea of the transformational leader will be abandoned. There will be more caution certainly and the apparently unbridled optimism and enthusiasm of the kind of management consultancy works exemplified by Kouzes and Posner (1997) may not find such easy favour. Moreover, there may, for a while, be some greater attraction for the less bombastic style of charismatic leader. This is the thesis of Birkenshaw's *Leadership: The Sven Goran Erikkson Way*. The more modest,

thoughtful, quieter approach will always be attractive in some quarters but it seems

highly unlikely that it represents an entirely new dominant model. A more balanced

approach is now in evidence. It is increasingly being argued that effective leaders are

both transactional and transformational in their leadership styles (Avolio and Bass

2002). They term their leadership development approach as encouraging 'the full

range of leadership styles'.

While stakeholders will probably approach staffing decisions in a more judicious way

in future, the allure of a leader who promises to point to new appealing directions and

also mobilise and energise followers will continue to be irresistibly appealing. Indeed,

as long as organizations require innovation, then this kind of leader will be sought.

There may however be less naivety about what a leader can achieve among all the

other variables which influence organizational outcomes and success. A notable

development is the idea of 'governance' as a means of ensuring that leaders act within

certain boundaries and that they can be held to account.

In the chapters which follow, the broad themes, issues and trends overviewed in these

first two chapters are explored in greater detail.

```
QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

Q1. To what extent can theories of leadership be classified in a chronological
manner?
Q2. Would you add any significant elements to the conceptual framework shown
in Figure 2.1?
Q3. What other key issues and trends could be identified in addition to those
discussed in this chapter?
```

References

Adair, J. (1983). Effective Leadership. London, Pan.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B (1998) '360 degree feedback and leadership development', *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 6 (1): 35-44.

Avolio, B. and B. Bass (1988). 'Transformational leadership, charisma and beyond' in J. Hunt, H. Baliga and C. Dachler (eds). Emerging Leadership Vistas, Lexington Books. Lexington, MA.

Avolio, B. and B. Bass, (Eds. (2002). Developing Potential Across a Full Range of Leadership Styles: Cases on Transactional and Transformational Leadership. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Avolio, B. J. and W. L. Gardner (2005). "Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership." *Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315-338.

Bass, B. M. (1985a). Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985b). "Leadership: good, better, best." Organizational Dynamics **13**: 26-40.

Bass, B. M. (1990). "From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision." Organizational Dynamics **19**(3): 19-31.

Bass, B.M. (2008) Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Applications, (4th Edition), NewYork: Free Press

Bendix, R. (1956). Work and Authority in Industry. Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.

Bennis, W (1994) On Becoming a Leader, Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W. G. and R. J. Thomas (2002). Geeks and Geezers; How Era, Values, and Defining Moments Shape Leaders. Boston, Harvard University Press.

Berg, N. (1976). Polaroid-Kodak. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press.

Blake, R. R. and J. S. Moulton (1964). The Managerial Grid. Houston, Gulf Publishing.

Blandford, S. and L. Squire (2000). "An evaluation of the teacher training agency headteacher leadership and management programme (HEADLAMP)." Educational Management & Administration **28**(1): 21-32.

Bolden, R. and Gosling, J. (2006) 'Leadership competences: Time to change the tune?', *Leadership*, 2(2): 147-164

Boyatzis, R. E., & McKee, A. (2005). *Resonant leadership: Renewing yourself and connecting with others through mindfulness, hope, and compassion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Bradford, D. L. and A. R. Cohen (1984). Managing for Excellence: The Guide to Developing High Performance in Contemporary Organizations. New York, Wiley.

Brodbeck, F. C. (2000). "Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries." Journal of Occupational amd Organizational Psychology **73**(1): 1-29.

Brodbeck, F. C., M. Frese, et al. (2002). "Leadership made in Germany: Low on compassion, high on performance." Academy of Management Executive **16**(1): 16-29.

Brundrett, M. (2001). "The Development of School Leadership Preparation Programmes in England and the USA." **29**(2): 229.

Bryman, A. (1992). Charisma and Leadership in Organisations. London, Sage.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York, Harper & Row.

Cabinet Office (2000). Strengthening Leadership in the Public Sector: A research study by the PIU. London, Performance and Innovation Unit.

Carlyle, T. (1841) *On Heroes,Hero Worship and the Heroic in History*, Reprinted 2007 by the Dodo Press.

Carroll, B., Levy, L. and Richmond, D.)2008) Leadership as practice: challenging the competency framework' *Leadership*, 4(4): 363-380.

Child, J. (1969). <u>British Management Thought</u>. London, Allen & Unwin.

Collins, J. (2005) 'Level 5 Leadership', *Harvard Business Review*, July-August: 1-10.

Conger, J. (1993). "The brave new world of leadership training." <u>Organizational Dynamics</u> **21**(3): 46-58.

Conger, J. and R. Kanungo (1987). "Towards a behavioural theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings." <u>Academy of Management Review</u> **12**: 635-647.

Conger, J. A. and B. Benjamin (1999). <u>Building Leaders: How Successful Companies Develop the Next Generation</u>. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

Conger, J. A. and R. N. Kanungo (1998). <u>Charismatic Leadership in Organizations</u>. Thousand Oaks, Calif., Sage.

Council for Excellence in Management & Leadership (2001). <u>Leadership Development: Best practice Guide for Organisations</u>. London, CEML.

Daresh, J. and T. Male (2000). "Crossing the border into leadership: experiences of newly appointed British headteachers and American principals." <u>Educational Management & Administration</u> **28**(1): 89-101.

DeChurch, L. A., C. S. Burke, M. L. Shuffler, R. Lyons, D. Doty and E. Salas (2011). "A historiometric analysis of leadership in mission critical multi-team environments'. *The Leadership Quarterly* 22: 152-169.

De Vries, M. F. K. (1994). "The leadership mystique." <u>Academy of Management Executive</u> **8**(3): 73-92.

de Vries, M. K. (1989). "The leader as mirror: clinical reflections." <u>Human Relations</u> **42**(7): 607-623.

de Vries, M.K. (2000). "When leaders have character: Need for leadership, performance, and the attribution of leadership." <u>Journal of Social Behavior and Personality</u> **15**(3): 413-430.

Diddans, M. and C. Chang (2012). "Only Human: exploring the nature of weakness in Authentic Leadership. ." *Leadership Quarterly* 23, 593-603.

Dinh, J. E., R. G. Lord, W. L. Gardner, J. D. Meuser, R. C. Liden and J. Hu (2014). "Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives." *Leadership Quarterly* 25: 36-62.

DiMaggio, P. W. and W. Powell (1983). "The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields." <u>American Sociological Review</u> **48**: 147-160.

Dotlich, D. and J. Noel (1998). <u>Action Learning: How the World's Top Companies are Recreating their Leaders and Themselves</u>. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

Dulebohn, J. H., W. H. Bommer, R. C. Liden, R. L. Brouer and G. R. Ferris (2012). "A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader–member exchange integrating the past with an eye toward the future." *Journal of Management* 38(1715-1759).

Fisher, R. and A. Sharp (1998). <u>Getting it Done: How to Lead when you are not in charge</u>. New York, HarperCollins.

Foley, M. (2013). *Political Leadership*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Fukuyama, F. (2012). *The Origins of Political Order: From Prehuman Times to the French Revolution*. New York, Profile Books.

Fukuyama, F. (2014). Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalisation of Democracy. London, Profile Books.

Fullan, M. (2001a). Leading in a Culture of Change. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

Fullan, M (2001b) The New Meaning of Educational Change, London, RoutledgeFalmer.

Fulmer, R. M., P. A. Gibbs, et al. (2000). "Developing leaders: How winning companies keep on winning." Sloan Management Review **42**(1): 49-59.

Gardner, H. E. (1996) Leading Minds: An Anatomy of Leadership, New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, W. L., Lowe K.B., T. W. Moss, K. T. Mahoney and C. Cogliser (2010). "Scholarly Leadership of the Study of Leadership. A review of the leadership Quarterly, second decade, 2000-2009", *The Leadership Quarterly* 21: 922-958.

Gardner, W. L., C. C. Cogliser, K. M. Davis and M. P. Dickens (2011). "Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda." The Leadership Quarterly, 22: 1120-1145.

Garrett, E. (1986). "The troops are restless at People Express." Venture **8**: 102-104.

Giber, D., L. Carter, et al. (2000). Leadership Development Handbook: Case Studies, Instruments and Training. Lexington, MA, Linkage Press.

Gill, R. (2006) Theory and Practice of Leadership, London: Sage.

Goleman, D., R. Boyatzis, et al. (2002). Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence. Boston, Harvard Business School Press.

Grint, K., Ed. (1997). Leadership: Classic, Contemporary and Critical Approaches. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Grint, K. (2000). The Arts of Leadership. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Grint, K. (2005) Leadership: Limits and Possibilities, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

Gronn, P. (2016). Instead of angels: Leaders, leadership and longue durée. Routledge Companion to Leadership. J. Storey. New York, Routedge.

Hollenbeck, G. and M. McCall (1999). 'Leadership development', in A. Kraut and A. Korman (eds) Evolving Practices in Human Resource Management.. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

House, R. J. (1971). "A path-goal theory of leadership." <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u> **16**: 321-38.

House, R. J. (1996). "Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, leagcy and a reformulated theory." <u>Leadership Quarterly</u> **7**: 323-352.

Howell, J. and B. Avolio (1992). "The ethics of charismatic leadership: submission or liberation?" <u>Academy of Management Executive</u> **6**(2): 43-54.

Humphrey, R. H. (2002). "The many faces of emotional leadership." <u>Leadership Quarterly</u> **13**(5): 493-504.

Jepson, D. (2009) 'Studying leadership at the cross-country level: A critical analysis' Leadership, 5(1): 61-80.

Judge, T.A.; Piccolo, R. F. and Kosalka, T. (2009) 'The bright and dark sides of leader traits: A review and theoretical extension of the leader trait paradigm' *Leadership Quarterly*, 20(6): 855-875.

Khurana, R. (2002a). "The curse of the superstar CEO." <u>Harvard Business Review</u> September: 3-8.

Khurana, R. (2002b). <u>Searching for the Corporate Savior</u>. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Kotter, J. (1988). The Leadership Factor. New York, The Free Press.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management. New York, Free Press.

Kouzes, J. M. and B. Z. Posner (1997). The Leadership Challenge: How to get Extraodinary Things Done in Organizations. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

Ladkin, D., Case, P., Wicks, P.G., Kinsella, K. (2009) 'Developing leaders in cyber-space: The paradoxical possibilities of on-line learning', *Leadership*, 5(2) 192-212

Lee, N., C. Senior and M. Butler (2012). 'Leadership research and cognitive neuroscience: The state of this union', *The Leadership Quarterly* 23, 213-218.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., White, R. (1939) 'Patterns of aggressive behaviour in experimentally created social climates', Journal of Social Psychology, 10: 271-301.

Liden, R.C, Wayne, S.J., Zhao, H. and Henderson, D. (2008) 'Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment', *Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2): 161-177.

London, M. (2002). Leadership Development: Paths to Self-Insight and Professional Growth. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Maccoby, M. (2000). "Narcissistic leaders: the incredible pros, the inevitable cons."
<u>Harvard Business Review</u> January-February: 69-77.

McCauley, C. D., Moxley, R. and E V Velsor, (Eds) (1998). <u>The Center for Creative
Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development</u>. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

Mangham, I (1986) Power and Performance in Organizations, Oxford: Blackwell

Mellahl, K. (2000). "The teaching of leadership in UK MBA programmes." <u>Journal of
Management Development</u> **19**(3/4): 297-309.

Mayer, C. (2014). *Firm Commitment: Why the Corporation is Failing Us and How to
Restore Trust in It*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Miller, D. and W. Form (1964). <u>Industrial Sociology</u>. New York, Harper & Row.

Mumford, M., Antes, A.L., Caughron, J. and Friedrich, T.L. (2008) 'Charismatic,
ideological, and pragmatic leadership: Multi-level influences on emergence and
performance', *Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2): 144-160.

Pawar, B. S. and K. K. Eastman (1997). "The nature and implications of contextual
influences on transformational leadership." <u>Academy of Management Review</u> **22**(1):
80-110.

Perrow, C. (1970). Organizational Analysis. Belmont, CA, Wadsworth.

Peters, T. and N. Austin (1985). A Passion for Excellence. New York, Random House.

Peters, T. and R. Waterman (1982). In Search of Excellence. New York, Harper & Row.

Pettigrew, A., E. Ferlie, et al. (1992). Shaping Strategic Change. London, Sage.

Pondy, L., P. Frost, et al., Eds. (1983). Organizational Symbolism. Greenwich, CT, JAI Press.

Riggio, R., Challeff, I., and Lipman-Blumen, J. (2008) *How Great Followers Create Great Leaders and Organizations,* San Francisco, Wiley.

Roberston, J. (2009) 'Coaching leadership learning through partnership', *School Leadership & Management*, 29(1): 39-49

Rowold, J. and Laukamp, L. (2009) 'Charismatic leadership and objective performance indicators', *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 58(4) : 602-621,

Salaman, G. 'Competences of managers, competences of leaders'. in J. Storey (ed) *Leadership in Organizations: Current Issues and Key Trends*, (1st edition) London: Routledge.

Sankowsky, D. (1995). "The charismatic leader as narcissist: understanding the abuse of power." Organizational Dynamics **23**(4): 57-71.

Sendjava, S., Sarros, J C., and Santora, J C (2008). 'Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organisations' *Journal of Management Studies* 45(2): 402-424.

Selznick, P. (1957). Leadership in Administration. Row Peterson, Evanston, IL.

Shackleton, V. (1995). *Business Leadership*. London, Routledge.

Spillane, J. (2006) *Distributed Leadership*, San Fancisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Storey, J., J. Hartley, J.L. Denis, P., 'tHart and D. Ulrich, Eds. (2016). *The Routledge Companion to Leadership*. New York, Routledge.

Tamkin, P and Pearson, G. Hirsh, W., Constable, S. (2010) *Exceeding Expectation: the principles of outstanding leadership*, London, The Work Foundation.

Thompson, G. and Vecchio, R.P. (2009) 'Situational leadership theory: A test of three versions', Leadership Quarterly, 20(5): 837-848

Tichy, N. and M. Devanna (1986). The Transformational Leader. New York, Wiley.

Uhl-Bien, M. and M. Carsten (2016). Followership in Context: A more nuanced understanding of followership in relation to leadership. The Routledge Companion to Leadership. J. Storey. New York, Routedge.

Uhl-Bien, M. and R. Marion (2009). "Complexity leadership in bureaucratic forms of organizing: A meso model. ." The Leadership Quarterly, 20: 631-650.

Vicere, A. A. (2000). "Ten observations on e-Learning and Leadership Development." Human Resource Planning **23**(4): 34-47.

Vitello-Cicciu, J. M. (2002). "Exploring emotional intelligence - Implications for nursing leaders." Journal of Nursing Administration **32**(4): 203-210.

Vroom, V. H. and P. W. Yetton (1988). The New Leadership: Managing Participation in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.

Waldman, D. A. (1999). "CEO charismatic leadership: levels of management and levels of analysis effects." Academy of Management Review **24**(2): 266-286.

Westley, F. a. M., H (1989). "Visionary leadership and strategic management." Strategic Management Journal **10**: 17-32.

Wolff, S. B., A. T. Pescosolido, et al. (2002). "Emotional intelligence as the basis of leadership emergence in self-managing teams." Leadership Quarterly **13**(5): 505-522.

Yukl, G. (2009). Leadership in Organizations. New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Zaleznik, A. (1992). "Managers and Leaders: Are they different?" <u>Harvard Business Review</u> March-April: 126-135.

<mark>Note to editor; ignore the refs below they are already in the list above</mark>

Avolio, B. J. and W. L. Gardner (2005). " Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership." <u>Leadership Quarterly, 16(3), 315-338</u>.
Diddans, M. and C. Chang (2012). "Only Human: exploring the nature of weakness in Authentic Leadership. ." <u>Leadership Quarterly 23, 593-603</u>
Dinh, J. E., R. G. Lord, W. L. Gardner, J. D. Meuser, R. C. Liden and J. Hu (2014). "Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives." <u>Leadership Quarterly</u> **25**: 36-62.
Gardner, W. L., Lowe K.B., T. W. Moss, K. T. Mahoney and C. Cogliser (2010). "Scholarly Leadership of the Study of Leadership. A review of the leadership Quarterly, second decade, 2000-2009.
." <u>The Leadership Quarterly</u> **21**: 922-958.
Mayer, C. (2014). <u>Firm Commitment: Why the Corporation is Failing Us and How to Restore Trust in It</u>. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Storey, J., J. Hartley, J.-L. Denis, P. 'tHart and D. Ulrich, Eds. (2016). <u>The Routledge Companion to Leadership</u>. New York, Routledge.