

Core Knowledge Area Module Number 6:
Organizational Leadership and Change

Breadth Component

Student: William A. Brantley
Faculty Mentor: Dr. Jason K. Lum

Walden University
November 18, 2005

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Bennis on Leadership.....	4
Transformational Leadership.....	9
Charismatic Leadership.....	12
Situational Leadership	17
Servant Leadership.....	19
Primal Leadership.....	21
Principle-centered Leadership.....	23
Bad Leadership.....	26
Political Aspects of Leadership.....	29
Leadership in Public Administration.....	32
Synthesizing a Model for Public Agency Leadership	36
References.....	39

Leadership has been the subject of intense study by many researchers but a general model of leadership has yet to be established. In this KAM, several major theories of leadership such as transformational leadership, situational leadership, primal leadership, and servant leadership will be examined in order to determine if there are common elements to leadership that can be synthesized into a general model for public agency leadership. To further substantiate the synthesis, the political aspects and public service aspects of leadership will be examined along with the new field of "bad leadership". The conclusion of this KAM is that a general model of public agency leadership can be constructed and this model will be used in the Depth Component to demonstrate how public agencies can successfully transform themselves.

The survey of theories starts with a major researcher in leadership studies, Warren Bennis (1985), and his research on transformational leadership. The section after Bennis details other researcher's contributions to transformational leadership. The focus then shifts to the competing theories of charismatic leadership and situational leadership to demonstrate the contrasting viewpoints of these two theories. Then, the theory of servant leadership is examined along with two contemporary theories of leadership that expand upon the servant leadership model. It will be demonstrated that there are common elements in these disparate leadership models.

Then the concept of "bad leadership" is examined. This is a new direction in leadership study which, as Kellerman (2004) argues, is needed because focusing solely on good leaders is not enough to fully comprehend what leadership is. The succeeding two sections of the KAM examine the political skills needed by all leaders and three classic theories of public leaders. Based on the above survey of leadership theories, the

KAM concludes with a general model of public agency leadership that draws heavily on concepts from transformational leadership, primal leadership, public leadership, bad leadership, and the political aspects of leadership.

Turning to the first section of the survey, Bennis' (1985) transformational leadership theory is examined in detail. Of all the theories in the leadership field, transformational leadership seems to be the most commonly-held view of how leadership works. This model deals specifically with how leaders initiate and manage change in an organization and thus it is ideal for understanding how leaders operate during deep organizational change in their organizations.

Bennis on Leadership

Leadership is "transformative" as Bennis and Nanus (1985) define it. "Transformative leadership achieves significant change that reflects the community of interests of both leaders and followers: indeed, it frees up and pools the collective energies in pursuit of a common goal" (p. 217). The transformational leader "commits people to action", "converts followers into leaders", and "converts leaders into agents of change" (p. 3). As Bennis and Nanus see it, leadership is all about change and how to bring about significant, positive change by empowering followers and providing a clear vision for change.

By defining leadership as transformative, Bennis and Nanus (1985) dispel four common myths of leadership. They argue that leadership is not a rare skill but is something most people can learn and use and thus there are no naturally-born leaders (p. 222). They also state that leaders do not have to be charismatic to be effective (p. 223)

and that leadership is found throughout the organization instead of just at the top (p. 224). Bennis and Nanus also make a distinction between management and leadership by claiming that leaders deal with "activities of vision and judgment – *effectiveness* [italics in original]" while managers deal with "activities of mastering routines – *efficiency* [italics in original]" (p.21). Transformational leaders are concerned with the emotional and spiritual resources of the organization while the manager is concerned with the physical resources of the organization (p. 92).

In discussing why transformational leaders are needed, Bennis and Nanus (1985) describe the three major contexts of leadership in today's world. The first context is complexity which is signified by "rapid and spastic change" leading to organizational problem that become increasingly complex (p. 8). This leads to the second context, credibility, as leaders are measured on how well they deal with the complexity (p. 11). In the third context, commitment, leaders are judged on how well they "instill vision, meaning, and trust in their followers" (p. 8). This is why the ability to manage change is at the heart of Bennis and Nanus' definition of leadership. Leaders who can tame the constant change around them and redirect those energies toward positive and significant goals are considered more successful than leaders who fail to inspire credibility and commitment among their followers.

In order to deal with the three contexts of leadership, leaders need to use power. Bennis and Nanus (1985) criticize other contemporary leadership theories because they tend to ignore or downplay the necessity for power in leadership (p. 15). Power is essential for leadership because it is the "basic energy to initiate and sustain action translating intention into reality" (p. 15). Without power, leaders cannot direct change

and they cannot empower their followers to aid in the change process (p. 80). It is through empowerment of their followers that transformational leaders affect positive and significant change.

Power that is solely contained in the leader will not bring about change. A transformational leader realizes this and works to empower their followers so as to achieve four objectives. The first objective is to persuade followers of the significance and meaning of the change (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 83) while the second objective is to develop the competence of the followers to bring about the change (p. 82). In the third objective, transformational leaders build a sense of community into their followers which fulfills the fourth objective of giving the followers a sense of fun and safety while pursuing the change (p. 83).

In order to wisely use power and to best empower their followers, Bennis and Nanus (1985) describe four strategies for leadership development. The first strategy is that the leader masters themselves by learning how to deal with uncertainty, learning to effectively communicate interpersonally, and "gaining self-knowledge" (p. 189). Self-regard is the second strategy and it requires the leader to recognize strengths and weaknesses with the goal of developing their innate leadership abilities (pp. 58-59). Both of these strategies require the leader to understand their own nature first before they begin to deal with their followers. This self-knowledge is vital in that it centers the leader for the challenges they will face in affecting change.

The second two strategies for leadership development require the leader to empower their followers. In the third strategy, leaders use vision to gain the attention of their followers and focus their efforts on the positive and significant change (p. 28). This

requires the establishment of trust, the fourth strategy, because it is the "lubrication that makes it possible for organizations to work" (p. 41). A special kind of trust is accomplished by positioning which is "seeing innovation through" (p. 52) and "establishing organizational integrity" (p. 48). Once all four strategies have been executed, the leader develops into a transformational leader.

After describing the four leadership strategies, Bennis and Nanus (1985) return to the idea of positioning because of its importance in establishing the organization's capacity for change. Positioning is defined as the organization developing a unique, important, resource-appropriate, and capability-appropriate niche that allows the organization to thrive in the complex and constantly-changing environment (p. 162). Organizations can choose different ways to bring about positioning. They can wait until the change happens and then react to the change (p. 162) or they can try to anticipate the change and alter their internal environment in response to the oncoming change (p. 164). A third reaction is to alter the external environment so as to make the oncoming change wholly beneficial to the organization (p. 165). The final reaction is a combination of changing internally and altering the external environment to best take advantage of the anticipated change (p. 165).

But what is necessary for the transformational leader to bring about change in an organization? Bennis and Nanus (1985) argue that the organization needs the proper social architecture, that the transformational leader creates a compelling vision for change, and that the organization is designed for innovative learning.

The first condition, proper social architecture, is defined as "that which provides context (or meaning) and commitment to its membership and stakeholders" (Bennis and

Nanus, 1985, p. 112). Members have a "shared interpretation of organizational events" that directs their behavior and compels their commitment to the organization's values and philosophy. Of the three styles of social architecture described by Bennis and Nanus, the "personalistic" with its emphasis on self-actualization and leadership at all levels is preferable to the "formalistic" which is based on a hierarchical power structure or the "collegial" which focuses on group consensus for its organizational actions (p. 138). Once the personalistic social architecture has been established, the transformational leader can work on the vision for change.

Vision is important because it answers the reward needs of the organization's members. As Bennis and Nanus write, "[p]eople join an organization based on the rewards they will receive from being members" (p. 90). Thus, in creating a successful and compelling change vision, leaders must develop a vision that answers the rewards needs of the work force, "develop commitment for the new vision", and "institutionalize the new vision" (p. 141). It is through vision that transformational leaders fulfill their leadership potential and bring about the significant and positive change.

Equally important for transformational leaders is the necessity to develop the organization's capacity for innovative learning. Change is constant and the organization's success depends on its ability to continually affect positive and significant change. Thus, organizations that learn effectively can change effectively. Therefore, the transformational leader needs to develop open organizations that empower all of its members in anticipating and affecting change (p. 209).

The next section details how other researchers have deepened the definition and mechanisms of transformational leadership. A common theme among these researchers

is the necessity for the transformational leader to create a change vision but the details on how they initiate and manage change differ according to each researchers' findings.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership arises from the unique challenges of transforming an organization such as the need for a new vision and different ways of thinking about strategy, organizational structure, and people (Tichy and Devanna, 1990, p. 4).

According to Tichy and Devanna, transforming organizations is a three part drama which consists of four dramatic tensions. In Act 1, there is the recognized need for revitalization which leads to Act 2 where a new vision is created. Act 3 culminates the drama by institutionalizing the change (pp. 5-6). During these acts there are struggles between stability and change; denial of the current reality and acceptance of the current reality; fear of change and hope for change; and between management and leadership (pp. 27-28). It is during this transformational drama that transitional leaders are needed and created.

Transitions are difficult for organizations. The organization must leave past processes and practices behind in creating a new future – "a process of death and rebirth" (Tichy and Devanna, 1990, p. 69). Transitions without good leadership can end in disengagement, disidentification, disenchantment, or disorientation of the people who work in the organization which could lead to the destruction of the organization (pp. 64-67). But, with a good transformational leader, the final phase of change can be a period of revitalization where people can "face the future with enthusiasm and energy" (p. 71). A good transformational leader can lead the organization from the awareness that

organizational change is required to the personal transformations required of the individual's mindset and behaviors to operate in the new organization (p. 58).

It is a truism that transformational change will meet heavy resistance to the change from the organization and its members. There is the technical resistance to change in which habit and inertia, the fear of the unknown, or the fallacy of sunk cost prevents the organization from envisioning the benefits of change (Tichy and Devanna, 1990, pp. 74-75). Powerful coalitions fearful of zero-sum decisions in which they will lose resources is the motivation of the second type of resistance to change – political (p. 77). The third type of resistance, "cultural", is embedded in the culture of the organization where there is desire for a "regression to the good old days" caused by cultural filters that do not allow the members of the organization to perceive the benefits of the proposed change (pp. 79-81). These strong resistors to change require an equally strong leader to bring about the transformational change.

Tichy and Devanna (1990) describe the transformational leader as courageous individuals who "identify themselves as change agents" and are visionaries. Transformational leaders "believe in people," are value-driven, and lifelong learners who "have the ability to deal with complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty" (pp. 271-280). The transformational leader avoids giving easy answers to change by having an agenda which they persuade others to adopt but go out of their way to not overadvocate the proposed change (p. 85). Transformational leaders understand that there are two parts to a vision: a conceptual framework that provides a roadmap to change and the emotional part that provides the motivation behind the change (p. 130). This extraordinary leader is

present throughout the three acts of the transformational drama as they lead the organization through the change.

As the transformational leader guides the organization, they focus on four tasks. First, they summarize the past which leads to the next task of justifying the change. The third task is to create a link between the past and future while the fourth task is to eulogize the past so as to free the organization in pursuing the new vision (Tichy and Devanna, 1990, pp. 180-181). The transformational leader also deals with the political and cultural resistance to change by identifying the individuals who stand in the way of the change or whose support is needed for the change. The transformational leader then determines the critical mass of cultural gatekeepers and political groups that are needed to insure the implementation for change. Their support is gained and the transformational leader sets up a monitoring system to track any changes in the political or cultural climate of the organization that will impact the transformation (pp. 210-211).

It is the understanding of social networks that allows transformational leaders to perform the above tasks and to overcome resistance by various groups. As Tichy and Devanna (1990) argue, social networks are how things are done in organizations and how people connect with one another in the organization (p. 193). The transformational leader must reweave these "webs of relationships" in order to bring about the change (p. 188). The transformational leader does not influence people merely through "bludgeoning people and the use of lies" (p. 197) but by their ability to detect the networks and the key players in those networks so as to more effectively direct their persuasive message of change (p. 200).

In influencing the different social networks, the most powerful tool that the transformational leader has is the ability to reduce uncertainty. "The critical variables in a successful organizational design are control and guidance in the face of uncertainty" (Tichy and Devanna, 1990, p. 221). The transformational leader designs the change to reduce the uncertainty of the transformation to the organization's culture, technical structures, and political structure (pp. 221-222). By reducing the fear of uncertainty, the transformational leader can better guide the organization and its members through the transformational drama to an effective ending in which the members are revitalized and their social networks are preserved or improved.

A common agreement among the researchers is that the transformational leader is a courageous individual who sees the need for change and works to persuade others of the need for change. They are consummate communicators who work through their network of personal relationships to generate excitement about the proposed change and to quell fears of leaving the status quo. A successful transformational leader uses the force of their personality and their persuasive abilities to lead. The same can be said of charismatic leaders but, as researchers have found, the major difference is that the charismatic leader is often committed to preserving the existing power structure for their own benefit.

Charismatic Leadership

Charismatic leadership theory rests upon the concept that authority is based in the leader's ability to persuade followers that the leader is the only source of power and legitimacy (Willner, 1984, p. 4). As Willner goes on to explain, there are four

dimensions that distinguish charismatic leaders from other leaders. First is the leader-image dimension in which the charismatic leader has an attractive personality to followers. The second dimension is "idea-acceptance" whereby the charismatic leader's ideas are unconditionally accepted by their follower. This leads to the final two dimensions, "compliance" and "emotional", whereby the followers have an emotional attachment to the charismatic leader that compels their obedience (p. 5).

Charismatic leaders are perceived to be superhuman by their followers who blindly believe and follow their leaders with almost religious zeal (Willner, p. 8). This type of relationship between followers and the charismatic leader can come about through "contrivance or calculation" or "fortuitously" but, however it came about, it allows charismatic leaders to wield enormous power in an organization especially during times of crisis or change.

The source of the charismatic leader's power during change or crisis is the belief by their followers that the leader has superior strategic insight (Conger, 1989, p. 98). The charismatic leader excels at seeing the "big picture" (p. 7) and by their superior ability to communicate a strategic vision to their followers (p. 5). Coupled with this are charismatic leader's tendencies toward unconventional behavior (p. 6) and their ability to perceive the shortcomings in the organization's current situation (p. 4). Thus, charismatic leaders are proficient in making the case for change and rallying others to their cause. This gains the leader their followers but it also energizes the opposition who endeavor to stop the charismatic leader and restore the status quo (p. 7). Opposition to the leader often legitimizes the leader's cause in the early stages but can overwhelm the leader in the long term.

So, how does the charismatic leader rise to power? First, the potential charismatic leader persuades followers that the leader has a mystic connection to mythical or historical legendary figures (Willner, 1984, p. 63). Through metaphor, the followers come to see the leader as the embodiment of myth (p. 64). Second, the potential charismatic leader performs some seemingly impossible task that further confirms their superhuman status (p. 61). This leads to the third factor in which the leader gains the aura of incredible expertise – "by claiming credit for others' accomplishments and by simply conveying an aura of expertise" (Conger, 1989, p. 100). Underlying all this is the fourth factor which is outstanding rhetorical ability (Willner, 1984, p. 61). Essentially, it is the ability to communicate and project an image of superhuman status that leads to the rise of the charismatic leader.

Conger (1989) describes a similar model for the rise of the charismatic leader. In the first stage, the potential charismatic leader detects "unexploited opportunities and deficiencies in the present situation" (p. 27). The leader is also highly aware of the unmet needs of potential followers and thus begins to craft a strategic vision. In the second stage, the potential leader communicates their vision as an alternative to deficient status quo. The third stage is where the leader gathers followers by exhibiting the above-mentioned superhuman traits. In the fourth stage, the leader demonstrates through "modeling, empowerment, and unconventional tactics" how the vision will be achieved and the status quo will be replaced with a brighter future (p. 27). Again, the ability to communicate compellingly is the key to charismatic leader's rise.

It is this amazing ability to communicate that marks the charismatic leader. Charismatic leaders can communicate effectively on both rational and emotional levels

(Conger, 1989, pp. 68-69) and are experts at a number of rhetorical devices such as metaphors and analogies (p. 73). "They [charismatic leaders] have employed rhetoric directly or implicitly to present themselves in a heroic mold, as, for example, prophet, seer, warrior, and protector of the people" (Willner, 1984, p. 153). Charismatic leaders rely more on the emotional impact of their words than logical arguments and thus their communication seems to be more effective especially during times of crisis and change (p. 152).

Once charismatic leaders have attracted followers, they have several ways to retain their followers. Charismatic leaders are adept at appealing to the needs of their followers and setting high expectations while at the same time maintaining the aura of superhuman abilities (Conger, 1989, p. 136). The charismatic leader builds the trust of their followers by using unconventional tactics that demonstrates a commitment to the cause and solidarity with their followers (pp. 102-104). Once trust has been gained, the charismatic leader works to instill a sense of empowerment in their followers so that they believe they alone have the necessary abilities to achieve the leader's vision (p. 108). Along with empowerment is constant education on the details of the leader's visions and how to best achieve the vision (p. 121). The most effective form of education is by modeling the expected behavior so charismatic leaders spend a great deal of time involved in dramatic and highly-visible acts which serve as examples of expected behaviors and attitudes (pp. 117-119). According to Conger, these methods are universal to charismatic leaders because they appeal to a wide range of followers (p. 127).

As the charismatic leader gains power and followers, they may tend to believe that the powers vested in their current position are inadequate in achieving their strategic

vision. Thus charismatic leaders use a variety of political strategies to gain more power and influence. They often speak of their policies as resurrecting a "glorious past" (Willner, 1984, p. 173) or that they are the embodiment of the people against powerful interests in the corrupt status quo (p. 174). They argue that innovation requires a change in the current power structure (p. 176) or they use suspense to build up interest and support before announcing the need for changes (p. 178). A common tactic is to use the division of power in the current government to weaken competing interests and thus raise the "need" for someone to consolidate power in order to get things done (p. 181).

It is at this point, that the charismatic leader becomes ineffective and potentially destructive. Once a charismatic leader becomes consumed with their own personal gain and loses touch with "reality or his followers' needs" (Conger, 1989, p. 137), they will harm themselves and the organization. Charismatic leaders are not inherently wicked but, because their power rests in the relationship with their followers, that relationship can turn destructive (Willner, 1984, p. 12). The communication powers of the charismatic leader can easily be used to manipulate followers such as making exaggerated claims for the vision, suppressing negative information, or creating the illusion of control (Conger, 1989, pp. 149-150). The leader's vision can also fail followers by being focused solely on the leader's personal needs or being overly optimistic about the future (p. 139). It is at this point that the charismatic leader either loses followers and the organization becomes dysfunctional (pp. 153-154).

A charismatic leader creates a situation or molds the current situation to legitimize their authority. At all times, they master events so as to demonstrate their superhuman powers of compelling fate to follow the will of the leader. Essentially, the charismatic

leader attempts to lead in the same way despite the current situation. In contrast to this, the situational leader is heavily influenced by the current situation and alters their leadership style based on their perception and their followers' perceptions of the situation. The next section details the situational leader model.

The Situational Leader

Hersey's (1984) situational leader theory deals with how a particular situation influences the way a leader communicates and behaves toward their followers. A leader can act in four different ways depending on a combination of directive (or task behavior) and supportive (or relationship behavior). Task behavior is defined as the "extent to which the leader engages in defining roles" and directing others to perform tasks (p. 125). Relationship behavior is "the extent to which the leader engages in two-way . . . communication" with their followers (p. 125). By constructing a table with the relationship behavior as the Y-axis and task behavior as the X-axis, the four leader behaviors and decision styles can be constructed. Follower readiness can also be determined by one of the four quadrants of the table.

In the first quadrant, "telling", the leader is high in task (directive) behavior while they score low in relationship behavior. Thus, the leader makes all of the decisions, is very specific in their instructions, and closely monitors their followers' performance. This behavior arises because the followers are unable or unwilling to perform their tasks or they feel too insecure to participate in the decisionmaking (Hersey, 1984, p. 125).

The second quadrant, "selling", is characterized by a high task orientation and a high relationship orientation by the leader. The leader still makes the final decisions but

will explain their decisions to the followers. The followers are willing and motivated to perform the tasks but they lack the necessary skills and knowledge to perform the tasks (Hersey, 1984, p. 125). This is in contrast to the third quadrant in which the followers are able to perform the tasks but are unwilling to do so. Thus, the leader's behavior is "participatory" in which he or she encourages their followers to make the decision. The third quadrant leader is high on the relationship axis but is low on the task orientation in this quadrant (p. 125).

The fourth quadrant, "delegating", is where the leader is almost absent from the group because of their low emphasis on relationships and tasks. The followers make the decisions and they are highly able and motivated to perform the tasks. The leader essentially turns over all responsibility to their followers and intervenes rarely and only after the followers has requested their input (p. 125).

Situational leadership differs from other leadership theories because Hersey (1984) argues that there is no one leadership behavior that is applicable to all occasions. Thus, a leader must first gauge the abilities and motivation of their followers and then adjust their behavior accordingly. This requires the leader to continually monitor the situation and their followers so that they can determine when to shift from one of the four leadership styles.

Situational leadership also demonstrates that the belief that the leader is unique from their followers is changing. Even though Bennis (1985) argues in his transformational leadership model that anyone has the potential to be a leader, it is still the individual who has a clearer vision of the future that becomes the leader. In the charismatic leadership model, the leader promotes their superiority over their followers.

But, in the situational leadership model, the follower becomes equal to and then superior to the leader depending on the situation. In the following section on servant leadership, Greenleaf (1977) argues that a good leader must first learn to be a follower and from this, the leader understands that their primary duty is to serve their followers through their leadership. This is an argument that is also at the core of primal leadership and principle-centered leadership.

Servant Leadership

The basic tenet of the servant leadership model is that the better leaders are the ones who have learned to serve first and then aspire to lead (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 10). The servant leader is considered superior to the leaders who desire only to lead because the servant leader acts from the nobler motive to serve rather than the need to "assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions" (p. 13). "The great leader is seen as servant first, and that simple fact is the key to his greatness" (p. 7).

Greenleaf (1977) attributes a number of positive characteristics to the servant leader based on his conception of their inherent nobility. A servant leader initiates the action by providing structure and ideas while taking responsibility for any failure as well as success (p. 15). This is because the servant leader has a goal that they can communicate well enough to elicit the trust of their followers (p. 16). In fact, the servant leader has extraordinary awareness and perception (p. 27) that gives them the uncanny ability to "sense . . . the unknowable" and to "foresee the unforeseeable" (pp. 21-22) and thus their followers attribute the servant leader with an incredible foresight (p. 24) and

ability to conceptualize the "bigger picture" (p. 32). It is the followers' belief in the vision of the servant leaders that make them great persuaders (p. 29).

Along with vision and persuasion, servant leaders have a great ability to find the optimum decisions in most circumstances. This ability to find and create the best balanced decisions for their followers is another factor that drives loyalty to the servant leader (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 19). This loyalty holds during even emergency situations because followers trust that once the crisis is over, the servant leader will restore the optimum balance.

Greenleaf (1977) asserts that the "true natural servant leader automatically responds to any problem by listening first" (p. 17). The follower is always listened to and they are always accepted even though the leader may not accept their behavior or performance. It is this unconditional acceptance of the follower that distinguishes the servant leader and leads to the intense loyalty of their followers (p. 20). The servant leader derives their persuasive power from the loyalty of their followers because the servant leader gives the impression that the followers are in control while the servant leader is only facilitating the followers as they aspire to higher goals (p. 18).

There are many similarities between charismatic leaders and servant leaders save for one fundamental difference. Charismatic leaders derive their power from their followers' belief that the leader has more ability than the average person whereas the servant leader rose to power based on their ability to serve others. Thus, charismatic leaders may be believed to have been born to lead whereas servant leaders are followers who have become superior leaders.

Primal leadership builds upon the idea of servant leadership by explaining that the primary duty of primal leaders is to aid their followers in achieving emotional intelligence and thus the followers empower themselves during the process of changing the organization. Much like servant leadership, the primal leader must first understand and master their own emotions before they can lead others.

Primal Leadership

Goleman, the creator of the theory of emotional intelligence, has extended his theory into leadership by asserting that "[g]reat leadership works through emotions" (Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee, 2002, p. 3). According to the authors, the emotional task of the leader is primal because it is the first "original and most important act of leadership" (p. 5) and it is this ability to sway the emotions of their followers that makes leaders great. Goleman, et al. acknowledge that leaders must have intelligence and think clearly in order to create a vision but, it is through emotion, that leaders motivate their followers into following the vision (pp. 26-27).

Before the primal leader can use emotion to sway their followers, they should first be aware of their own emotional intelligence. Without an understanding of the leader's own emotions, they are unable to understand emotions in others. Toward this end, Goleman, et al. (2002) have devised four emotional intelligence domains that contain specific competencies for each domain. The first two domains, "self-awareness" and "self-management", make up the personal competence capabilities of the primal leader while the remaining two domains, "social awareness" and "relationship management", make up the social competence capabilities of the primal leader (p. 39). In order to create

these competencies, Goleman, et al. detail a five-step self-directed learning process in which the primal leader creates a vision of their ideal self, determine their real self, and develop a plan to evolve from their real self to their ideal self (pp. 111-112).

The importance of building emotionally-intelligent leaders is that they are vital for a good corporate climate. As Goleman, et al. (2002) found, leaders are the single most important influence on how employees perceive their workplace and on employee productivity (p. 18). Emotionally intelligent leaders help foster trust in the workplace and aids employees in developing emotional bonds that makes their work more meaningful (p. 21). Emotionally intelligent leaders are more effective because they have the stability and flexibility to handle a wider range of issues than the average leader (p. 84). The leader who becomes more aware of their emotions and learns to channel their emotions productively has a halo effect on their employees as the employees become more emotionally intelligent as they model the behavior of their leader.

As the leader continues to grow in emotional intelligence, they will eventually reach "resonant leadership." Resonant leadership is where the followers "vibrate with the leader's upbeat and enthusiastic energy" (Goleman, et al., 2002, p. 20). At this high level of interaction, the followers are better able to work with each other with a minimum of misunderstanding and a high degree of effectiveness. Under a resonant leader, there is a genuine enthusiasm for the vision that is contagious and the workplace becomes an open and trusting environment.

The polar opposite of the resonant leader is the dissonant leader. As the title suggests, the dissonant leader creates emotional disharmony in the workplace that causes group distress which diverts attention away from the leader's vision (Goleman, et al.,

2002, p. 19). Dissonant leaders may be unaware of their effect and may try to project an upbeat message but their emotional intelligence incompetence still causes dissonance (p. 25). Other dissonant leaders are fully aware of their effects but use the group disharmony to manipulate followers and to abuse those who would challenge their leadership (p. 23). These types of leaders are ultimately unsuccessful as their best people either leave or fail to develop trust and enthusiasm in the workplace (p. 82).

After describing the harmful effects of the dissonant leader, Goleman, et al. (2002) again reassert the beneficial effects of creating emotional intelligence in the workplace. Emotionally intelligent leaders identify the current emotional reality of their organization (p. 192) and work through groups to build up emotional intelligence. Leaders start by raising awareness of emotional intelligence among the group members (p. 183) and help the group members to build emotional intelligence in much the same way the leader built their own emotional intelligence (p. 177). This helps to raise the group's IQ, "the sum total of person's best talents contributed at full force" (p. 15), and thus the entire organization's emotional intelligence rises. The ultimate goal is to create a resonant organizational climate in which all members contribute to the best of their abilities in an open and trusting environment.

Principle-centered Leadership

Principle-centered leaders are much like Goleman, et al.'s (2002) primal leaders but their defining characteristics are based on Covey's (1991) seven habits theory. According to Covey, principle-centered leaders are "continually learning", "lead balanced lives", "see life as an adventure", "are synergistic", and "exercise for self-renewal" (pp.

33-39). Principle-centered leadership is based on the idea that personal contribution is the "highest level of human motivation" (p. 70) which leads to the three character traits for greatness: integrity, maturity, and an abundance mentality (pp. 61-62). Covey further divides principle-centered leadership into four levels: personal, interpersonal, managerial, and organizational (p. 31). Aligned with each of these levels is trustworthiness, trust, empowerment, and alignment, respectively (p. 315).

Trustworthiness is the foundational level because it is based on the leader's character and competence (Covey, 1991, p. 31). From trustworthiness comes trust which enables members of the organization to form win-win agreements (p. 31). Once trust has been established, leaders establish principles that empower members to act without "constant monitoring, evaluating, correcting, or controlling" (p. 98). The top level, alignment, rests upon these levels of principles and trust and allows for clear communication in the organization (p. 110) and the ability of the leader to influence the organization (p. 120).

Along with the four levels described above, principle-centered leaders must make a choice of the type of power they will use (Covey, 1991, p. 105). The first type of power is "coercive" which uses the fear of the followers to bring out about the leader's vision (p. 101). The second type of power, "utility", is based on the followers' belief that they will personally benefit from following the leader (p. 102). It is the third type of power, "legitimate", that Covey advocates for the principle-centered leader. Legitimate power rests upon the beliefs of the followers and the leader that their cause is just and that everyone is treated with respect. Followers follow the principle-centered leader

because they have a "knowledgeable, wholehearted, and uninhibited commitment" (p. 102) to the leader's vision.

But even if the leader uses legitimate power, they can still fall victim to the three common big mistakes of poor leadership. They can try to advise before fully understanding the situation or attempt to build relationships without changing conduct/attitudes (Covey, 1991, p. 128). Leaders that believe that merely modeling good behavior and trustworthiness is sufficient is also a common mistake (p. 129).

Thus, principle-centered leaders must work to empower their followers by setting four conditions in their organization (Covey, 1991, p. 192). First, leaders must demonstrate how to create win-win agreements to their followers which leads to the second condition of self-supervision in the organization. The third condition is to create helpful structures and systems that will also support the fourth condition of accountability. Once these conditions are in place, the leader can depend on win-win self-management to allow the organization's members to work based on principles and the environment of trust (p. 195).

Thus, principle-centered leaders work to improve their own personal competence and then, through their leadership, help their followers to achieve the same level of principle-centered leadership. Ultimately, a critical mass of principle-centered leaders transforms the organization into a highly effective and efficient workplace.

In all of the leadership theories examined so far, the assumption is that the leaders are acting in the best interest of their followers. Even in the case of charismatic leaders, the researchers assert that a charismatic leader who begins acting only in their best interests will soon lose influence and followers. Leadership study is an old field but, as

Kellerman (2004) argues, researchers are only focusing on half the story when they only focus on good leadership.

Bad Leadership

Kellerman's (2004) thesis is that other leadership theories only focus on what makes a good leader and that leadership and coercion are unrelated (p. 4). Kellerman calls this the "Hitler's ghost" problem – the leadership industry's refusal to link bad leadership to good leadership and thus distorting research in leadership (p. 11).

Kellerman argues that by not studying bad leadership, the field of leadership studies will become confused and misleading without the lessons of what to avoid that could be gleaned from studying bad leadership (p. 12). By understanding the causes and effects of bad leadership, a more complete theory of leadership can be built that better explains what good leadership is.

Kellerman (2004) begins the study of bad leadership by explaining that self-interest is at the heart of all leadership. Leaders and followers both seek leadership to protect against disorder and the fear of death (p. 17). Bad leaders are motivated by greed or malignant narcissism which makes their self-interest understandable (pp 19-21). But the reasons why followers follow bad leaders are more complex.

On the most basic level, bad leaders fulfill the needs of their followers (Kellerman, 2004, p. 22). Even in the most repressive regimes, many followers can still enjoy safety, simplicity, and certainty (until they run afoul of the bad leader). Also, not following the bad leader is often not worth the risk and energy – "to actively protest against the powers that be takes time, energy, and, more often than not, courage" (p. 25). For a few followers, they benefit greatly by following the bad leader because they can

share in the power and the riches generated by the bad leader's actions. In fact, for some followers who are close to the bad leader, sharing in the spoils is highly motivational.

Having established that it is unethical self-interest which motivates leaders and followers, Kellerman (2004) describes a continuum of bad leadership which is anchored on one end by ineffective leadership and anchored on the other end by unethical leadership. Ineffective leadership is the failure to produce the desired change and does not necessarily imply that the leader is acting unethically (p. 33). An unethical leader is one who "fails to distinguish between right and wrong" (p. 34). Based on these two definitions, Kellerman posits seven types of bad leaders.

The first type is the incompetent leader who lacks the will and/or skill to create positive change (Kellerman, 2004, p. 40). The second type of leader, rigid, is competent but they are unwilling to adapt to change and new ideas (p. 41). Leaders who lack self-control which is further exacerbated by their followers are designated intemperate (p. 42). These three types of leaders exemplify the ineffective end of the bad leadership continuum. They may not be unethical but they are still bad leaders.

It is with the fourth type, callous, that bad leadership crosses into the unethical part of the continuum. Callous leaders ignore the needs of their followers while corrupt leaders, the fifth type, actively "lie, cheat, and steal" on their followers (pp. 43-44). Insular leaders, the sixth type, vilify anyone who is outside of their group (p. 45). The final type, evil leaders, is the kind that is most typically thought of when describing bad leaders. These leaders are the one who commit great atrocities and the harm they cause their followers is severe (p. 46).

According to Kellerman (2004), bad leadership does not occur solely by the leader alone. Both the leader and followers co-create the bad leadership. "Together, leaders and followers can bring out the best in people, as in, say the civil rights movement; or they can amplify what's worst in people and leave murder and mayhem in their wake" (p. 226). As he points out, this has profound moral implications because leaders and followers share the responsibility of leadership.

To combat bad leadership Kellerman (2004) proposes a number of self-help rules which can be summed up in a few simple principles. For leaders, they should be self-aware and learn to control their self-desires while striving to do what is best for their followers (pp. 233-235). Followers should empower themselves and keep a skeptical attitude toward their leaders while holding them accountable for their actions (pp. 239-242). As Kellerman has demonstrated, studying bad leadership leads to many valuable lessons on what makes good leadership.

Both Bennis (1985) and Kellerman (2004) would agree that many leadership researchers ignore the issue of politics in leadership. Some researchers will hint at the effective leader being masterful at influencing their followers through social networks but there is not a great deal of research on exactly how leaders use political influence to bring about change. DeLuca (1999) posits that effective leaders are politically-savvy leaders. They understand that the managing of informal politics of an organization is just as important as the traditional duties of leadership.

Political Aspects of Leadership

"Politics is a fact of organizational life" (DeLuca, 1999, p. 41) and it is this fact that makes it important for the leader to become politically savvy. As DeLuca argues, the "behind-the-scenes" actions of the leader are just as important as their overt actions and thus leaders must learn to manage organizational politics in an effective and ethical way (p. 49).

Organizational politics exist because of the "chit system." DeLuca (1999) defines a chit as "a type of unofficial influence credit" (p. 102) which organizational members exchange for favors from other members in the organization. A politically-savvy leader knows where and how the chits are distributed so that they can more effectively implement their vision.

Some leaders recoil at the idea of a chit system because of the manipulative connotation that being politically-savvy implies (DeLuca, 1999, p. 30). This causes a political blind spot which handicaps the leader because they do not realize the extent to which decisions are shaped by the informal influences that permeate the organization (p. 27).

DeLuca (1999) argues that this belief is misguided because it is possible for a leader to be ethical and still be an active player in organizational politics. Politically-savvy leaders view the organization as composed of diverse individuals with differing agendas (p. 39). Thus, politically-savvy leaders engage in organizational politics so as to increase rational decision-making while preventing the "more dysfunctional irrational aspects of human nature from distorting the decision-making process" (p. 40). These

leaders keep in constant contact with all members of the organization so that they can keep track of who is influential and the various agendas of the organization's members.

Politically-savvy leaders are constantly seeking opportunities for agenda-linking in which they identify the different agendas so that they can find ways to build win-win solutions from the various agendas and build coalitions (DeLuca, 1999, p. 96). At all times, the politically-savvy leader is completely open about their agenda-linking activities thus avoiding the stigma that they are being manipulative (p. 32). By being open about agenda linking the leader can more easily build coalitions because they are perceived as credible and thus their influence grows (p. 141: also see p. 85). Politically-savvy leaders are effective because they work with the organizational culture to bring about change (p. 121).

Politically –savvy leaders are always concerned with the ethics of their actions. They work to use ethical means to achieve ethical ends (DeLuca, 1999, p. 32). In cases where unethical means are required to achieve ethical ends, politically-savvy leaders seek advice from their mentors and will struggle with their decision. When they do decide to use unethical means to achieve ethical ends, the politically-savvy leader will take personal responsibility for their decisions (p. 34).

How politically-savvy leaders affect change in organizations is through the "organizational political mapping technique" which is a map of who has influence in the organization and how to best distribute chits to affect the change (DeLuca, 1999, p. 64). To create the organizational political map, politically-savvy leaders first determine who the key players are and how much influence they have. Then the leader ascertains how the key players stand on the proposed change and the ease at which they can be

influenced to support the leader's proposal. Finally, the leader determines how the key players influence each other (p. 67). By identifying the key players and how they can be best influenced, the politically-savvy leader creates "credibility paths" that uses key players who support the proposed change to persuade other key players to lend their support to the proposed change (p. 103).

In affecting change in the organization, politically-savvy leaders also work to identify and block the actions of unethical manipulators – "Machiavellians." Machiavellians often hide their agendas and use covert influence to satisfy their personal needs to the detriment of the organization (DeLuca, 1999, p. 11). Machiavellians are adept at grabbing credit for other's work and for shifting blame when necessary. They often are loners even though they give the appearance of great networkers with much personal charm (pp. 190-191). DeLuca cautions the politically-savvy leader from directly confronting Machiavellians. Instead politically-savvy leaders "learn to predict their [Machiavellians] behavior and use that to [the politically-savvy leader's] advantage" (pp. 186-188). Thus, the politically-savvy leader makes the decision-making process as open as possible and encourages all participants to be open about their agendas and to work together for the good of the organization (p. 192).

Leaders need to be politically-savvy so as to positively influence change in the organization and to make sure that all decisions are as rational and ethical as possible. Ignoring the political implications of their actions blinds the leader to the reality of the organization and gives the Machiavellians a chance to fulfill their personal interests even though it is detrimental to the organization. Leaders can be political and ethical by being

open about their agenda and encouraging others to link their agendas together to create win-win situations.

Although all organizations have some level of politics, public agencies may have the most political environment. The next section examines three leadership theories specific to public administration. Many leadership researchers hold the view that leadership is essentially the same no matter the situation the leader is in. Other researchers argue that there are significant differences between business leadership and public sector leadership. This is still an unresolved issue but it cannot be denied that public sector leaders have a different set of constraints on their authority than faced by business leaders and thus there is credence to the argument that public sector leadership is significantly different.

Leadership in Public Administration

Some leadership scholars argue that leadership required for public administration is much different from leadership required for business organizations and military organizations. In this section, three perspectives of public administration leadership will be examined to demonstrate this difference. The first perspective concerns the shared-power context of public leadership while the second perspective examines how bureaucratic structures influence leadership. The third perspective is an argument for the public leader to be a moral exemplar in the performance of their public duties. As will be demonstrated in this section, the environment of the public administrator has a profound influence on their leadership.

Bryson and Crosby (1992) argue that public leadership is different because the power that public leaders wield is composed of three dimensions and takes place in three different loci. The first dimension is "interaction" which is the realm of personal human interaction and the second dimension deals with "ideas, rules, modes, media, or methods" while the third dimension is called "deep structure" because it deals with policy making and control over [the] political agenda" (p. 83). These three dimensions are placed over the loci of forums, arenas, and courts to create the model of how public leaders exercise their power for different purposes (p. 85).

Forums are the first locus which is used by leaders and their followers create and communicate meaning "through discussion, debate, or deliberation" (Bryson & Crosby, 1992, p. 92). This is closely related to the second locus, "arenas", in which leaders work in a structured process to create policy (p. 103). The third locus, "courts", is where leaders apply policy to settle disputes (p. 108). As can be seen, forums raise the issues that result in policy being created in the arenas and that same policy is used in courts to resolve conflicts. Therefore, leaders must adapt their leadership style to purposes of the loci by utilizing one of the three dimensions of communication.

Other authors have similar context-based definitions of public leadership. Terry (2003) defines public leadership as "bureaucratic leadership" – "institutional leadership in the administration of public bureaucracies within the executive branch of all levels of government" (p. 4). He argues that bureaucratic leadership is vital to democracy because bureaucracies are how the public good is served (p. 16) and thus the foremost duty of the bureaucratic leader is to "protect and maintain administrative institutions" so that "constitutional processes, values, and beliefs" are promoted and supported (p. 24).

The bureaucratic leader fulfills their primary duty by preserving institutional integrity by "administrative conservatorship" (Terry, 2003, p. 25). The bureaucratic leader has three primary functions of conservatorship: conserving the mission, maintaining the distinctive role of the agency, and preserving internal and external support (p. 63). Administrative conservatorship is the balancing of interests between serving "political elites, the courts, interest groups, and the citizenry" and preserving the integrity of the agencies they lead (p. 29). This is a complex act because bureaucratic leaders must serve the needs of their constituencies in order to gain support for the agency (p. 155) while maintaining the "completeness, wholeness, and intact quality" of the agency (p. 27).

This does not mean that the bureaucratic leader is sacrificing growth or progress by being conservative. As Terry (2003) argues, "[c]onservation and progress are also linked together by evolution" (p. 35). In preserving the agency, the bureaucratic leader can initiate changes that allow the agency to maintain its autonomy while serving its constituencies.

Even so, there is a fear of the rise of bureaucratic power (Terry, 2003, p. 5). One reason is that those who subscribe to the heroic conception of leadership do not approve of the need for administrative conservatorship as it implies that the leader is merely a servant to the needs of the bureaucracy (p. 39). And those who were progressives also criticized bureaucracy because they wanted to make bureaucracies more efficient and businesslike (p. 7). When progressive spoke of efficiency, they were referring to getting the most public service for the least amount of public monies whether or not the reforms

upheld democratic values (p. 8). Thus, progressive would often attack bureaucratic leaders' attempts to maintain the autonomy and integrity of the agency.

Hart (1992) also echoes Terry's (2003) thesis that public leaders are highly criticized by the public (p. 9) but, that this criticism is the fault of the leader and not because of the context in which they lead. As modern society has grown more complex, the need for moral exemplars in public leadership has become even more needed (p. 11).

To be a moral exemplar, the leader must possess four characteristics. The moral character must be a constant part of the leader's personality and the leader must act morally without compulsion. The leader must constantly strive for virtue in almost all things they do and their actions must always bring about real good (Hart, 1992, p. 15). In both moral crisis and moral confrontation, the exemplar leader must demonstrate high moral character in their actions (p. 23).

But a leader who only acts morally when there is crisis and confrontation is not an exemplar (Hart, 1992, p. 23). They must initiate moral projects that improve the moral quality of their followers and organizations (p. 24). The ultimate objective of the exemplar leader is moral work in which their routine activities are suffused with morality (p. 25). As Hart argues, those who serve the public trust must be worthy of public leadership by being examples of high morality and duty.

Each of these three leadership models of public administrators display two common themes. The first is that the public administrator operates under more constraints than their private sector counterpart and thus faces greater scrutiny both in the organization and outside the organization. The second is that the public administrator is expected to act in the public interest even if it conflicts with their duty to the agency.

They have to constantly battle the concerns of organization with the demands of the public, other branches of government, and governing documents such as statutes, regulations, and constitutions. Private sector leaders also have their constraints but they have comparatively more freedom to take action than their public sector counterparts. Understanding this difference is the key to synthesizing a model of public agency leadership.

Synthesizing a Model for Public Agency Leadership

In synthesizing a model for public agency leadership, it is important to start with the overall situation as a backdrop to the model. As discussed in the "Leadership in Public Administration" section, public agency leaders have three primary duties: conserve the mission of the agency, maintain the agency, and preserve the integrity of the agency by seeking internal and external support. These can be considered the prime directives for the public leader which shapes the structure of the leadership model.

After establishing the situation in which the public leader operates, the first and foundational component of public agency leadership is integrity. Much of the public agency leader's power is in their ability to persuade and thus they must have a reputation for integrity or they will not convince anyone to follow them. Integrity is established by having the public leader adopt the servant-leadership frame of mind in which their primary duty is to help their followers in carrying out the tasks of the agency. The public leader also must be a moral exemplar and they accomplish this by adopting the principles outlined by Covey (1991) in his principle-centered leadership model.

By adopting integrity that is based in servant-leadership and principle-centered leadership, the public leader avoids acting in their own self-interest and thus avoids sliding into one of the categories of Kellerman's (2004) bad leadership. A foundation of integrity of also leads to the other three components of the public agency leadership model: resonance, vision, and empowerment.

Resonance is from the primal leadership model and it requires the public leader to first become aware of their own emotional intelligence. The public leader learns to master their emotional intelligence so as to increase their emotional maturity (Goleman, et al., 2002). Once they have reached a high level of emotional intelligence, the public leader can resonate this level of maturity to their followers and enable them to raise their own emotional intelligence. This leads to better relationships in the organization and a higher level of trust between all members.

Closely following resonance is empowerment in which the public leader builds a personalistic social architecture that encourages dialogue and openness in the organization. The public leader is constantly observing and analyzing the organization's culture and current reality while looking for ways to create win-win situations through agenda-linking. The goal of the leader in this component is to be a reassuring presence while encouraging followers to take risks and grow as leaders themselves.

The third component stemming from the integrity foundation is vision. The public leader is adept at communicating vision to the followers and building coalitions to support the vision. As some researchers have commented, the leader must be skilled at building and working through social networks in carrying out the vision. Here again, being savvy about the organization's politics aids the leader in building coalitions and

mobilizing support. But all of this rests upon how much faith the followers have in the public leader and thus the importance of integrity as the foundational component.

The public agency leadership model is well suited for the current shared-power and constrained environment in which the leader operates because their influence is based on their persuasive ability instead of relying solely on the power inherent in their title. A leader who relies solely on their authority power will only gain begrudging compliance by the members of the organization. A leader who empowers followers and inspires them to follow a vision will have highly motivated and enthusiastic followers which will perform at a higher level.

But, there is a fundamental paradox inherent in this model. The public leader is required to act in the public interest by leading an exemplary public agency. In some cases, the goals of both the internal members of the organization and the public will be the same but, in the cases where there is a conflict, the public leader is forced to choose the public interest over the interests of the organization. In those cases, the leader may damage their integrity and thus lose leadership of the agency which may harm the public interest in the long-term. Therefore, the public leader is forced to ignore the public interest for the short-term to preserve the agency or they can attempt a compromise which will probably not satisfy either the organization or the public. The balancing of internal organizational interests with the public interest is common dilemma in any leadership model for public leaders.

References

- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Bryson, J.M., & Crosby, B.C. (1992). *Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared-power world*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Conger, J.A. (1989). *The charismatic leader: Behind the mystique of exceptional leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Covey, S. R. (1991). *Principle-centered leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- DeLuca, J.R. (1999). *Political savvy: Systematic approaches to leadership behind-the-scenes*. Berwyn, PA: Evergreen Business Group.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hart, D.K. (1992). The moral exemplar in an organizational society. In Cooper, T.L., & Wright, N.D. (Eds.). 1992. *Exemplary public administrators: Character and leadership in government* (pp. 9-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Hersey, P. (1984). *The situational leader*. New York: Warner Books, Inc.
- Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Terry, L.D. (2003). *Leadership of public bureaucracies: The administrator as conservator* (2nd, Ed.). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Tichy, N.M. & Devanna, M.E. (1990). *The transformational leader*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Willner, A.R. (1984). *The spellbinders*. Ann Arbor, MI: Bookcrafters, Inc.