Introduction

Leadership is a highly sought-after and highly valued commodity. In the 15 years since the first edition of this book was published, the public has become increasingly captivated by the idea of leadership. People continue to ask themselves and others what makes good leaders. As individuals, they seek more information on how to become effective leaders. As a result, bookstore shelves are filled with popular books about leaders and advice on how to be a leader. Many people believe that leadership is a way to improve their personal, social, and professional lives. Corporations seek those with leadership ability because they believe they bring special assets to their organizations and, ultimately, improve the bottom line. Academic institutions throughout the country have responded by providing programs in leadership studies.

In addition, leadership has gained the attention of researchers worldwide. A review of the scholarly studies on leadership shows that there is a wide variety of different theoretical approaches to explain the complexities of the leadership process (e.g., Antonakis, Ciancio, & Sternberg, 2004; Bass, 1990; Bryman, 1992; Gardner, 1990; Hickman, 1998; Mumford, 2006; Rost, 1991). Some researchers conceptualize leadership as a trait or as a behavior, whereas others view leadership from an information-processing perspective or relational standpoint. Leadership has been studied using both qualitative and quantitative methods in many contexts, including small groups, therapeutic groups, and large organizations. Collectively, the research findings on leadership from all of these areas provide a picture of a process that is far more sophisticated and complex than the often-simplistic view presented in some of the popular books on leadership.

This book treats leadership as a complex process having multiple dimensions. Based on the research literature, this text provides an in-depth description and application of many different approaches to leadership.
Our emphasis is on how theory can inform the practice of leadership. In this book, we describe each theory and then explain how the theory can be used in real situations.

**LEADERSHIP DEFINED**

There are many ways to finish the sentence, “Leadership is...” In fact, as Stogdill (1974, p. 7) pointed out in a review of leadership research, there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are people who have tried to define it. It is much like the words democracy, love, and peace. Although each of us intuitively knows what we mean by such words, the words can have different meanings for different people. As soon as we try to define leadership, we discover that leadership has many different meanings.

**Ways of Conceptualizing Leadership**

In the past 60 years, as many as 65 different classification systems have been developed to define the dimensions of leadership (Fleishman et al., 1991). One such classification system, directly related to our discussion, is the scheme proposed by Bass (1990, pp. 11-20). He suggested that some definitions view leadership as the focus of group processes. From this perspective, the leader is at the center of group change and activity and embodies the will of the group. Another set of definitions conceptualizes leadership from a personality perspective, which suggests that leadership is a combination of special traits or characteristics that some individuals possess. These traits enable those individuals to induce others to accomplish tasks. Other approaches to leadership define it as an act or behavior—the things leaders do to bring about change in a group.

In addition, some define leadership in terms of the power relationship that exists between leaders and followers. From this viewpoint, leaders have power that they wield to effect change in others. Others view leadership as a transformational process that moves followers to accomplish more than is usually expected of them. Finally, some scholars address leadership from a skills perspective. This viewpoint stresses the capabilities (knowledge and skills) that make effective leadership possible.

**Definition and Components**

Despite the multitude of ways in which leadership has been conceptualized, the following components can be identified as central to the
phenomenon: (a) Leadership is a process, (b) leadership involves influence, (c) leadership occurs in groups, and (d) leadership involves common goals. Based on these components, the following definition of leadership is used in this text:

**Leadership** is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal.

Defining leadership as a process means that it is not a trait or characteristic that resides in the leader, but rather a transactional event that occurs between the leader and the followers. Process implies that a leader affects and is affected by followers. It emphasizes that leadership is not a linear, one-way event, but rather an interactive event. When leadership is defined in this manner, it becomes available to everyone. It is not restricted to the formally designated leader in a group.

Leadership involves influence. It is concerned with how the leader affects followers. Influence is the sine qua non of leadership. Without influence, leadership does not exist.

Leadership occurs in groups. Groups are the context in which leadership takes place. Leadership involves influencing a group of individuals who have a common purpose. This can be a small task group, a community group, or a large group encompassing an entire organization. Leadership is about one individual influencing a group of others to accomplish common goals. Others in groups are required for leadership to occur. Leadership training programs that teach people to lead themselves are not considered a part of leadership within the definition that is set forth in this discussion.

Leadership includes attention to common goals. Leaders direct their energies toward individuals who are trying to achieve something together. By common, we mean that the leaders and followers have a mutual purpose. Attention to common goals gives leadership an ethical overtone because it stresses the need for leaders to work with followers to achieve selected goals. Stressing mutuality lessens the possibility that leaders might act toward followers in ways that are forced or unethical. It also increases the possibility that leaders and followers will work together toward a common goal (Rost, 1991).

Throughout this text, the people who engage in leadership will be called leaders, and those toward whom leadership is directed will be called followers. Both leaders and followers are involved in the leadership process. Leaders need followers, and followers need leaders (Bums, 1978; Heller & Van Til, 1983; Hollander, 1992; Jago, 1982). Although
leaders and followers are closely linked, it is the leader who often initiates the relationship, creates the communication linkages, and carries the burden for maintaining the relationship.

In our discussion of leaders and followers, attention will be directed toward follower issues as well as leader issues. Leaders have an ethical responsibility to attend to the needs and concerns of followers. As Burns (1978) pointed out, discussions of leadership sometimes are viewed as elitist because of the implied power and importance often ascribed to leaders in the leader-follower relationship. Leaders are not above or better than followers. Leaders and followers must be understood in relation to each other (Hollander, 1992) and collectively (Burns, 1978). They are in the leadership relationship together—and are two sides of the same coin (Rost, 1991).

LEADERSHIP DESCRIBED

In addition to definitional issues, it is also important to discuss several other questions pertaining to the nature of leadership. In the following section, we will address questions such as how leadership as a trait differs from leadership as a process; how appointed leadership differs from emergent leadership; and how the concepts of power, coercion, and management differ from leadership.

Trait Versus Process Leadership

We have all heard statements such as, “He is born to be a leader” or “She is a natural leader.” These statements are commonly expressed by people who take a trait perspective toward leadership. The trait perspective suggests that certain individuals have special innate or inborn characteristics or qualities that make them leaders, and that it is these qualities that differentiate them from nonleaders. Some of the personal qualities used to identify leaders include unique physical factors (e.g., height), personality features (e.g., extraversion), and other characteristics (e.g., intelligence and fluency; Byman, 1992). In Chapter 2, we will discuss a large body of research that has examined these personal qualities.

To describe leadership as a trait is quite different from describing it as a process (Figure 1.1). The trait viewpoint conceptualizes leadership as a property or set of properties possessed in varying degrees by different people.
Figure 1.1 The Different Views of Leadership

The process viewpoint suggests that leadership is a phenomenon that resides in the context of the interactions between leaders and followers and makes leadership available to everyone. As process, leadership can be observed in leader behaviors (Jago, 1982), and can be learned. The process definition of leadership is consistent with the definition of leadership that we have set forth in this chapter.

Assigned Versus Emergent Leadership

Some people are leaders because of their formal position in an organization, whereas others are leaders because of the way other group members respond to them. These two common forms of leadership are called assigned leadership and emergent leadership. Leadership that is based on occupying a position in an organization is assigned leadership. Team leaders, plant managers, department heads, directors, and administrators are all examples of assigned leadership.

Yet the person assigned to a leadership position does not always become the real leader in a particular setting. When others perceive an individual
as the most influential member of a group or organization, regardless of the individual's title, the person is exhibiting emergent leadership. The individual acquires emergent leadership through other people in the organization who support and accept that individual's behavior. This type of leadership is not assigned by position; rather, it emerges over a period through communication. Some of the positive communication behaviors that account for successful leader emergence include being verbally involved, being informed, seeking others' opinions, initiating new ideas, and being firm but not rigid (Fisher, 1974).

In addition to communication behaviors, researchers have also found that personality plays a role in leadership emergence. For example, Smith and Fott (1998) found that certain personality traits were related to leadership emergence in a sample of 160 male college students. The individuals who were more dominant, more intelligent, and more confident about their own performance (general self-efficacy) were more likely to be identified as leaders by other members of their task group. Although it is uncertain whether these findings apply to women as well, Smith and Fott suggested that these three traits could be used to identify individuals perceived to be emergent leaders.

Leadership emergence may also be affected by gender-biased perceptions. In a study of 40 mixed-sex college groups, Watson and Hoffman (2004) found that women who were urged to persuade their task groups to adopt high-quality decisions succeeded with the same frequency as men with identical instructions. Although women were equally influential leaders in their groups, they were rated significantly lower than comparable men were on leadership. Furthermore, these influential women were also rated as significantly less likable than comparably influential men were. These results suggest that there continue to be barriers to women's emergence as leaders in some settings.

A unique perspective on leadership emergence is provided by social identity theory (Hogg, 2001). From this perspective, leadership emergence is the degree to which a person fits with the identity of the group as a whole. As groups develop over time, a group prototype also develops. Individuals emerge as leaders in the group when they become most like the group prototype. Being similar to the prototype makes leaders attractive to the group and gives them influence with the group.

The leadership approaches we discuss in the subsequent chapters of this book apply equally to assigned leadership and emergent leadership. When a person is engaged in leadership, that person is a leader, whether
leadership was assigned or emerged. This book focuses on the leadership process that occurs when any individual is engaged in influencing other group members in their efforts to reach a goal.

**Leadership and Power**

The concept of power is related to leadership because it is part of the influence process. Power is the capacity or potential to influence. People have power when they have the ability to affect others' beliefs, attitudes, and courses of action. Ministers, doctors, coaches, and teachers are all examples of people who have the potential to influence us. When they do, they are using their power, the resource they draw on to effect change in us.

The most widely cited research on power is French and Raven's (1959) work on the bases of social power. In their work, they conceptualized power from the framework of a dyadic relationship that included both the person influencing and the person being influenced. French and Raven identified five common and important bases of power: referent, expert, legitimate, reward, and coercive (Table 1.1). Each of these bases of power increases a leader's capacity to influence the attitudes, values, or behaviors of others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 1.1</strong> Five Bases of Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referent Power</strong> Based on followers' identification and liking for the leader. A teacher who is adored by students has referent power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expert Power</strong> Based on followers' perceptions of the leader's competence. A tour guide who is knowledgeable about a foreign country has expert power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legitimate Power</strong> Associated with having status or formal job authority. A judge who administers sentences in the courtroom exhibits legitimate power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward Power</strong> Derived from having the capacity to provide rewards to others. A supervisor who gives rewards to employees who work hard is using reward power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coercive Power</strong> Derived from having the capacity to penalize or punish others. A coach who sits players on the bench for being late to practice is using coercive power.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In organizations, there are two major kinds of power: position power and personal power. *Position power* is the power a person derives from a particular office or rank in a formal organizational system. It is the influence capacity a leader derives from having higher status than the followers have. Vice presidents and department heads have more power than staff personnel do because of the positions they hold in the organization. Position power includes legitimate, reward, and coercive power (Table 1.2).

*Personal power* is the influence capacity a leader derives from being seen by followers as likable and knowledgeable. When leaders act in ways that are important to followers, it gives leaders power. For example, some managers have power because their subordinates consider them to be good role models. Others have power because their subordinates view them as highly competent or considerate. In both cases, these managers' power is ascribed to them by others, based on how they are seen in their relationships with others. Personal power includes referent and expert power (see Table 1.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Power</th>
<th>Personal Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>Referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In discussions of leadership, it is not unusual for leaders to be described as wielders of power, as individuals who dominate others. In these instances, power is conceptualized as a tool that leaders use to achieve their own ends. Contrary to this view of power, Burns (1978) emphasized power from a relationship standpoint. For Burns, power is not an entity that leaders use over others to achieve their own ends; instead, power occurs in relationships. It should be used by leaders and followers to promote their collective goals.

In this text, our discussions of leadership treat power as a relational concern for both leaders and followers. We pay attention to how leaders work with followers to reach common goals.
Leadership and Coercion

Coercive power is one of the specific kinds of power available to leaders. Coercion involves the use of force to effect change. “Coerce” means influencing others to do something against their will and may include manipulating penalties and rewards in their work environment. Coercion often involves the use of threats, punishment, and negative reward schedules. Classic examples of leaders who used coercion are Adolf Hitler in Germany, Jim Jones in Guyana, and David Koresh in Waco, Texas, each of whom used power and restraint to force followers to engage in extreme behaviors.

It is important to distinguish between coercion and leadership because it allows us to separate out from our examples of leadership the behaviors of individuals such as Hitler, Jones, and Koresh. In our discussions of leadership, coercive people are not used as models of ideal leadership. Our definition suggests that leadership is reserved for those who influence a group of individuals toward a common goal. Leaders who use coercion are interested in their own goals and seldom are interested in the wants and needs of subordinates. Using coercion runs counter to working with followers to achieve a common goal.

Leadership and Management

Leadership is a process that is similar to management in many ways. Leadership involves influence, as does management. Leadership entails working with people, which management entails as well. Leadership is concerned with effective goal accomplishment, and so is management. In general, many of the functions of management are activities that are consistent with the definition of leadership we set forth at the beginning of this chapter.

But leadership is also different from management. Whereas the study of leadership can be traced back to Aristotle, management emerged around the turn of the 20th century with the advent of our industrialized society. Management was created as a way to reduce chaos in organizations, to make them run more effectively and efficiently. The primary functions of management, as first identified by Fayol (1916), were planning, organizing, staffing, and controlling. These functions are still representative of the field of management today.
In a book that compared the functions of management with the functions of leadership, Kotter (1990) argued that the functions of the two are quite dissimilar (Figure 1.2). The overriding function of management is to provide order and consistency to organizations, whereas the primary function of leadership is to produce change and movement. Management is about seeking order and stability; leadership is about seeking adaptive and constructive change.

**Figure 1.2  Functions of Management and Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Produces Order and Consistency</th>
<th>Leadership Produces Change and Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Budgeting</td>
<td>Establishing Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish agendas</td>
<td>• Create a vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set timetables</td>
<td>• Clarify big picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allocate resources</td>
<td>• Set strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing and Staffing</td>
<td>Aligning People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide structure</td>
<td>• Communicate goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make job placements</td>
<td>• Seek commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish rules and procedures</td>
<td>• Build teams and coalitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling and Problem Solving</td>
<td>Motivating and Inspiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop incentives</td>
<td>• Inspire and energize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generate creative solutions</td>
<td>• Empower subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take corrective action</td>
<td>• Satisfy unmet needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As illustrated in Figure 1.2, the major activities of management are played out differently from the activities of leadership. Although they are different in scope, Kotter (1990, pp. 7–8) contended that both management and leadership are essential if an organization is to prosper. For example, if an organization has strong management without leadership, the outcome can be stifling and bureaucratic. Conversely, if an organization has strong leadership without management, the outcome can be meaningless or
misdired change for change’s sake. To be effective, organizations need to
nurish both competent management and skilled leadership.

Many scholars, in addition to Kotter (1990), argue that leadership and
management are distinct constructs. For example, Bennis and Nanus
(1985) maintained that there is a significant difference between the two.
To manage means to accomplish activities and master routines, whereas to
lead means to influence others and create visions for change. Bennis and
Nanus made the distinction very clear in their frequently quoted sentence,
“Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do
the right thing” (p. 221).

Rost (1991) has also been a proponent of distinguishing between leader-
ship and management. He contended that leadership is a multidirectional
influence relationship and management is a unidirectional authority rela-
tionship. Whereas leadership is concerned with the process of developing
mutual purposes, management is directed toward coordinating activities in
order to get a job done. Leaders and followers work together to create real
change, whereas managers and subordinates join forces to sell goods and
services (Rost, 1991, pp. 149–152).

Approaching the issue from a narrower viewpoint, Zaleznik (1977) went
so far as to argue that leaders and managers themselves are distinct, and
that they are basically different types of people. He contended that manag-
ers are reactive and prefer to work with people to solve problems but do so
with low emotional involvement. They act to limit choices. Zaleznik sug-
gested that leaders, on the other hand, are emotionally active and involved.
They seek to shape ideas instead of responding to them and act to expand
the available options to solve long-standing problems. Leaders change the
way people think about what is possible.

Although there are clear differences between management and leader-
ship, the two constructs overlap. When managers are involved in influen-
cing a group to meet its goals, they are involved in leadership. When leaders
are involved in planning, organizing, staffing, and controlling, they are
involved in management. Both processes involve influencing a group of
individuals toward goal attainment. For purposes of our discussion in this
book, we focus on the leadership process. In our examples and case stud-
ies, we treat the roles of managers and leaders similarly and do not empha-
size the differences between them.