

Leadership in Organizations

DEANNE N. DEN HARTOG
and PAUL L. KOOPMAN

Leadership has always been an important topic in work and organizational psychology and much research has been devoted to the topic. This chapter describes the developments in this field over the last decades. Trait, style, and contingency theories of leadership in organizations are presented, as well as several alternative approaches to studying leadership. Special attention is also given to transformational/charismatic leadership. The growing importance of global and international world business creates a strong demand for managers who are sophisticated in international management and skilled at working with people from other countries. This has resulted in increased attention for cross-cultural perspectives the leadership field. Other currents of change, such as the developing information technology and the increased importance of teams and other lateral organizing mechanisms are influencing work and organizations in a pervasive manner. We conclude the chapter by presenting several possible ways in which these trends may change the role of leadership in future organizations.

INTRODUCTION

Legends and myths about what distinguishes 'great leaders' from 'commoners' seem to have always attracted people. Bass writes: 'The study of leadership rivals in age the emergence of civilization, which shaped its leaders as much as it was shaped by them. From its infancy, the study of history has been the study of leaders – what they did and why they did it' (1990a: 3). Leadership still fascinates scholars as well as the general public. However, the term 'leadership' means different things to different people. Definitions of leadership vary in terms of emphasis on leader abilities, personality traits, influence relationships, cognitive versus emotional orientation, individual versus group orientation, and appeal to self versus collective interests. Definitions also vary in whether they are primarily descriptive or normative in nature as well as in their relative emphasis on behavioral styles (Den Hartog, Koopman, Thierry, Wilderom, Maczynski &

Jarmuz, 1997). Leadership is sometimes distinguished from management (e.g., Kotter, 1990; Zaleznik, 1977) or seen as one of several managerial roles (e.g., Mintzberg, 1989). Bryman (1992) states that most definitions of leadership emphasize three main elements: *group*, *influence*, and *goal*. Table 9.1 provides several examples of definitions of leadership.

Another way to view leadership is in terms of the different *domains* leadership encompasses. Most approaches to leadership have been leader-centered. However, one can distinguish between the leader, follower, and relationship domain of leadership (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). In all three domains different levels of analysis (i.e., individual, dyad, group or larger collectivities) can be the focus of investigation (e.g., Yammarino & Bass, 1991). According to Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), leader behavior and characteristics and their effects are the primary issues of concern in the leader-based domain. A follower-based approach would lead to hypotheses focusing on follower issues such as follower characteristics, behaviors, and perceptions

Table 9.1 *Defining leadership*

Anglo-Saxon definitions of leadership
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership is the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization (Katz & Kahn, 1978). • Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal achievement (Rauch & Behling, 1984). • Yukl (1998) broadly defines leadership as influence processes affecting the interpretation of events for followers, the choice of objectives for the group or organization, the organization of work activities to accomplish the objectives, the motivation of followers to achieve the objectives, the maintenance of cooperative relationships and teamwork, and the enlistment of support and cooperation from people outside the group or organization. • Leadership is defined in terms of a process of social influence whereby a leader steers members of a group towards a goal (Bryman, 1992). • Leadership is the ability of an individual to motivate others to forego self interest in the interest of a collective vision, and to contribute to the attainment of that vision and to the collective by making significant personal self-sacrifices over and above the call of duty, willingly (House & Shamir, 1993).

or topics such as empowerment (e.g., Hollander, 1992; Meindl, 1990). A relationship-based model takes the relationship between leader and follower as the starting point for research and theory building. Issues of concern are reciprocal influence and the development and maintenance of effective relationships (e.g., Bryman, 1992; Graen & Scandura, 1987). Graen and Uhl-Bien note that a multiple domain approach should be taken more often and that 'careful sampling from multiple domains within the same investigation should account for more of the potential leadership contribution, and thus increase the predictive validity and practical usefulness of our studies' (1995: 221).

As stated, most research in the leadership field so far has been done from a leader-centered point of view. The following section presents an overview of the major developments in leadership research and theory to date. This is followed by a more extensive treatment of the most recent trend in leadership research, which focuses on so-called charismatic, transformational, or inspirational leadership. The growing importance of global and international world business creates a strong demand for managers who are sophisticated in international management and skilled at working with people from other countries (Adler, 1991). This has led to increased attention for cross-cultural perspectives the leadership field. Therefore, the topic of international and cross-cultural research into leadership is also discussed. A discussion of the future of leadership and future leadership research concludes this chapter.

TRENDS AND DEVELOPMENTS IN LEADERSHIP RESEARCH

Leadership has been an important topic of investigation, especially in North America, for many decades. Several main trends can be distinguished

in the development of the study of (business) leadership. Prior to the 1980s the main approaches to leadership were the *trait*, *style*, and *contingency* approach. Table 9.2 presents a historical overview of the main trends in the leadership field. The dates in this table represent rough indications of the periods in which the emphasis was on that approach. A new stage did not necessarily mean the previous stage was completely abandoned; rather, a shift in emphasis occurred (Bass, 1990a; Bryman, 1992). Several alternative ways to conceptualize and study leadership have had a profound influence on the development of ideas about and research into leadership from the early 1980s onward. Below, the three aforementioned main trends and several of these alternative approaches to leadership will be described.

The Trait Approach

Early research into leadership can be characterized as a search for 'the great man.' Personal characteristics of leaders were emphasized and the implicit idea was that leaders are born rather than made. All leaders were supposed to have certain stable characteristics that made them into leaders. The focus was on identifying and measuring traits that distinguished leaders from nonleaders or effective from ineffective leaders (Hollander & Offermann, 1990). From these distinctions between leaders and nonleaders, a profile of an 'ideal' leader could be derived, which could serve as the basis for selection of future leaders.

Three main categories of personal characteristics were included in the search for the 'great man.' First, *physical* features, such as height, physique, appearance, and age. Second, *ability* characteristics such as intelligence, knowledge, and fluency of speech. And third, *personality* traits such as dominance, emotional control and expressiveness, and introversion–extraversion (Bryman, 1992).

Table 9.2 *Trends in leadership theory and research*

Period	Approach	Core theme
Up to late 1940s	Trait	Leaders are born; leadership as an innate ability
Late 1940s to late 1960s	Style	What do they do; effectiveness has to do with how the leader behaves
Late 1960s to early 1980s	Contingency	It all depends; effectiveness of leadership is affected by the situation/context
Since early 1980s	New leadership (including charismatic/ transformational leadership)	Leaders need vision and inspire loyalty and emotional attachment

Adapted from Bryman (1992: 1).

Research up to 1950 failed to yield a consistent picture of leader traits, therefore research into this area slowed. After about 25 years the interest in traits possessed by leaders revived. In 1974, after reviewing 163 studies that had been reported between 1949 and 1970, Stogdill showed that contrary to what had been concluded from earlier reviews, several universal personal traits and skills (such as vigor and persistence in the pursuit of goals, self-confidence and tolerance for uncertainty and frustration) were indeed associated with leadership (Bass, 1990a). Other studies have also shown that traits or personal characteristics do indeed play a more significant role in leadership than was concluded earlier (e.g., Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Lord, De Vader & Allinger, 1986). Kirkpatrick and Locke's (1991) review suggests that drive, a desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, and knowledge of the business are personal characteristics that distinguish leaders from nonleaders. Other traits predicting effective leadership include: high energy level and stress tolerance, internal locus of control orientation, emotional maturity, socialized power motivation, moderate achievement motivation, and a low need for affiliation (Yukl, 1998).

The type of 'traits' under consideration in this 'reviving' trait approach are different from the early studies. Bryman (1992) warns that there is a danger that the term 'trait' becomes so stretched that it applies to any variable on which leaders and non-leaders differ, even certain behavioral patterns such as those discussed below. Thus, although there has been a resurgence of interest in the trait approach, the way in which traits are treated has changed. Also, traits are now considered along with other (situational and behavioral) variables.

Disillusionment followed the lack of empirical evidence for the existence of a 'leadership trait profile' in the early years of trait research. This led to a new emphasis in leadership research, the style approach.

Leadership Style

The second major trend in researching leadership emphasized *leader behavior*. The focus shifted

from who leaders are (traits) to what leaders do (behavioral style). In this approach, effectiveness of leaders is dependent on the exerted leadership style. Whereas the trait approach focused on stable personal characteristics which were usually thought to be largely innate (implying selection of effective leaders rather than training), the style approach implied that leadership is a behavioral pattern, which can be learned. Thus, according to this approach, once one was able to discover the 'right' style, people could be trained to exhibit that behavior and become better leaders (Bass, 1990a; Bryman, 1992).

Most influential in this period was probably the series of questionnaire-based Ohio State studies. The Ohio State researchers concluded that leadership style could best be described as varying along two dimensions, i.e., '*consideration*' and '*initiating structure*' (e.g., Fleishman & Harris, 1962). A second major research program concerning leader behavior in this period was carried out at the University of Michigan. The results of these studies (summarized by Likert, 1961, 1967) show that they found three types of leader behavior differentiating between effective and ineffective managers: task-oriented behavior, relationship-oriented behavior, and participative leadership.

Some researchers proposed '*universal*' theories of effective leader behavior, stating that, for instance, effective leaders are both people- and task-oriented, so-called 'high-high' leaders. Blake and Mouton's (1982) managerial grid is an example of such a 'high-high' theory. Other prominent 'universal' theories were based on the idea that leaders who make extensive use of participative decision procedures are more effective than other leaders (e.g., Likert, 1967; McGregor, 1960).

Criticism of the Style Approach

There have been many criticisms of the style approach. Among the criticisms are the inconsistent findings and measurement problems, the problem of causality, the problem of the group, informal leadership, and, most pressing, the lack of situational analysis (Bryman, 1992). Korman (1966) showed that the magnitude and direction of correlations

between leadership styles and outcomes were highly variable and divergent. Often, correlations were not statistically significant (see also Bass, 1990a). Identified measurement problems include response tendencies such as leniency effects and contamination by subordinate's implicit theories of leadership (implicit theories will be described in more detail below). Assumed causality was a problem in the early studies (this also goes for trait studies). These studies were usually cross-sectional, meaning that the notion that leadership style constitutes the independent rather than the dependent variable is an assumption in stead of a conclusion based on investigation of this view. Since then it has been shown that causality can run both ways (Bryman, 1992).

The problem of the group refers to the tendency in leadership research to focus on the group level rather than the individual or dyad levels of analysis. We will return to this below when briefly discussing the vertical dyad linkage (VDL) approach as an alternative way to study leadership. Most research described above was directed at formal, designated leaders who might behave different than informal leaders. Also, where designated leaders are not the actual group leaders the questions are probably not about the 'right' person (Bryman, 1992). Informal and emergent leadership are still rarely studied.

The failure of the style approach to pay attention to situational characteristics that act as possible moderators of the relationship between leadership and outcomes is probably its most serious problem. Possible moderators include task characteristics (e.g., complexity, interdependence) and subordinate characteristics (e.g., experience, motivation), but environmental factors or organizational culture could also influence the shape or form of the relationship between leadership style and outcomes. Attempts to address this situational issue led to the next main trend, contingency approaches to study leadership.

Contingency Approaches

As stated, many contingency approaches can be considered as an attempt to repair what researchers saw as the deficiencies of the aforementioned approaches (Smith & Peterson, 1988). The main proposition in contingency approaches is that the effectiveness of a given leadership style is *contingent on the situation*, implying that certain leader behaviors will be effective in some situations but not in others.

Fiedler's Model

The earliest contingency theory of leader effectiveness was the theory by Fiedler (1967). Fiedler is well-known and heavily criticized for his 'least-preferred-coworker' (LPC) measure. The

basic assumption is that a leader's description of the person with whom he has the greatest difficulty working reflects a basic leadership style. A second assumption is that which of the basic leadership styles contributes most to group performance varies with the 'situation favorability.' This favorability is determined by weighting and combining three aspects of the situation, namely leader-member relations, position power and task structure. For instance, a situation is least favorable for a leader when leader-member relations are poor, position power is low and the task is unstructured. The model predicts that when the situation is either highly favorable or very unfavorable, low LPC leaders are more effective than high LPC leaders. In intermediate situations, high LPC leaders should be more effective than low LPC leaders. Support for the model is at best weak. Also, the LPC measure and several of the assumptions made in the model (such as the weighting of situation aspects) are criticized for lacking a theoretical basis (Yukl, 1998).

More recently, Fiedler and Garcia (1987) developed a model that deals with the cognitive abilities of leaders (cognitive resources theory). According to this model, group performance depends on an interaction between two 'traits' (leader intelligence and experience), one type of leadership behavior (directive), and two aspects of the situation (interpersonal stress and the nature of the group task). So far, there is little empirical support for this model.

Situational Leadership Theory

Hersey and Blanchard's (1969, 1977) situational leadership theory (SLT) has been a popular basis for leadership training for many years. Originally SLT proposes that leaders should attune their behavior to fit with the 'maturity' or in later writings the 'development level' of the team as a whole as well as its individual members. Combining high or low task and relationship behavior creates four different leadership styles: telling (high task, low relations); selling (high, high); participating (low task, high relations); and delegating (low, low). These styles are more or less appropriate for different types of team members. For team members who are, for instance, low on willingness and ability a 'telling' style is appropriate. The empirical evidence for the theory is scant (Bass, 1990a; Yukl, 1998).

The Normative Decision-Making Model

Another widely known contingency theory focuses on criteria to determine whether or not a leader should involve subordinates in different kinds of decision making (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). The importance of using decision procedures that are appropriate for the situation has been recognized for some time (Heller, Pusic, Strauss & Wilpert, 1998; Yukl, 1998). For instance, Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) noted that a

leader's choice of decision procedures reflects forces in the leader, the subordinates and the situation. Also, Maier (1963) recognized the need for leaders to consider both the quality requirements of a decision and the likelihood of subordinate acceptance before choosing a decision procedure. Vroom and Yetton (1973) go beyond these approaches. In their model they try to indicate which decision procedure will be most effective in a specific situation. They distinguish five decision procedures, namely two types of autocratic decision (AI and AII), two types of consultative decision (CI and CII), and one joint decision by leader and group (GII). AI entails that a manager decides without asking others for input such as opinions or suggestions. In AII, a manager gathers the necessary information from subordinates (with or without explaining the problem at hand), then makes the decision. CI means sharing the problem with individual subordinates and considering their ideas and suggestions and CII involves getting them together as a group and sharing the problem. In both C cases, the manager still decides, and the decision may or may not reflect subordinates' opinions. Finally, GII implies sharing the problem with subordinates and that the solution should reflect agreement (consensus) of the group. The manager accepts and implements any decision the group reaches and does not have more influence over the final decision than others.

The Vroom and Yetton model predicts that the effectiveness of these decision procedures depends on several aspects of the situation, including the amount of relevant information held by leader and subordinates, the likelihood subordinates will accept an autocratic decision, and the extent to which the decision problem is unstructured. The model also provides a set of rules that help identify whether a decision procedure in a given situation is inappropriate (i.e., would it jeopardize decision quality and/or acceptance?). For instance, when subordinates possess relevant information the leader does not have, an autocratic decision may not be appropriate because the leader would lack relevant information that needs to be considered. This model was updated and extended by Vroom and Jago (1988). Their revised version of the model takes some important aspects of the situation into account that the earlier model lacks (e.g., serious time constraints and geographical dispersion of subordinates). The model can be considered normative in the sense that it prescribes 'rules' for leaders to follow in order to make the best decisions under different circumstances. There is some empirical support for the model; however, it deals with a relatively small part of leadership and also has some conceptual weaknesses (see Yukl, 1998 for an overview).

Path-Goal Theory

The most influential and complete contingency theory to date is probably House's path-goal theory

of leadership (House, 1971; House & Mitchell, 1974). This dyadic theory of supervision describes how formally appointed superiors affect the motivation and satisfaction of subordinates (House, 1996). House and Mitchell advanced two general propositions: (1) leader behavior is acceptable and satisfying to subordinates to the extent that subordinates see such behavior as either an immediate source of or instrumental to future satisfaction; (2) leader behavior is motivational (i.e., increases follower effort) to the extent that such behavior makes follower need satisfaction contingent on effective performance and to the extent that such behavior complements the environment of subordinates by providing guidance, support, and rewards necessary for effective performance (1974: 84). Leaders will be effective to the extent that they complement the environment in which their subordinates work by providing the necessary cognitive clarifications to ensure that subordinates expect they can attain work goals (i.e., path-goal clarifying behavior), and to the extent that subordinates experience intrinsic satisfaction and receive valent rewards as a direct result of attaining those work goals (i.e., behavior directed toward satisfying subordinate needs (House, 1996). House and Mitchell (1974) specify four types of leader behavior: directive path-goal clarifying behavior, supportive leader behavior, participative leader behavior, and achievement-oriented behavior. Proposed effects of leader behavior include subordinate motivation, satisfaction, and performance. Task and subordinate characteristics are treated as moderator variables.

Bryman (1992) describes several general problems with path-goal theory. Many of these problems are shared with the aforementioned Ohio tradition of investigating leadership style (e.g., inconsistent findings, problems associated with using group average methods of describing leaders, no attention for informal leadership, problems with causality and potential measurement problems). However, according to Evans (1996) the theory has not adequately been tested.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO STUDYING LEADERSHIP

The general dissatisfaction and pessimism that arose from the inconsistent research findings on the different contingency models stimulated several researchers to search for more or less radical 'remedies' to revive leadership theory. Smith and Peterson (1988) list five such remedies:

- (1) Replace leader style measures by measures of reward and punishment.
- (2) Differentiate between subordinates.

- (3) Review the circumstances which call for leadership.
- (4) Examine leaders' perceptions of subordinates.
- (5) Reexamine the basis of subordinates' perceptions of leaders.

A sixth that can be added to these is focusing on the use of power and influence tactics rather than on 'leadership' (e.g., Yukl & Falbe, 1990). These 'remedies' reflect three broad developments. First, the tendency to relate the study of leadership to theoretical developments in other areas of social, cognitive, and organizational psychology as well as to those in other social sciences. Second, to pay more attention to the role of cognition and perceptions of those (both leaders and subordinates) under study. Third, to use greater control through more sophisticated statistical techniques and different methodologies, including experiments (Smith & Peterson, 1988).

Reward and Punishment

The first of the five remedies listed above focuses on leader reward and punishment. The analyses of leader's use of reward and punishment rather than leadership style developed from the application of conditioning and cognitive-behavioral models (see Podsakoff, 1982). Podsakoff, Todor and Skov (1982) found that leaders rewarding good performance had subordinates who performed better and were more satisfied than other subordinates. This did not hold for leaders rewarding regardless of performance or punishing leaders (see Smith & Peterson, 1988).

Differentiating Between Subordinates

The second remedy mentioned above focuses on differentiating between subordinates. Researchers in the leadership field tend to use group average scores rather than individual perceptions as indications for leadership style. This means treating individual followers and their relationship with the leader as interchangeable. The different exchange that leaders can develop with different individual subordinates is the focus of the work of Graen and colleagues (Graen & Cashman, 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Vertical Dyad Linkage and Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) focus on the dyadic exchange between leader and subordinate. The general point of the approach by Graen and colleagues is that leaders differentiate between subordinates and that group average perceptions are not necessarily the best reflection of leader behavior. So far, this work does not answer what the basis is for the differentiations leaders make. In their review of this approach, Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) place the questions raised in the LMX tradition in the relation-based domain of leadership.

When Do We Need Leadership?

Reviewing the circumstances that do or do not call for leadership is the basis of the substitutes for leadership approach. This is the third remedy listed above. Essentially the substitutes for leadership model posits that there are a variety of situational variables that can substitute for, neutralize, or enhance the effects of leader behavior. Proposed variables include subordinate characteristics (e.g., experience, ability), task characteristics (e.g., a routine task, feedback provided by task) and organizational characteristics (e.g., a cohesive work group). Such variables can diminish or amplify the leader's ability to influence subordinates' attitudes, behavior, or performance (Howell, Dorfman & Kerr, 1986; Kerr & Jermier, 1978). The intuitive appeal of this approach is considerable and the model can nowadays be found in most textbooks on leadership and organizational behavior (e.g., Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy, 1999; Navahandi, 2000). However, the empirical support for the substitutes for leadership model (testing whether substitutes moderate relationships between leader behavior and subordinate outcome/criterion variables) has not been encouraging (e.g., Howell & Dorfman, 1981).

Podsakoff, MacKenzie and Bommer (1996) present a meta-analysis of the relationships between substitutes for leadership and employee attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. Their main effects test (i.e., not a moderator analysis) shows that the combination of substitutes and leader behavior accounted for the majority of variance in attitudes and role perceptions and for some of the variance in performance. The results indicate that in some cases the unique effects of the 'substitutes' on the outcomes are even stronger than the unique effects of the leadership behaviors. This implies that even though the model does not hold, the 'substitutes' themselves are important to consider in organizational research. More theoretical and empirical work on these issues is necessary.

De Vries, Roe and Taillieu (1999) focus on the 'need for leadership' as a characteristic of subordinates. As such they use a more follower-centered approach of leadership (see, e.g., Hollander & Offermann, 1990). The need for leadership reflects the extent to which an employee wishes the leader to facilitate the paths towards goals. De Vries et al. (1999) show that the need for leadership moderates the relationship between charismatic leadership and several outcomes.

The Role of Perception

The next two remedies focus on leader and subordinate perceptions. When researching how leaders perceive subordinates, leaders are seen as systems processing information about their subordinates.

On basis of that information, leaders then choose a strategy to influence a subordinate's behavior in the desired direction (Smith & Peterson, 1988). Attribution plays a major role. To what do leaders attribute the cause of subordinates' performance? Leaders can attribute performance (good or bad) either to subordinates themselves or to the circumstances. Bad performance could, for instance, be caused either by subordinates' incompetence or weak effort, or by unforeseen circumstances. Research shows that leaders tend to attribute failure to subordinates and success to themselves. Attributing failure to a subordinate is done most when the focal subordinate performs worse than others and when that subordinate has failed before on a similar task (Green & Mitchell, 1979). Below, subordinate perceptions of leaders will be described in more detail.

Leader Perception

Being perceived as a leader acts as a prerequisite for being able to go beyond a formal role in influencing others (Lord & Maher, 1991). Thus, perceptual processes on the part of followers play a crucial role in the leadership process as well as in researching leadership.

Most people are confronted with leadership almost daily, either in their job or through the media. As such, those people have (often implicit) ideas about what kind of characteristics leaders should have or should not have and what leaders should or should not do. An individual's implicit leadership theory refers to beliefs held about how leaders behave in general and what is expected of them (Eden & Leviatan, 1975). 'Implicit theories are cognitive frameworks or categorization systems that are in use during information processing to encode, process and recall specific events and behavior. An implicit theory can also be conceived as the personalized factor structure we use for information processing' (Bass, 1990a: 375–6). Implicit leadership theories (ILTs) are seen as personal constructs used to make judgments about leadership (Korukonda & Hunt, 1989). 'While leadership perceptions may not be reality, they are used by perceivers to evaluate and subsequently distinguish leaders from non-leaders. They also provide a basis for social power and influence' (Lord & Maher, 1991: 98). ILTs have been used in attempts to explain leadership attributions and perceptions (e.g., Lord, Foti & Phillips, 1982; Lord, Foti & De Vader, 1984; Offermann, Kennedy & Wirtz, 1994). Furthermore, ILTs have been shown to be a possible bias in the measurement of actual leader behavior (e.g., Gioia & Sims, 1985).

Leadership perceptions can, according to Lord and Maher (1991), be based on two alternative processes. First, leadership can be *recognized* based on the fit between an observed person's characteristics with the perceiver's implicit ideas of what 'leaders' are (ILTs). This type of process is tied closely to categorization theory (see Rosch, 1978). Lord and his

colleagues (1982, 1984) applied the principles of categorization to the field of leadership. They developed a theory on how leader perceptions are formed, focusing on the knowledge structures used to classify leaders and the actual information processes used in forming and evaluating leadership perceptions. Leadership perceptions are based on cognitive categorization processes in which perceivers match the perceived attributes of potential leaders they observe to an internal prototype of leadership categories (Foti & Luch, 1992). A prototype can be conceived as a collection of characteristic traits or attributes and the better the fit between the perceived individual and the leadership prototype, the more likely this person will be seen as a leader (Offermann et al., 1994; Foti & Luch, 1992).

Alternatively, leadership can be *inferred* from outcomes of salient events. Attribution processes are crucial in these inference-based processes (Lord & Maher, 1991). A successful business 'turnaround' is often quickly attributed to the high-quality 'leadership' of top executives or the CEO. Another example of such an inference-based process is that attributions of charisma to leaders are more likely when organizational performance is high (Shamir, 1992). In such cases charismatic leadership is inferred from business success. In Meindl's 'romance of leadership' approach, inference-based processes (leadership is inferred from good results) are central to the conception of leadership (Meindl, Ehrlich & Dukerich, 1985; Meindl, 1990).

Power and Influence

As Yukl (1998) notes, influence over followers is the essence of leadership. As such, the research by Yukl and associates on power and influence processes can be seen as an alternative way to study leadership.

Power can stem from different sources. In their well-known taxonomy, French and Raven (1959) describe five sources of power, namely reward power, coercive power, legitimate, referent, and expert power. However, these five are not complete, for instance, access to and control over information also acts as an important source of power (Pettigrew, 1972; Heller, Drenth, Koopman & Rus, 1988). Bass (1960) distinguishes between position power and personal power. Position power includes formal authority, control over punishments, rewards, and information, and ecological control. The latter refers to having control over the physical environment, technology, and organization of work. Personal power is derived from one's relationship to others rather than one's position in the hierarchy. Potential influence based on expertise, friendship, and loyalty can be seen as personal power. Research by Yukl and Falbe (1991) has shown these two types of power are relatively independent. Political processes in organizations involve members' efforts to increase or protect their power (Pfeffer, 1981). Contributing

to such political power are: having control over key decisions, forming coalitions, cooptation, and institutionalization (Yukl, 1998).

Influence Tactics

Several studies have looked at influence tactics (e.g., Erez, Rim & Keider, 1986; Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). Yukl and his colleagues identified nine proactive influence tactics (see Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, 1998). The first is *pressure*. Threats, requests, persistent reminding or frequent checking are used to influence the target in the desired direction. The agent can also use *exchange*. This involves offering an exchange of goods/services, promises to return the favor later or promising the target a share in the benefits if the target complies with the request. When using *coalition tactics*, the agent enlists the aid of a third party to persuade the target to do something, or uses the support of others as a reason for the target to agree also. The agent can also resort to *legitimizing tactics*. This involves trying to legitimate a request by claiming the authority or right to make it or by verifying and stressing that it is in accordance with organizational policies, rules, or traditions. Agents using *rational persuasion* use rational arguments and facts to convince the target that a request is reasonable and viable, and that it is likely to result in the attainment of the objectives. Another tactic is *inspirational appeals*: the agent makes a request or proposes something that arouses the target's interest and enthusiasm by appealing to his or her values, ideals, and aspirations or by increasing target self-confidence. The next tactic Yukl and associates distinguish is *consultation*. The agent asks the participation of the target in planning a strategy, activity, or change that requires target support and assistance, or is willing to modify a proposal to incorporate target suggestions. *Ingratiation* involves the agent using flattery, praise, or friendly behavior to get the target in a good mood or think favorably of the agent before making a request. Finally, agents can use *personal appeals* to the target's feelings of friendship and loyalty when asking for something.

The influence tactics are used in different directions, i.e., not only do managers try to influence subordinates, but these tactics are also used vice versa and to influence peers. Research shows that inspirational appeals, consultation, ingratiation, exchange, legitimating, and pressure are used more downward (i.e., to influence subordinates) than upward (i.e., to influence superiors) and that rational persuasion is used more upward than downward (Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, Falbe & Youn, 1993; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). There are also differences in sequencing of tactics within a prolonged influence attempt. 'Softer' tactics such as personal and inspirational appeals, rational persuasion, and consultation are used early on, and 'harder' tactics such

as pressure, exchange and coalitions are more likely to be used later (if the earlier tactics fail), as they involve greater costs and risks (Yukl et al., 1993; Yukl, 1998). Agents may also use a combination of tactics at the same time. Falbe and Yukl (1992) found that some combinations are more effective than others. For instance, combinations of soft tactics such as consultation, and inspirational and personal appeals, were usually more effective than using a single soft tactic. In contrast, combining soft tactics with a harder tactics such as pressure was usually less successful than using a soft tactic alone. Finally, the effectiveness of soft tactics was enhanced by combining them with rational persuasion.

THE 'NEW' LEADERSHIP

From the early 1980s onward a renewed interest in the concept of leadership itself arose in both scientific and professional fields. Meindl (1990) notes that this resurgence of interest appears to be accompanied by an acceptance of the distinction between transactional and transformational leadership, with an emphasis on the latter. Quinn (1988) compares transactional and transformational leadership with other differentiations in leadership such as relations-oriented–task-oriented leadership (Fiedler, 1967), consideration–initiating structure (Korman, 1966), and directive–participative or autocratic–democratic leadership (Heller & Yukl, 1969). However, Bass (1990b) claims that the transactional-transformational model is a new paradigm, neither replacing nor explained by other models such as the relations-oriented–task-oriented leadership model. Bryman (1992) refers to this new 'paradigm' as 'the new leadership' approach.¹

Terms used to describe these 'new leaders' include: transformational, charismatic, 'leaders' (as opposed to managers), transforming, inspirational, visionary, or value-based. Despite the broad array of terms used by different authors within this approach, there seem to be more similarities than differences between these views of the phenomenon of leadership. In literature the terms 'transformational' and 'charismatic' leadership are the most often used terms to refer to this type of leadership (e.g., Hunt, 1999).

The theories attempt to explain how certain leaders are able to achieve extraordinary levels of follower motivation, admiration, commitment, respect, trust, dedication, loyalty, and performance. They also try to explain how some of these leaders succeed to lead their organizations or units to attain outstanding accomplishments, such as the founding and growing of successful entrepreneurial firms or corporate turnarounds (House, Delbecq & Taris, 1998). Comparing House's path-goal theory with his 1976 charismatic theory one could say that

path-goal theory focuses on how follower needs and conditions determine leader behavior, whereas charismatic theory is about how leaders change people rather than respond to them (House, 1996). Another difference is that where in path-goal theory leaders are effective when they complement the environment, the new leadership focuses more on changing and creating the environment.

The Concept of Charisma

Most writers concerned with charisma begin their discussion with Max Weber's ideas. Charisma appears in his work on the origins of authority (Weber, 1947). Weber's charisma concept includes an exceptional leader, a (crisis) situation, the leader's vision or mission presenting a solution to the crisis, followers who are attracted to the leader and the vision, and validation of the charismatic qualities of the leader through repeated success (Trice & Beyer, 1986). These five components are present to some extent in almost all theories on charisma. The theories differ in how the components are operationalized and in which component is seen as the most important (Den Hartog, Koopman & Van Muijen, 1995).

Charisma as a Personal Attribute or a Social Relationship?

One of the most common views is that charisma is something that people 'have' or 'do not have,' a trait standpoint. There is an undeniable personal factor in the charismatic leadership. Such leaders are viewed by their followers as being special. Rather than treating charisma itself as a personality trait, most authors have attempted to distinguish personal factors associated with charismatic leadership. Examples of personal factors that have been named as potentially important in acquiring and maintaining charisma are: physical characteristics, such as a handsome appearance, piercing eyes, and distinct voice (Willner, 1984; Bryman, 1992). Psychological leader characteristics, such as high energy and self-confidence, dominance and a strong need for power, and a strong conviction in their own beliefs and ideals (e.g., House, 1977; House, Woycke & Fodor, 1988; House & Howell, 1992). Turner (1993) names audacity and determination as crucial personal qualities of leaders. Finally, ability characteristics, such as intelligence and interpersonal skills (Locke, 1991) as well as the leader's eloquence or rhetorical skills (e.g., Willner, 1984; Atkinson, 1984; Den Hartog & Verburg, 1997).

Exclusively defining charisma as a personal attribute or skill does not do justice to reciprocity of the relationship between leader and follower. Weber conceptualized charisma as a naturally fragile and unstable social relationship between leader and follower, in constant need of validation. Following

from Weber's writings, leader characteristics, behavior, and mission, followers' attribution of charisma, the situation, and the validation of charisma all play a role in a complex social relationship. This social relationship perspective does not imply that the idea of the leader as an exceptional person and the personal factors described above are not important; on the contrary, they are an important part of the relationship.

Although the emphasis is traditionally on the influence leaders have on followers, some authors emphasize that both followers and leaders are influenced by leadership processes. Burns (1978), for instance, conceptualizes transforming leadership as a two-way process; transforming leadership 'raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both the leader and the led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both' (p. 20).

Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Behavior

A first major application of charisma to the study of formal organizations can be found in House (1977), whose theory combines personal traits, leader behavior, and situational factors. According to House, four personal characteristics of the leader contribute to charismatic leadership: dominance, self-confidence, need for influence, and a strong conviction of the integrity of one's own beliefs. Charismatic leaders represent their values and beliefs through role modeling. To create a favorable perception with followers they can engage in image building and express ideological goals (a mission). They communicate high expectations of followers and show confidence in followers' ability to live up to those expectations. And, according to House, charismatic leaders are more likely than noncharismatic leaders to arouse motives (e.g., need for achievement) in followers that are relevant to attaining the mission. House assumes charismatic leadership is more likely to arise in stressful situations. A sense of crisis makes the attribution of charisma more likely. House (1977) specifies the following effects of such leadership: follower trust in the correctness of the leader's beliefs, similarity of followers' beliefs to those of the leader, unquestioning acceptance of and willing obedience to the leader, identification with and emulation of the leader, emotional involvement of the follower in the mission, heightened goals of the follower, and a feeling on the part of followers that they will be able to contribute to the accomplishment of the mission.

Charisma and Attribution

Several attribution-based explanations of charismatic leadership can be found in the literature. The most 'drastic' dismisses charisma as mere attribution, virtually unrelated to leader characteristics or behavior. Meindl (1990) speaks of charisma as a

social contagion process. According to the social contagion view, charismatic elements of leader–follower relations are a function of processes occurring within the context of lateral relationships that develop among followers and subordinates themselves. The attribution and effects of charisma originate from the group, not from the leader and in that light, leaders are seen as largely interchangeable. The social contagion process is instigated by conditions causing stress or arousing excitement, which can be channeled and defined in terms of leadership and charisma and set in motion a social contagion process among followers.

A less radical example of an attribution-based explanation of charisma is the charismatic influence model developed by Conger and Kanungo (1987, 1988). In this model the basis for follower attributions of charisma is the leader's observed behavior, which can be interpreted as expressing charismatic qualities. According to Conger and Kanungo, charismatic leaders can be distinguished from non-charismatic leaders, by:

- (1) their sensitivity to environmental constraints and follower needs and their ability to identify deficiencies in the status quo;
- (2) their formulation of an idealized vision and extensive use of articulation and impression management skills;
- (3) their use of innovative and unconventional means for achieving their vision and their use of personal power to influence followers.

Charismatic leadership is seen as (partly) attributional by most authors. Leaders must not only display certain characteristics, but must also be perceived as charismatic. According to Bass and Avolio (1990), transformational leaders (see below) are likely to become charismatic *in the eyes of their followers*. This seems to imply that charisma is not seen as a type of leader behavior, but as an attribution of followers, in other words a 'product' rather than a component of transformational leadership. Attributed charisma has been shown to be (in part) a function of the leader's prior success in reaching hard goals and accomplishing outstanding feats of performance. As stated, Shamir (1992) has shown that performance outcomes affect the attribution of influence and charisma to the leader.

Charisma and the Self-Concept

Rather than influencing by affecting the task environment of followers or using material incentives or threat of punishment, Shamir, House and Arthur (1993) state that charismatic leadership is seen as giving meaningfulness to work by infusing work and organizations with moral purpose and commitment. Their self-concept-based explanation of charisma proposes that 'charismatic leadership achieves its effects by implicating the self-concept

of followers and recruiting their self expressive motivation' (Shamir, 1991: 90–1). Thus, leader behavior is linked with follower effects through follower self-concepts.

The focus of this explanation of charisma is on the qualitative changes in follower's motivation that Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) describe, namely a strong internalization of the leader's values and goals, a strong personal or moral (as opposed to calculative) commitment to these values and goals and a tendency to transcend their own self-interests. Based on several assumptions about the self-concept, Shamir et al. (1993) describe several processes by which charismatic leaders have their transformational and motivational effect on followers. Leaders increase the intrinsic value of effort and goal accomplishment by linking them to valued aspects of the self-concept, thus harnessing the motivational forces of self-expression, self-consistency, specific mission-related self-efficacy, generalized self-esteem, and self-worth. Leaders also enhance self-efficacy, self-esteem, and collective efficacy through positive evaluations, expressions of confidence, higher expectations, and emphasizing the individual follower's ties to the collective. Thus the theory comprises four main parts: leader behaviors, effects on followers' self-concepts, further effects on followers, and the motivational processes by which the leader behaviors produce the charismatic effects.

Different Types of 'Charisma'?

The term *charismatic* has been applied to very diverse leaders in political arenas, religious spheres, social movements, and business organizations (Howell, 1988). A question raised by the widespread application of the term charisma is whether different types of charisma should be defined. Howell (1988), for example, differentiates between personalized and socialized charismatic leaders. Socialized charismatic leadership is based on egalitarian behavior, serves collective interests, and develops and empowers others. Personalized charismatic leadership is based on personal dominance, and narcissistic and authoritarian behavior, serves the leader's self-interest, and is exploitative of others. Similarly, Conger (1990) distinguishes negative from positive charismatic leaders. A different type of distinction is made by Etzioni (1961) and Hollander (1978). They hold that charisma can be a property of one's office (a position providing celebrity status) and/or of one's person.

A third way of distinguishing types of charisma has to do with the idea of social or psychological distance between leader and follower. Katz and Kahn (1978) state that charisma requires some psychological distance between leader and follower. The day-to-day intimacy of organization members and their immediate supervisors destroys the illusion needed in the charismatic relationship. They hold

that charisma is only appropriate in the top echelon of the organization. A leader in the top echelon would be sufficiently distant from most organization members to make a simplified and almost magical image possible. Others (e.g., Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987) assume that charisma is common at all levels of the organization. A third position would be that charismatic leadership may be found at different levels, and in both a situation of close and distant leadership, but that relevant characteristics and behaviors as well as their effects are different for close and distant leaders. In other words, one can distinguish 'close' from 'distant' charismatic leadership (see Shamir, 1995).

Transactional and Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) argues that transactional leadership entails an exchange between leader and follower. Followers receive certain valued outcomes (e.g., wages, prestige) when they act according to the leader's wishes. According to Burns the exchange can be economic, political, or psychological in nature. Bass (1985) notes that leadership in (organizational) research has generally been conceptualized as a cost-benefit exchange process. Such transactional leadership theories are founded on the idea that leader-follower relations are based on a series of exchanges or implicit bargains between leaders and followers. House et al. (1988) hold that the general notion in these theories is that when the job and the environment of the follower fail to provide the necessary motivation, direction, and satisfaction, the leader, through his or her behavior, will be effective by compensating for the deficiencies. The leader clarifies the performance criteria, in other words what he expects from subordinates, and what they receive in return. Several transactional theories have been tested extensively and some have received empirical support. Examples are the aforementioned path-goal theory and vertical dyad theory.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership goes beyond the cost-benefit exchange of transactional leadership by motivating and inspiring followers to perform beyond expectations (Bass, 1985). Transformational leadership theories predict followers' emotional attachment to the organization and emotional and motivational arousal of followers as a consequence of the leader's behavior (House et al., 1988). Hater and Bass state: 'The dynamics of transformational leadership involve strong personal identification with the leader, joining in a shared vision of the future, or going beyond the self-interest exchange of rewards for compliance' (1988: 695). Transformational leaders broaden and elevate the interests

of followers, generate awareness and acceptance among the followers of the purposes and mission of the group, and motivate followers to go beyond their self-interests for the good of the group. Tichy and Devanna (1990) highlight the transforming effect these leaders can have on organizations as well as on individuals. By defining the need for change, creating new visions, and mobilizing commitment to these visions, leaders can ultimately transform the organization. According to Bass (1985) such transformation of followers can be achieved by raising the awareness of the importance and value of designed outcomes, getting followers to transcend their own self-interests and altering or expanding followers' needs.

Contrasting transactional and transformational leadership does not mean the models are unrelated. Bass (1985) views these as separate dimensions, which would imply that a leader can be *both* transactional and transformational. He argues that transformational leadership builds on transactional leadership but not vice versa. Transformational leadership can be viewed as a special case of transactional leadership, in as much as both approaches are linked to the achievement of some goal or objective. The models differ on the *process* by which the leader motivates subordinates and the *types of goals* set (Hater & Bass, 1988).

Specific Behaviors

Bass (1985, 1997) defines both transactional and transformational leadership as comprising several dimensions. Transactional leadership has two dimensions. The first dimension is *contingent reward*. The leader rewards followers for attaining the specified performance levels. Reward is contingent on effort expended and performance level achieved. The second type of transactional leadership is (*active*) *management by exception*. When practicing *management by exception* a leader only takes action when things go wrong and standards are not met. Leaders avoid giving directions if the old ways work and allow followers to continue doing their jobs as always, as long as performance goals are met (e.g., Hater & Bass, 1988). A leader actively seeks deviations from standard procedures and takes action when irregularities occur.

Transformational leadership has four dimensions. The first dimension is *charisma*. The charismatic leader provides vision and a sense of mission, instills pride, gains respect and trust, and increases optimism (Bass, 1985). Charismatic leaders excite, arouse, and inspire their subordinates. According to Bass (1990a) attaining charisma in the eyes of one's employees is central to succeeding as a transformational leader. This dimension is sometimes referred to as *idealized influence*. The second dimension of transformational leadership is *inspiration*. Bass (1985) originally conceptualized inspiration as a subfactor within charisma. Inspiration describes a

leader's capacity to act as a model for subordinates, the communication of a vision and the use of symbols to focus efforts. The third dimension is *individual consideration*. While a leader's charisma may attract subordinates to a vision or mission, the leader's use of individualized consideration also significantly contributes to a subordinate achieving his/her fullest potential (Yammarino & Bass, 1990). Individual consideration is in part coaching and mentoring, it provides for continuous feedback and links the individual's current needs to the organization's mission (Bass, 1985). Some feel that individualized consideration is similar to the Ohio State notion of consideration (Hunt, 1991; Bryman, 1992). Bass and Avolio, however, state that the two are related, but that individualized consideration builds on two aspects of behavior, i.e., individualization and development of followers, where as earlier scales measuring consideration were primarily concerned with whether a leader was seen a 'good guy or gal' or not (1993: 63). The last dimension of transformational leadership is *intellectual stimulation*. An intellectually stimulating leader provides subordinates with a flow of challenging new ideas to stimulate rethinking of old ways of doing things (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1990). It arouses an awareness of problems, of subordinates' own thoughts and imagination, and a recognition of their beliefs and values. Intellectual stimulation is evidenced by subordinates' conceptualization, comprehension, and analysis of the problems they face and the solutions generated (Yammarino & Bass, 1990).

Other authors have included several other dimensions of this type of leadership, for instance, vision, demonstrating trust in subordinates, role modeling, and expressing high performance expectations (e.g., House, 1996; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990).

Outcomes of Transformational/ Charismatic Leadership

Conger and Kanungo (1988) observe there is consensus among authors on the following effects of charismatic leaders on followers: high attachment to and trust in the leader, willing obedience to the leader, heightened performance and motivation, greater group cohesion in terms of shared beliefs and low intragroup conflict and a sense of empowerment. Other often-mentioned follower outcomes are commitment to the organization's goals, perceived leader effectiveness and follower's satisfaction with the leader (Den Hartog et al., 1995).

In general, charismatic/transformational leadership is expected to lead to more positive effects on subordinates than transactional leadership. Bass and associates find a consistent pattern of relationships between his leadership measures and the outcome and performance measures, with transformational leadership and the outcomes being highly positively

correlated and transactional leadership and the outcomes less so (Bass, 1997). Self-reports of extra effort, satisfaction with the leader, and perceived leader effectiveness were often used as dependent variables early on (e.g., Bass, Avolio & Atwater, 1996; Bryman, 1992). However, many other 'outcomes' have been studied, including: trust in the leader (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 1990; 1996); trust in management and colleagues (Den Hartog, 1997); organizational commitment (e.g., Den Hartog, 1997; Koh, Steers & Terborg, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 1996); leader performance (e.g., Yammarino, Spangler & Bass, 1993), business unit performance (e.g., Howell & Avolio, 1993); subordinate/work group performance (e.g., Howell & Frost, 1989); and organizational citizenship behaviors (Podsakoff et al., 1990; Koh et al., 1995).

The results of a comprehensive meta-analysis by Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam (1996) indicate that transformational leadership scales reliably predict work unit effectiveness, both for subordinate perceptions (.80) and for (objective) organizational measures of effectiveness (.35). According to Lowe et al. (1996) subordinate ratings of effectiveness are probably inflated as raters would probably strive for consistency across independent and dependent variables. Again, logical distance is questionable. On the other hand, organizational measures are likely to be attenuated as they narrow the perspective of performance to a single measured criterion (financial indicators, percentage of goals met), rather than include the constellation of outcomes that would contribute to subordinate perceptions of leader effectiveness (e.g., individual development, organizational learning, more ethical principles). Lowe et al. (1996) found that transformational leadership consistently showed higher associations with effectiveness than transactional leadership. Against expectations, they also found that effect sizes were larger in public rather than private organizations and for lower- rather than higher-level leaders.

Possible Negative Effects

House and Singh (1987) conclude that charismatic and transformational leaders profoundly influence follower effort, performance and affective responses toward them. Thus, charismatic leaders can have a considerable influence on organizations; however, these consequences are not necessarily beneficial. The possible negative effects are sometimes referred to as 'the dark side of charisma.' Possible negative effects in organizations include poor interpersonal relationships, negative consequences of impulsive, unconventional behavior, negative consequences of impression management, poor administrative practices, negative consequences of self-confidence, and failure to plan for succession (Conger, 1990; Yukl, 1998). Charismatic leadership, by reducing

in-group criticism and increasing unquestioning obedience could also have negative effects on group decision making (groupthink, Janis, 1982). Although transformational or socialized charismatic leaders are able to empower and develop followers, De Vries et al. (1999) find a positive relationship between charismatic leadership and the need for leadership. This suggests that subordinates are more rather than less 'dependent' when a charismatic leader is present. Such increased dependency on leaders may not always be beneficial to organizations.

CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVES: LEADERSHIP AROUND THE WORLD

Different cultural groups may have a different conception of what leadership should entail (Bass, 1990a; Hofstede, 1993). And, following from these different conceptions, the evaluation and meaning of many leader behaviors and characteristics may also strongly vary in different cultures. For instance, in a culture which endorses an authoritarian style, leader sensitivity might be interpreted as weak, whereas in cultures endorsing a more nurturing style, sensitivity is a prerequisite to be seen as a leader (Den Hartog et al., 1999).

Most research on leadership during the past half-century was conducted in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe. If research is conducted elsewhere, leadership theories and questionnaires developed in the USA are often translated and used abroad without much adaptation. An example is Bass and Avolio's (1990) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Besides in the USA and Canada, the MLQ is used in countries as diverse as Japan (Yokochi, 1989, reported in Bass, 1990a), New Zealand (Singer & Singer, 1990), Taiwan and Mexico (Dorfman & Howell, 1988), the Netherlands (Den Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997), Austria (Geyer & Steyrer, 1998), and Belgium (Lievens, Van Geit & Coetsier, 1997).

However, the applicability of certain concepts and ways to measure these in a non-US context should not be taken for granted (e.g., Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991). Hofstede (1993: 81) states: 'In a Global perspective, US management theories contain a number of idiosyncrasies not necessarily shared by management elsewhere. Three such idiosyncrasies are mentioned: A stress on market processes, a stress on the individual and a focus on managers rather than workers.' Similarly, House (1995) notes that almost all prevailing theories of leadership and most empirical evidence is rather North American in character, that is, 'individualistic rather than collectivistic; emphasizing assumptions of rationality rather than ascetics, religion, or superstition; stated in terms of individual rather than group incentives, stressing follower responsibilities

rather than rights; assuming hedonistic rather than altruistic motivation and assuming centrality of work and democratic value orientation' (1995: 443). House also notes that much cross-cultural psychological, sociological, and anthropological research shows that there are many cultures that do not share these assumptions. 'As a result there is a growing awareness of need for a better understanding of the way in which leadership is enacted in various cultures and a need for an empirically grounded theory to explain differential leader behavior and effectiveness across cultures' (1995: 443-4, see also Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991; House et al., 1997). Kanungo and Mendonca (1996), for instance, describe how demands for leadership in developing countries differ from those placed on leaders in the USA. They examine the 'culture fit' of four distinct leader roles – task, social, participative and charismatic – relative to the sociocultural characteristics of developing countries and the internal work cultures of such countries. The impact of cultural contingencies on these four leader roles is described. Kanungo and Mendonca (1996) argue that organizational change is needed in such countries, rather than maintaining the status quo. As a result they see the charismatic leadership role as critical for organizations in developing countries. More theory development and testing is clearly needed in this area.

Studying Leadership Across Cultures

An increasing body of literature (including some of the aforementioned studies) deals with comparisons of leadership dimensions, behaviors or preferences across cultures (e.g., House et al., 1997; Peterson & Hunt, 1997; Dorfman, Howell, Hibino, Lee, Tate & Bautista, 1997). Still, much research to date has been limited in scope, usually comparing leaders and leader effectiveness in two or three countries. An interesting example of studying cross cultural aspects of leadership in a more elaborate project (involving over 25 countries) is found in the ongoing work on the event management model proposed by Smith and Peterson (1988). In this model 'leadership which contributes to effective event management can be defined *'as actions by a person which handle organizational problems as expressed in the events faced by others'* (Smith & Peterson, 1988: 80). The event management model presents an analysis of role relationships putting the role of leaders in the context of other sources of meaning. In handling events, managers can use different sources of information and meaning (e.g., rules, national norms, superiors, peers, subordinates). Smith, Peterson and Misumi (1994) show that managers in high power distance countries (i.e., countries where a high degree of inequality among people is considered normal by the population, cf. Hofstede, 1991) report more use of rules and

procedures than do managers from low power distance countries.

Leader Prototypes

Several studies have focused on culture-based differences in leadership prototypes or implicit theories of leadership. As described above, implicit leadership theory (ILT) has been found to be a potent force in answering questions on leader behavior in the USA. Bryman (1987) conducted a study into the generalizability of implicit leadership theory and found strong support for the operation of implicit theories of leadership in Great Britain. Gerstner and Day (1994) performed a study focusing on a cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. Respondents filled out a questionnaire (developed and tested only in the USA) which asks respondents to assign prototypicality ratings to 59 attributes relevant to (business) leadership. They compared these prototypicality ratings from a sample of American students ($n = 35$) to small samples ($n =$ between 10 and 22) of students from seven countries outside the United States (who on average had been living in the United States for 2.5 years). They found that the traits considered to be most (as well as moderately and least) characteristic of business leaders varied by respondents' country or culture of origin. This study has obvious limitations due to the small sample sizes, using only foreign students in the sample, and only an English-language trait-rating instrument, which has not been cross-culturally validated. However, the reliable differences found in leadership perceptions of members of various countries warrant further examination.

Another example of a study focusing on leadership preferences in different countries is the research by Singer and Singer (1990). Presuming subordinates' leadership preferences mediate the effectiveness of actual leader behavior, they conducted their study in New Zealand and Taiwan and found a common preference among their respondents for transformational leadership. This preference has also been found in the United States (Bass & Avolio, 1989). According to Bass (1997) such a preference for transformational leadership is found across a wide range of cultures.

The GLOBE Project

Increasing the understanding of culture-based differences in leadership perception is a key issue in the GLOBE research program. GLOBE is a long-term study directed toward the development of systematic knowledge concerning how societal and organizational cultures affect leadership and organizational practices (House et al., 1999). Approximately 60 countries from all major regions of the world participate in GLOBE, making it the most extensive investigation of cross-cultural

aspects of leadership to date. The project was originated by Robert House who has led 'the coordinating team' based in the United States. Besides the coordinating team, approximately 150 social scientists (Co-Country Investigators or CCIs) from around the world are responsible for managing the project and collecting data in their respective countries.

The main objectives of the GLOBE study are to answer questions such as: Are there leader behaviors that are universally accepted and effective across cultures and are there behaviors that are differentially accepted and effective across cultures? The overall hypotheses that are to be tested concern relationships between societal culture dimensions, organizational culture dimensions and CLTs (culturally endorsed implicit leadership theories) as well as relationships specified by structural contingency theory of organizations (e.g., Donaldson, 1995). The information ensuing from this project will be useful for understanding how leaders in various societal and organizational cultures can be effective and for identifying the constraints imposed on leaders by cultural norms, values, and beliefs (House et al., 1999).

The initial aim of the GLOBE project was to develop societal and organizational measures of culture and leadership attributes that are appropriate to use across cultures. This aim was accomplished in the first phase of the project. The results of two pilot studies support the reliability and construct validity of the questionnaire scales (Hanges et al., under review).

Data collection in the second (hypothesis testing) phase is now completed and the analyses to test the hypotheses are currently being conducted. Over 15,000 middle managers from approximately 800 organizations in the financial, food and/or telecommunications industries in 60 countries were asked to describe leader attributes and behavior that they perceived to enhance or impede outstanding leadership. Some first results of the GLOBE study report which leadership attributes are universally endorsed as contributing to outstanding leadership, which are universally seen as undesirable, and which are culturally contingent (Den Hartog et al., 1999).

Contributing to outstanding leadership in all cultures were several attributes reflecting integrity (being trustworthy, just, and honest) Also, an outstanding leader shows many attributes reflecting charismatic, inspirational, and visionary leadership (an outstanding leader is encouraging, positive, motivational, a confidence builder, dynamic, and has foresight). Team-oriented leadership is also universally seen as important (such a leader is effective in team building, communicating, and coordinating). Finally, other items that are universally endorsed include being excellence oriented, decisive, intelligent, and a win-win problem solver (Den Hartog et al., 1999: 240). The GLOBE study also shows that several attributes are universally viewed as

ineffective or in other words as impediments to outstanding leadership. These include being a loner, being noncooperative, ruthless, nonexplicit, irritable, and dictatorial (Den Hartog et al., 1999: 240).

Finally, many leadership attributes were found to be culturally contingent, i.e., a high positive rating was obtained in some and a low or even negative rating in other cultures. For instance, country means for the attribute enthusiastic range from 3.72 to 6.44 on a seven point scale. Country means for risk taking range from 2.14 to 5.96, for sensitive from 1.96 to 6.35, for class-conscious from 2.53–6.09 and for autonomous from 1.63–5.17 (see Den Hartog et al., 1999: 241, for the complete list).

Regional Differences

Besides testing the overall ‘global’ hypotheses, the GLOBE data are also suited to look at regional differences. Studies by Brodbeck et al. (2000) and Koopman et al. (1999), for instance, focus on the European results, distinguishing different patterns of leadership and societal culture in Europe. Generally speaking, two broad clusters of cultures were distinguished in Europe, namely a north/western cluster and a south/eastern cluster. Concerning the culture dimensions, the north/west scored significantly higher on dimensions such as achievement orientation, future orientation, and uncertainty avoidance. In contrast, the south/east scored significantly higher on dimensions such as assertiveness and power distance. On gender egalitarianism the combination of the Nordic and the central/eastern European countries had a significantly higher score (indicating a more equal treatment of men and women) than the other European countries (e.g., Latin countries). On most culture dimensions there is considerable variance within Europe, in other words there is no typical ‘European culture.’

Interesting differences between north/western Europe and the south/eastern Europe were also found on the leadership profiles. South/eastern Europe scores higher on administrative competence, being autocratic, a conflict inducer, diplomatic, face saving, nonparticipative, procedural, self-oriented, and status-conscious. In north/western Europe characteristics such as being inspiring and having integrity are seen as more important (Koopman et al., 1999). From the perspective of Bass’s (1960) distinction between personal and position power, one might conclude that in the south/east of Europe the importance of position power is emphasized, whereas in the north/west the focus is on the (use of) personal power.

The GLOBE data can also be used for smaller scale in-depth comparisons between two (or more) countries. This allows for a focused comparison providing more detailed information than the general study that looks at differences at a global level, while being able to rely on the internationally

developed and thoroughly tested questionnaires. An example of such a more focused comparison of national culture and leader attributes in the Netherlands and Poland, two of the European countries participating in the GLOBE study can be found in Den Hartog et al. (1997a). This study shows that Dutch respondents value attributes associated with integrity and inspirational leader behavior more strongly than Polish respondents. Visionary qualities score high in both countries. Diplomacy and administrative skills (being orderly, well-organized, and a good administrator) are considered more important in Poland. Polish respondents also have a less negative attitude towards autocratic leader behavior and status consciousness than the Dutch managers.

Enacting Leadership Behaviors

The GLOBE results show a ‘universal’ preference for certain leadership attributes. However, this does not mean such attributes will be enacted in the same manner across cultures. For example, Bass states that ‘Indonesian inspirational leaders need to persuade their followers about the leaders’ own competence, a behavior that would appear unseemly in Japan’ (1997: 132). However, according to Bass, not withstanding the fact that it can be expressed in different ways, the concept of inspiration appears ‘to be as universal as the concept of leadership itself’ (1997: 132).

Similar examples of enacting positively valued attributes in a different manner in different countries ensue from the qualitative data that are also gathered in the GLOBE research (media analyses, interviews, and focus group meetings). For instance, Martinez and Dorfman (1998) gathered GLOBE data in Mexico. An example of behavior that was highly valued by the Mexicans, but might not be appropriate in other contexts was a high degree of involvement of a leader in the private lives of his employees. An example from their interviews is a leader calling the doctor when the husband of an employee was in hospital to make sure an operation was legitimate. However, such a behavior would be felt to be an invasion of privacy in other countries. Such examples clearly show that the behaviors indicative of consideration or compassion will differ strongly in different cultures even if the positive evaluation of the construct ‘consideration’ in itself is found across different cultures (see Den Hartog et al., 1999).

IS THERE A FUTURE FOR LEADERSHIP?

Currents of change such as the developing information technology and globalization are influencing work and organizations as we know them in a pervasive and long-lasting manner (e.g., Howard, 1995; Davis, 1995). Among the fundamental

changes in organizations is the increasing use of teams to make decisions (Guzzo, 1995) and more generally the increased importance of teams and other lateral organizing mechanisms (Mohrman & Cohen, 1995).

Organizations are becoming more and more flexible. As Shamir (1999) puts it, an important characteristic of the new form of organization is 'the obliteration of boundaries within the organization and between the organization and elements in its external environment' (p. 52). Such 'boundaryless' organizations (Davis, 1995) to a large extent comprise temporary systems whose elements (people as well as technology) are assembled and disassembled according to the shifting needs of specific projects. As organizations can no longer rely on the traditional hierarchy, managing and coordinating the efforts of employees may become more difficult. In the flexible, boundaryless structures where people shift from team to team, leaders will not be able to rely on the same level of formal power they had in their position in the former hierarchies. Also, the content of work is changing. As House (1995) notes, much 21st century work will be intellectual rather than physical. Observing, monitoring, and controlling, in other words, direct supervision of such tasks, will be very difficult.

Such developments could lead to a less pronounced role for leaders in organizations. One could even suggest that the idea of a single person taking on the 'leadership role' may become obsolete in the future organization. Shamir (1999) describes several possible scenarios that imply a reduced importance of the role of leadership in the 21st century. One such scenario is 'disposable leadership.' As organizations increasingly rely on temporary arrangements (e.g., project teams), leadership itself will become such a temporary arrangement, and will as such be limited in scope and duration. The group member with the most relevant knowledge would then be leader regarding that specific task. A similar scenario is the idea of shared, distributed, peer, or collective leadership. As Shamir (1999) notes, the common element in these ideas is that leadership is not concentrated in the hands of one single 'heroic' leader or a limited group, but is divided and performed by many or all team members simultaneously or sequentially. Similarly, the idea behind 'self-managed teams' also implies a transfer of the leadership responsibility to the team as a whole (e.g., Barker, 1993; Manz & Sims, 1993).

A third scenario implying a reduction of the importance of leadership is what Shamir and Ben-Ari (1999) refer to as 'teleleadership.' As Shamir (1999) describes, the increasing use of computer-mediated technologies and group decision support systems may enhance the importance of leadership functions that relate to the transmission of information between leader and group members. It may also reduce the distance between the top and lower levels

in the organization and enable more effective communication between those parties. However, the role of leaders is obviously reduced to more cognitive elements (managing information flow) rather than the social, human, and emotional elements of leadership. Whether it is possible to identify with or trust leaders with whom one only communicates electronically is yet unclear (Shamir, 1999).

There are also other problems with these scenarios. Self-management does not always yield positive results. Also, identifying with a professional group, organization, or team increases commitment to that group and its goals and implies adherence to a pattern of values shared within such a group. Belonging to multiple groups with unclear boundaries may lead to identity problems (Emans, Koopman, Rutte & Steensma, 1996). House (1995) notes that the nonroutine tasks of the future will require problem solving, individual initiative, innovative behavior, and motivation, as well as a willingness to take on personal responsibility for getting the task done on the part of employees. Also, increased uncertainty and pace of change may be accompanied with increased feelings of uncertainty and anxiety on part of organization members. As West and Altink (1996) point out, a sense of psychological safety is essential for showing innovative behavior. Creating such a sense of safety and clarity and increasing motivation and commitment may still remain important leadership functions in tomorrow's organizations.

As Shamir summarizes, 'boundaryless, flattened, flexible, project-based and team-based organizations that employ temporary, externalized and remote workers, whose tasks are more intellectual and less routine and cannot be controlled and coordinated by structure or direct supervision, need mechanisms of coordination through shared meaning systems, a shared sense of purpose, and high member commitment to shared values' (1999: 59). Therefore, boundaryless organizations are likely to need strong leadership to perform integrative functions. Such integrative functions are less likely to be performed by movable or disposable leaders. Leaders have played an important role in promoting change and innovation and challenging the status quo in stable environments. In tomorrow's unstable environments the role of leaders is to balance an emphasis on change with providing (a sense of) stability and continuity, and to establish and maintain collective identities in the absence of traditional identity-forming boundaries (Shamir, 1999).

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH ON LEADERSHIP

The changing role of leadership in future organizations is an obvious and important topic for future

research. As discussed above, the role of leaders in ever-changing organizations will be different from their traditional role in a more stable environment. An added problem in this respect is that leaders are often selected on a certain profile, relevant for a certain job or time period. Changes in the organization and environment may require new skills or characteristics that these managers were not selected on. As the pace of change increases, this problem may also increase. More research seems needed in this area.

Similarly, more theory development and research on the similarities as well as differences of leadership in different cultures around the world is clearly needed.

Also, in many studies on leadership in organizations the role of 'time' is not incorporated. It has often been noted that leadership is essentially a relational process unfolding over time. If leadership is supposed to contribute to the development of certain attitudes, emotional states, or self-efficacy, and increased performance, a longitudinal perspective is needed to capture some of this development. Examples of such longitudinal studies include Yammarino et al. (1993) and Howell and Avolio (1993). Not enough is known about leadership development over time. How leadership skills and perceptions develop, and which factors help or impede such development are interesting issues in need of further research. A possibility to study such topics would be to follow the development of attitudes and perceptions of both leaders and followers over time in groups in which new leaders start. Questions such as whether leaders can start out being 'inspirational' or do they first need to build 'idiosyncrasy credit' (Hollander, 1978) and trust, and which leadership skills and behaviors can or cannot be learned are also interesting in this respect.

Another important way in which time exerts crucial influence is that people in organizations more often than not have a shared history and/or a shared future. Experiences from the past as well as expectations for the future shape both behavior and perceptions in ways which many studies are not designed or able to capture. The shared history implies that relationships have been shaped over time, and take place in a broader context which altered prior expectations. A shared future implies that some behaviors are less appropriate or effective than others. An example of the influence of shared history is that often, even after managers are trained to exert certain leader behaviors, and try to do so, they find that they are not perceived to be or behave any different. Also, circumstances and therefore the appropriateness of behavior may change over time. Becoming more experienced may influence followers' perception of leader behavior over time. For instance, depending on the need and stage of development of the follower, leader behaviors reflecting consideration can be interpreted

differently by the same people over time (Avolio, & Bass, 1995).

Although much can be done using questionnaires, leadership research would benefit from a multimethod approach. Yukl (1998) states that the field would benefit from descriptive research using observation and interviews to discover what leaders actually *do*. Using less traditional data sources, such as analyzing speeches (e.g., Den Hartog & Verburg, 1997; Shamir, Arthur & House, 1994) or doing historiometric studies (e.g., Deluga 1997; House, Spangler & Woyke, 1991) could also be used to triangulate self-report survey data. Insch, Moore and Murphy (1997) propose to use content analysis more often and give guidelines how to perform such analyses in this field. Increased use of (field) experiments is also important to gain more understanding of causal relationships and direction of causality of many relationships.

Another possibility for future research is to examine leadership in relation to topics stemming from other research fields: for example, expanding research into leadership and personality as well as followership and personality or incorporating recent trends from cognitive psychology. Examples in this direction are the development of the so-called leaderplex model (Hooijberg, Hunt & Dodge, 1997) as well as increased attention for perception and cognition (Lord & Maher, 1991). Relationships between leadership and leader as well as follower affect and emotions are also in need of more research.

In 1978, Burns stated that 'Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth' (p. 2). Much has happened since: substitutes, LMX, globalization, and leadership perception are only some of the topics that have had a major impact. Also, the introduction of charisma and transformational leadership to the field of organizational leadership has inspired many to reexamine their ideas about the essence of leadership. These developments indeed seem to have enhanced the understanding of the phenomenon of leadership. However, the overview presented here shows that the quest is far from over.

NOTE

1 Not to be confused with Vroom and Jago's (1988) use of 'new leadership' as a term to describe a revised contingency approach to participation in decision-making (see paragraph 1.2.4).

REFERENCES

- Adler, N.J. (1991). *International dimensions of organizational behavior* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Atkinson, M. (1984). *Our masters' voices. The language and body language of politics*. London: Routledge.

- Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 199–218.
- Barker, J.R. (1993). Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 408–437.
- Bass, B.M. (1960). *Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1990a). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications* (3rd ed.) New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1990b). Editorial: Toward a meeting of minds. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1.
- Bass, B.M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52(2), 130–139.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1989). Potential biases in leadership measures: How prototypes, leniency and general satisfaction relate to ratings and rankings of transformational and transactional leadership constructs. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 49, 509–527.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 4, 231–272.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership a response to critiques. In M.M. Chemers, & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., & Atwater, L. (1996). The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women. *Applied Psychology: An international Review*, 45(1), 5–34.
- Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S. (1982). Management by grid principles or situationalism: Which? *Group and Organization Studies*, 7, 207–210.
- Boyacigiller, N., & Adler, N. (1991). The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context. *Academy of management Review*, 16, 262–290.
- Brodbeck, F.C., Frese, M., & 44 coauthors (2000). Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, in press.
- Bryman, A. (1987). The generalizability of leadership theory. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 127, 129–141.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Conger, J.A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19, 44–55.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1987). Towards a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637–647.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1988). Behavioral dimensions of charismatic leadership. In J.A. Conger, & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness* (pp. 78–97). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Davis, D.D. (1995). Form, function and strategy in boundaryless organizations. In A. Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Deluga, R.J. (1997). Relationship among American presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism and rated performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 49–65.
- Den Hartog, D.N. (1997). Inspirational leadership. VU doctoral dissertation. KLI-dissertation series, 1997-nr 2. Enschede: Ipskamp.
- Den Hartog, D.N., House, R.J., Hanges, P., Dorfman, P., Ruiz-Quintanilla, A., & 159 coauthors (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally endorsed implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 219–256.
- Den Hartog, D.N., Koopman, P.L., Thierry, Hk., Wilderom, C.P.M., Maczynski, J., & Jarmuz, S. (1997a). Dutch and Polish perceptions of leadership and national culture: The GLOBE project. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 6(4), 389–415.
- Den Hartog, D.N., Koopman, P.L., & Van Muijen, J.J. (1995). Charismatic leadership: A State of the Art. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(4), 35–50.
- Den Hartog, D.N., Van Muijen, J.J., & Koopman, P.L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70(1), 19–34.
- Den Hartog D.N., & Verburg, R.M. (1997). Charisma and rhetoric: The communicative techniques of international business leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8(4), 355–391.
- De Vries, R.E., Roe, R.A., & Taillieu, T.C.B. (1999). On charisma and need for leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 109–127.
- Donaldson, L. (1995). *American anti-management theories of organization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dorfman, P.W., & Howell, J.P. (1988). Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns. *Advances in International Comparative Management*, 3, 127–150.
- Dorfman, P.W., Howell, J.P., Hibino, S., Lee, J.K., Tate, U., & Bautista, A. (1997). Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across culture. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8(3), 233–274.
- Eden, D., & Leviatan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 736–741.
- Emans, B., Koopman, P.L., Rutte, C., & Steensma, H. (1996). Teams in organisaties: Interne en externe determinanten van resultaatgerichtheid. *Gedrag en Organisatie*, 9, 309–327.
- Erez, M., Rim, Y., & Keider, I. (1986). The two sides of the tactics of influence: Agent vs. target. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 59, 25–39.

- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organisations*. New York: Free Press.
- Evans, M.G. (1996). R.J. House's A path-goal theory of leadership effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 305–309.
- Falbe, C.M., & Yukl, G. (1992). Consequences for managers of using single influence tactics and combinations of tactics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 638–653.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1967). *A contingency theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fiedler, F.E., & Garcia, J.E. (1987). *New approaches to leadership: Cognitive resources and organizational performance*. New York: John Wiley.
- Fleishman, E.A., & Harris, E.F. (1962). Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 15, 43–56.
- Foti, R.J., & Luch, C.H. (1992). The influence of individual differences on the perception and categorization of leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3, 55–66.
- French, J., & Raven, B.H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies of social power*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Gerstner, C.R., & Day, D.V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 121–134.
- Geyer, A.L.J., & Steyrer, J.M. (1998). Transformational leadership and objective performance in banks. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 47(3), 397–420.
- Gioia, D.A., & Sims, H.P. (1985). On avoiding the influence of implicit leadership theories in leader behavior descriptions. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 45, 217–243.
- Graen, G.B., & Cashman, J.F. (1975). A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J.G. Hunt, & L.L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers* (pp. 143–165). Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Graen, G.B., & Scandura, T. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9, 175–208.
- Graen, G.B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219–247.
- Green, S.G., & Mitchell, T.R. (1979). Attributional processes of leaders in leader member exchanges. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 23, 45–458.
- Guzzo, R.A. (1995). Introduction: At the intersection of team effectiveness and decision making. In R.A. Guzzo, & E. Salas (Eds.), *Team effectiveness and decision making in organizations* (pp. 1–8). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hanges, P.J., House, R.J., Dickson, M.W., Dorfman, P.W., & 170 coauthors (in review). The development and validation of scales measuring societal culture and culturally shared implicit theories of leadership.
- Hater, J.J., & Bass, B.M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 695–702.
- Heller, F.A., Drenth, P.J.D., Koopman, P.L., & Rus, V. (1988). *Decisions in organisations: A three country comparative study*. London: Sage.
- Heller, F., Pusic, E., Strauss, G., & Wilpert, B. (1998). *Organizational participation: Myth and reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heller, F.A., & Yukl, G. (1969). Participation, managerial decisionmaking and situational variables. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 227–241.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1969). *The management of organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: MacGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7(1), 81–94.
- Hollander, E.P. (1978). *Leadership dynamics*. New York: Free Press.
- Hollander, E.P. (1992). Leadership, followership, self, and others. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3, 43–54.
- Hollander, E.P., & Offermann, L.R. (1990). Relational features of organizational leadership and followership. In K.E. Clark, & M.B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 83–98). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Hooijberg, R., Hunt, J.G., & Dodge, G.E. (1997). Leadership complexity and the development of the leaderplex model. *Journal of Management*, 23, 375–408.
- House, R.J. (1971). Path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321–338.
- House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt, & L.L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189–204). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R.J. (1995). Leadership in the 21st century: A speculative enquiry. In A. Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- House, R.J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 323–352.
- House, R.J., Delbecq, A., & Taris, T.W. (1998). Value based leadership: An integrated theory and an empirical test. Internal publication.
- House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., Dorfman, P.W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M.W. et al. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. In W.H. Mobley, M.J. Gessner, & V. Arnold (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership* (pp. 171–233). Stamford, CN: JAI Press.
- House, R.J., & Howell, J.M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3(2), 81–108.
- House, R.J., & Mitchell, T.R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Contemporary Business*, 3, 81–98.

- House, R.J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic and visionary theories. In M.M. Chemers, & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 81–107).
- House, R.J., & Singh, J.V. (1987). Organizational behavior: Some new directions for I/O psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 669–718. New York: Academic Press.
- House, R.J., Spangler, W.D., & Woyke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the US presidency: A psychological theory of leadership effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364–396.
- House, R.J., Woycke, J., & Fodor, E.M. (1988). Charismatic and noncharismatic leaders: Differences in behavior and effectiveness. In J.A. Conger, & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 98–121). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- House, R.J., Wright, N.S., & Aditya, R.N. (1997). Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory. In P.C. Early, & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology*. San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.
- Howard, A. (Ed.) (1995) *The changing nature of work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Howell, J.M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: Socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In J.A. Conger, & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 213–236). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Howell, J.M., & Avolio B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891–902.
- Howell, J.M., & Frost, P.J. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43, 243–269.
- Howell, J.P., & Dorfman, P.W. (1981). Substitutes for leadership: Test of a construct. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 714–728.
- Howell, J.P., Dorfman, P.W., & Kerr, S. (1986). Moderator variables in leadership research. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 88–102.
- Hughes, R.L., Ginnett, R.C., & Curphy, G.J. (1999). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience* (3rd Ed.). Boston: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.
- Hunt, J.G. (1991). *Leadership: A new synthesis*. Newbury park, CA: Sage.
- Hunt, J.G. (1999). Transformational/charismatic leadership's transformation of the field: A historical essay. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 129–144.
- Insch, G.S., Moore, J.E., & Murphy, L.D. (1997). Content analysis in leadership research – example, procedures, and suggestions for future use. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 1–25.
- Janis, I.L. (1982). *Groupthink* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Kanungo, R.N., & Mendonca, M. (1996). Cultural contingencies and leadership in developing countries. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 14, 263–295.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Kerr, S., & Jermier, J.M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 22, 375–403.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, F.M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intra-organizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 440–452.
- Kirkpatrick, S.A., & Locke, E.A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive*, 5, 48–60.
- Koh, W.L., Steers, R.M., & Terborg, J.R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 319–333.
- Koopman, P.L., Den Hartog, D.N., Konrad, E., & 44 co-authors (1999). National culture and leadership profiles in Europe: Some results from the GLOBE study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 503–520.
- Korman, A.K. (1966). 'Consideration', 'initiating structure', and organizational criteria – a review. *Personnel Psychology*, 19, 349–361.
- Korukonda, A.R., & Hunt, J.G. (1989). Pat on the back vs. kick in the pants: An application of cognitive inference to the study of leader reward and punishment behaviors. *Group and Organization Studies*, 14, 299–334.
- Kotter, J.P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.
- Lievens, F., Van Geit, P., & Coetsier, P. (1997). Identification of transformational leadership qualities: An examination of potential biases. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 4, 415–430.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Locke, E.A. (with Kirkpatrick, S.A., Wheeler, J.K., Schneider, J., Niles, K., Goldstein, H., Welsh, K., & D.O. Chah) (1991). *The essence of leadership*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Lord, R.G., De Vader, C.L., & Allinger, G.M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relationship between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 402–410.
- Lord, R.G., Foti, R., & De Vader, C. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34, 343–378.
- Lord, R.G., Foti, R.J., & Phillips, J.S. (1982). A theory of leadership categorization. In J.G. Hunt, U. Sekaran, & C.A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership: Beyond establishment views* (pp. 104–121). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Lord, R.G., & Maher, K.J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing*. London: Routledge.

- Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K.G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385–425.
- Maier, N.R.F. (1963). *Problem solving discussions and conferences*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Manz, C.C., & Sims, H.P., jr. (1993). *Business without bosses: How self-managing teams are building high performance companies*. New York: Wiley.
- Martinez, S., & Dorfman, P.W. (1998). The Mexican entrepreneur: An ethnographic study of the Mexican empresario. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 28, 97–123.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Meindl, J.R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In B.M. Staw, & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 12, 159–203.
- Meindl, J.R., Ehrlich, S.B., & Dukerich, J.M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 78–102.
- Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Mintzberg on management*. New York: Free Press.
- Mohrman, S.A., & Cohen, S.G. (1995). When people get out of the box: New relationships, new systems. In A. Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nahavandi, A. (2000). *The art and science of leadership* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Offermann, L.R., Kennedy, J.K., & Wirtz, P.W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Content structure, and generalizability. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5(1), 43–55.
- Peterson, M.F., & Hunt, J.G. (1997). International perspectives on international leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8(3), 203–231.
- Pettigrew, A. (1972). Information control as a power resource. *Sociology*, 6, 187–204.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). Management as symbolic action: The creation and maintenance of organizational paradigms. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 3, 1–52.
- Podsakoff, P.M. (1982). Determinants of a supervisor's use of rewards and punishments: A literature review and suggestions for future research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 29, 58–83.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., & Bommer, W.H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22, 259–298.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Todor, W.D., & Skov, R. (1982). Effects of leader contingent and noncontingent reward, and punishment behaviors on subordinate performance and satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 810–821.
- Quinn, R.E. (1988). *Beyond rational management: Mastering the paradoxes and competing demands of high performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rauch, C.F., & Behling, O. (1984). Functionalism: Basis for an alternate approach to the study of leadership. In J.G. Hunt, D.M. Hosking, C.A. Schriesheim, & R. Stewart (Eds.), *Leaders and managers: International perspectives on managerial behavior and leadership*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch, & B.B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and categorization*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Shamir, B. (1991). The charismatic relationship: Alternative explanations and predictions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2(2), 81–104.
- Shamir, B. (1992). Attribution of charisma and influence to the leader: The romance of leadership revisited. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22(5), 386–407.
- Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: Theoretical notes and an exploratory study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(1), 19–47.
- Shamir, B. (1999). Leadership in boundaryless organizations: Disposable or indispensable? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 49–71.
- Shamir, B., Arthur, M.B., & House, R.J. (1994). The rhetoric of charismatic leadership: A theoretical extension, a case study and implications for research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5(1), 25–42.
- Shamir, B., & Ben-Ari, E. (1999). Leadership in an open army? Civilian connections, interorganizational frameworks, and changes in military leadership. In J.G. Hunt, G.E. Dodge, & L.Wong (Eds.), *Out-of-the-box leadership: Transforming the 21st century army and other top performing organizations*. Stanford, CT: JAI Press.
- Shamir, B., House, R.J., & Arthur, M.B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4, 1–17.
- Singer, M.S., & Singer, A.E. (1990). Situational constraints on transformational versus transactional leadership behavior, subordinates' leadership preference, and satisfaction. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 130(3), 385–396.
- Smith, P.B., & Peterson, M.F. (1988). *Leadership, organizations and culture*. London: Sage.
- Smith, P.B., Peterson M.F., & Misumi, J. (1994). Event management and work team effectiveness in Japan, Britain and the USA. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 33–43.
- Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W.H. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review*, 36 (March-April), 95–101.
- Tichy, N.M., & Devanna, M.A. (1990). *The transformational leader* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Trice, H.M., & Beyer, J.M. (1986). Charisma and its routinization in two social movement organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8, 113–164.
- Turner, S. (1993). Charisma and obedience, a risk cognition approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4, 235–256.
- Vroom, V.H., & Jago, A.G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Vroom, V.H., & Yetton, P.W. (1973). *Leadership and decisionmaking*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (A.N. Henderson, & T. Parsons, Eds., & trans.). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- West, M.A., & Altink, W.M.M. (1996). Innovation at work: Individual, group, organizational, and socio-historical perspectives. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(1), 3–11.
- Willner, A.R. (1984). *The spellbinders: Charismatic political leadership*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Yammarino, F.J., & Bass, B.M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers: Some preliminary findings. In K.E. Clark, & M.B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 151–170). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Yammarino, F.J., & Bass, B.M. (1991). Person and situation views of leadership: A multiple levels of analysis approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2, 121–139.
- Yammarino, F.J., Spangler, W.D., & Bass, B.M. (1993). Transformational leadership and performance: A longitudinal investigation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4(1), 81–102.
- Yokochi, N. (1989). *Leadership styles of Japanese managers: Transformational and transactional*. Doctoral dissertation, United States International University, San Diego, CA.
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Yukl, G., & Falbe, C.M. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(2), 132–140.
- Yukl, G., & Falbe, C.M. (1991). The importance of different power sources in downward and lateral relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 416–423.
- Yukl, G., Falbe, C.M., & Youn, J.Y. (1993). Patterns of influence behavior for managers. *Group and Organization Management*, 20, 272–296.
- Yukl, G., & Tracey, B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 525–535.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*, 15, 67–78.