Knowledge Area Module 5:
Leadership Development

Student: Malcolm Scott Sotebeer malcolm.sotebeer@waldenu.edu
Student ID # 328215
Program: PhD in Applied Management and Decision Science
Specialization: Leadership & Organizational Change

KAM Assessor: Robert Levasseur robert.levasseur@waldenu.edu
Faculty Mentor: Robert Levasseur robert.levasseur@waldenu.edu

Walden University
February 15, 2009

ABSTRACT

Breadth

This KAM addresses theories, models, and applications of the concept of leadership. The central theme of this review explores the question of whether or not leaders are born or made, defining leadership across classical and contemporary perspectives. The Breadth section contains a discussion of the similarities and differences of several classical and contemporary leadership theorists. A critical review compares and contrasts trait, behavioral, situational, transactional, charismatic, and transformational theory from the works of Tead, Lewin, Stogdill, Hersey and Blanchard, Burns, Braford and Cohen, Senge, Bass, and Kouzes and Posner.

ABSTRACT

Depth

The Depth section contains a critical review and analysis of current literature discussing applications of theory in the leadership development context. The effectiveness of various theories, such as behavioral and situational leadership, is critiqued and evaluated in the context of contemporary management practice. A synthesis of the findings contemplates a global thematic objective of addressing the questions of "what is leadership?" and "are leaders born or made?" This section seeks to uncover viable, contemporary strategies and applications of theory that address leadership gaps in organizations where managers and supervisors rotate frequently.

ABSTRACT

Application

Contemporary theory obtained from the Breadth and Depth sections forms the basis for an examination of how managers can effectively use leadership development strategies as an empowerment tool within a public sector organization with multiple represented employee groups. Specific recommendations target the issue of employee empowerment within highly transient public sector management and supervisory structures. The Application demonstration critically examines a leadership development training model for represented staff employees in specific divisional units in a public sector organization and provides the CEO and human resources management with recommendations regarding the use of a leadership development program to stabilize and improve the performance of divisions and/or divisional units that have frequent management or supervisory turnover.

Table of Contents

BREADTH

AMDS 8512: CLASSICAL AND EMERGING PARADIGMS OF LEADERSHIP

The Breadth section consists of a comparison and contrasting of the theories of Tead, Lewin, Stogdill, Hersey and Blanchard, Burns, Braford and Cohen, Senge, Bass, and Kouzes and Posner to evaluate their theories about leadership in the context of the question of whether leaders are born or made. Applying their theories, various characteristics and attributes of leadership are explored to address the question of what leadership is and how it is defined. The discussion and analysis contemplates a more narrow focus on leadership development in a continuously changing leadership environment.

Leadership Theory

"Only the man who never does anything --never makes a mistake," paraphrased Ordway Tead (1935) of an often repeated Theodore Roosevelt saying (p. 125). Buried deep in the pages of Tead (1935), Roosevelt could have as easily been publicly defending his own leadership profile as serving up a mentor's advice in the context of making decisions, taking risks—and ultimately leading. Tead (1935) argued that decisiveness was a critical attribute for leadership (p. 120), along with heart, spirituality, morality, and a host of behaviors, characteristics, and attributes that contributed to the framework for early leadership theory (Tead, 1933, 1935).

Differentiating Tyrants From Leaders

Repeatedly in Tead (1935), discussions of tyrants such as Hitler and Napoleon appear in the psychological context of trait, charismatic, great man, situational, and behavioral theory. More socially appealing figures such as Kennedy, Mother Theresa, and Gandhi appear in the same theory context. The question and dilemma is whether or not a historical 'monster' is or

should be viewed in the same theoretical light as other leaders in history. It is troubling conceptually and bears early clarification as the content of this effort addresses social, biological, and psychological framing of leaders and leadership that theoretically fits the worst of humankind. A plausible dismissal of such a discussion in the theory comes from Burns (1978). He points to the lack of research in this area, citing the fact that there is a complete absence of juvenile data collection around history's most notorious "leaders" (p. 51).

In as much as it might be desirable to explain the behavior and development of people like Hitler by theorizing backwards, there have been no researcher(s) present and *in person* to observe and analyze such individuals in their young, formative years (Burns, 1978, p. 51). There are stories and recollections from relatives. There are accounts from other eye-witnesses. But a significant gap exists as there is no data to create and support viable arguments and conclusive (social and psychological) evidence for any theory connecting or explaining abhorrent behavior and leadership theory by tracing the development of a Hitler or Jim Jones as children (Burns, 1978). Hence, leaders such as Hitler are not discussed further or given credence in the leadership context for the remainder of this document.

Trait Theory

Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999) and Tead (1933, 1935) built upon emerging social and behavioral science and psychology concepts and research to develop correlations between traits and behavior and behavioral outcomes in leadership. Their movement was clearly away from the Great Man argument that individuals are, one way or another, born into leadership and that followers respond accordingly, by choice or by force (Bass, 1990). Around the turn of the century, autocratic leadership beliefs, driven by the models of schools, military, and religion,

were yielding to desires for a deeper understanding and an ability to define who and what a leader was (Bass, 1990). In his theoretical view of leadership, Tead (1933) presented a more global position. In his theory, leadership is: something we are all capable of, not an issue of

> superior intellect or intelligence, and is as simple as a combination of normal human qualities (p. 150).

An early trait theorist, Tead's (1933, 1935) view of leadership's broader potential parallels later transformational theories in many respects. Tead (1935) also predicts that the born not made argument would be difficult to extinguish due to the complexity and vagueness of the concept of leadership in general (p. 152).

Traits, attributes, and behavior. The behavioral sciences background of early researchers, such as Tead (1933, 1935) and Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999), contributed a foundation for a clear and still contemporary connection of behavior to traits, attributes, and values in leadership theory. Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999) made behavioral links to traits and postulates when he argued that needs, motives, and intentions are an avenue to construct specific theory connecting leadership and behavior (p. 89). He further suggested that "will" is a key attribute or trait that represents an internal force driving leadership-type behavior (p. 92).

Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999) further connected trait theory around a behavioral state identified in 1931 by Dembo as "level of aspiration" (p. 137). He defined aspiration in leadership relative to traits or attributes such as ambition, courage, and prudence; also identifying the ability to dismiss failure as a leadership trait (p. 155). As theory evolved, Hersey and Blanchard (1972) suggested that the leader's aspiration level is a function of the standards set by the group in contrast to a more individualist, trait-based model presented earlier in the century (p. 172). In application, for example, if the level of aspiration correlates in trait terms as ambition or a level

of ambitiousness, Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999) defined the leader and arguably, relative behavior, by the level of aspiration. He further connected leadership behavior to a leader's response given a specific challenge and the likelihood of achieving individual success (p.155). This linkage of expectation, effort or behaviors, and a reward or outcome in the form of success suggests a precursor theoretical view of transactional leadership (Bass, 1990).

Behavioral theorists Kouzes and Posner (2007) addressed individual leadership traits research with 25 years of follower surveys. Over 60 percent of the time, "honest, forward-looking, inspiring, and competent" are among the predominant traits identified by followers as being most common to successful leaders (p. 29). This is a notable research finding corresponding to a broad leadership theme emerging from the range of theorists reviewed here. The significance of follower opinion across a 25 year period corroborates theoretical views of the direct relationship between leader attributes, values, morality, and behaviors and follower affirmation of their relevance and importance. In contemporary terms, the summation of the trait research manifests itself as leader credibility measured by the willing output of followers and the ultimate (transactional) value exchanged between the leader and the followers (Kouzes and Posner, 2007, p. 37).

Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999) and Kouzes and Posner (2007) addressed their discussion of traits around the relevance to personality, profile, and behavior in relation to who the leader was as the individual. In contrast and in a more transformational approach, Tead (1933) theorized that traits such as an individual's physical presence, intelligence, and imagination, and attributes and virtues, such as courage, tact, humor, and initiative, were outwardly or externally influential in creating follower behavior. This theoretically focused more on what the leader did.

Leadership success measures include achieving goals collectively and through what he calls a "unity of purpose", also a more transformational posture (pp. 152-162). A central theme to Tead's theory of leadership promotes a state where the leader's ultimate goal is the satisfaction and fulfillment of the followers (p. 162).

Senge (1990) explained that core attributes and values such as compassion, spirituality, and social responsibility or awareness are central to helping guide the behavior of the leader and, thus, positively impacting the behavior of followers (pp. 156-162). Senge (1990) challenged classical theoretical views, believing that great man, trait, and charismatic theories are both unrealistic and "mythical" (p. 320).

Hero models and charismatic leadership traits. Tead (1935) did not support the born theory. However, he acknowledged charismatic leaders in the 'born' context, theoretically positioning them as "a scarce resource requiring no further development" (p. 157). Proposing that leaders behave and succeed more as teachers, mentors, and coaches, Tead's (1935) discussion of charismatic leaders also contributed to later transformational theory principles.

Stogdill (1959) advocated a behavioral theory of leadership, but recognized "natural ability" as a highly desirable and unique trait specific to leadership (p. 219). Leaders with a natural, sensory talent for motivating others through reinforcing actions or behaviors are special and unique (Stogdill, 1959). The discussion of natural ability as a trait without definition or evidence is vague and elusive in a scientific context. It raises the question of the born concept of leadership and later evolvement of transactional theory where motivational power is involved (Stogdill, 1959).

Burns (1978) rejected the born or made theories as generalizations of a more complex process but recognizes traits and attributes of leadership as important measures to help understand leaders and their "formative factors" (p. 74). Burns (1978) connected traits of character, such as individual values and morality along with psychological, social, and biological make up, as central to leaders and leadership behavior in the formative factors argument. Heroic leadership in trait terms frames a more charismatic type of leader (Burns, 1978). Characteristics such as compassion, resourcefulness, and dynamism, coupled with follower needs and timing (as a situational concept), help to facilitate a behavior relationship between the heroic leader and followers (Burns, 1978). However, this heroic leader analysis leaves the door open, in near contradiction, to those traits or attributes certain leaders may be born with (Burns, 1978).

Bradford and Cohen (1984) contrasted and categorized the heroic leadership model in trait and ultimately behavioral terms around controlling leadership practices. They framed heroism in a leadership context against self-involved personal profiles of leaders who need to control situations, solve problems single handedly, and rescue followers (p. 28). They created models of heroic leaders as (a) master technicians who are so knowledgeable that they can be called on to solve any problem (p. 33), (b) conductors who have quit trying to do the task but instead gets the job done by managing others (p. 44), and (c) leaders-as-developer who make the investment in followers to the degree that they both solve problems and take responsibility for the outcomes (pp. 60-61).

In considering the hero as a leader and influencer of behavior, the heroic leader trait functions negatively. Regardless of the trait or behavioral type, the hero-leader becomes a "rescuer" (Bradford & Cohen, 1984). Unlike Burns' (1978), the Kennedy-and-Camelot-view of

the connection between traits, attributes, and behavior, Bradford and Cohen (1984) postulated that a dominating interpersonal style, regardless of type, is a key trait driver of the hero that ultimately contributes to holding back the talent, creativity, and ability of others (pp. 47-55).

In sharp contrast, Tead (1935) viewed the hero model in a more spiritual sense and as a deeper obligation. The leader serves a valuable function in the role as rescuer and positive enabler where strong follower needs and the desire to be led exist (p 91, p. 251). Tead (1935) promoted a belief that people have a strong desire to be led, driven by a qualified "need to identify with a force outside themselves" (p. 91).

It is noteworthy that descriptions and terms such as inherent, natural ability, charismatic, and heroic, apply interchangeably across various theorists when addressing the issue of born leaders or leadership traits. Unanimously, the same theorists reject the born concept but clearly imply a gap in the research to explain more lofty and elusive born traits in their respective theoretical models. Further discussion occurs in the trait theory synthesis.

Traits and leadership learning. Senge (1990) acknowledged charisma as a verifiable trait, but argued that it can also be developed and modeled in a learning context (p. 339). Situational theorists, Hersey and Blanchard (1972) supported the concept that you can teach people to lead. They qualified their theory by suggesting that leadership training is only good for those who possess inherent leadership traits (p. 68).

Traits tie into a level of influence, leadership greatness, and follower satisfaction, attained by identifying those traits that can be enhanced through training or learning (Tead, 1933, p. 153). For example, sound judgment is trainable because it is a skill tied to practicing reasoning (p.

122). In another context, imagination is a trait that is expandable through learning and application. However, Tead (1935) postulates that you cannot teach a sense of humor (p. 128).

Tead (1933) argued that it is possible to teach leadership by focusing on those traits and attributes that can be positively and measurably affected. Tead sets out five critical objectives to meet through traits-based leadership development: (a) a greater knowledge of human nature, (b) personal self awareness, (c) attitude, (d) the ability to execute knowledge, and (e) a broad personality to fit the culture (p. 272). Three success measures for effective leadership development include: follower satisfactions, follower enthusiasm, and follower loyalty (Tead, 1933, p. 298).

In the learning organization leadership model, personal mastery develops by focusing on higher order virtues, values, and attributes such as spirituality, compassion, and social responsibility (Senge, 1990, p. 156). The leadership goal of the individual is to develop those attributes and values that will ultimately guide and model leader behavior for others to follow (Senge, 1990, p. 162).

Situational concepts and trait theory. Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999) and Tead (1933, 1935) posited a relationship of situation and circumstances as components of their trait theory arguments. A given situation or environment integrates into the leadership model as an important tool (Tead, 1933, p. 149). Accordingly, there are necessary conditions, environments, or situations for certain leaders to emerge (p. 23). Tead (1935) rationalized that self-driven leaders by nature would push their way through life, but that they relied heavily on timing and circumstances to support their existence. While traits and attributes define the leader,

environment and circumstances are a part of the successful leadership equation and are to be exploited (Tead, 1935, p. 23).

Lewin connected situational factors and the trait of "will" (as cited in Gold, 1999). In a behavioral context, the leader's will supplies a level of drive or motivation that is influenced by any number of variables that arise in a given situation (p. 98). Tead's (1935) contrasting view connects awareness and a potential for direct control and integration between any number of traits and situational factors.

Synthesis. There is a common theoretical acknowledgement of unique traits that an individual may possess that contribute to defining and identifying them as leaders. Across the theorists discussed in this section, a strong alignment emerges between traits and behavior, applicable to both leader and follower. Traits and given circumstances, situations, and environments also matter. This is attributable in the case of Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999) and Tead (1933, 1935) to their research backgrounds in emerging, period psychology, and behavioral sciences.

Lewin's (as cited in Gold, 1999) trait discussion around levels of aspiration theory creates a link to transactional leadership. Using Lewin's (as cited in Gold, 1999) level of aspiration trait model, there is a behavioral motivation by the leader to exchange value with the follower based on the leader's goal(s) and the follower's needs in the transactional framework (Burns, 1978). The focus by Lewin on the leader's individual trait, behavior, and motivation supports the transactional theme (as cited in Gold, 1999).

A transformational connection exists where theorists' evidence supports higher order leadership traits associated with teachers, coaches, developers, stewards, and mentors (Tead,

1933, 1935; Stogdill, 1959; Burns, 1978; Senge, 1990; Bass, 1990). Tead (1933) frames the principle focusing leader traits in such a way that creates a "harmony of goals" (p. 149). Transformational leadership evolves from those traits of the leader that support behaviors ultimately contributing to the benefit of the follower (Burns, 1978). The distinction is that the follower, not the leader, is the focus. Tead (1993, 1935) also advocates that any number and combination of situational factors and circumstances are integral pieces of the leadership formula.

Theoretical differences arise in the trait analysis when considering the more ethereal application of virtues, values, and attributes such as compassion, imagination, tact, and spirituality to the theory. While unanimously rejecting the born theory of leadership, there is a puzzling pattern of agreement amongst the cited theorists on those ethereal, influential traits that individuals possess that contradicts, to some degree, the wholesale rejection of the born argument. Whether it be natural ability (Stogdill, 1959) or the rationalization of charisma (Tead, 1935), there is a gap in connecting the dismissal of born leadership and explaining the origins or basis of dominant, "born with" traits in the theory. How does one acquire natural ability to lead if it is not a born trait? Is natural ability enough to sustain an individual argument for one as a born leader?

Tead (1935) asserted that certain traits will respond to improvement efforts and postulated that virtues can be developed if leaders have the desire and are willing to "open themselves up" (Tead, 1933). Senge (1990) argued that you can teach certain traits. While the broader discussion addressed the question of whether leaders are born or made, a distinction between born traits and born leadership was not as clearly established.

Situational Theory and Behavioral Relationships

Bass (1990) stated that for leadership to occur, at least two people must be involved. Someone has to do something and someone has to respond in some way (p. 320). What drives the scenario are any number of conditions and circumstances that interact with the motives and needs of the individuals involved on both sides of the equation to get any number of potential outcomes in the form of behaviors (Hersey & Blanchard, 1972).

A.J. Murphy (as cited in Bass, 1990) proposes a classical view asserting that the situation is the key variable which dictates a certain type of leader action. In Murphy's view, the leader more passively occupies space in a given time to act as the pass through or agent for a solution to a problem (as cited in Bass, 1990, p. 39). The situation dictates a behavior.

Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999) draws powerful connections between situations and behavior, stating that "given the opportunity, we will set goals at the boundary of our ability" (p. 144). The range of the behavior, or responses from either a leader or follower, according to the given situation, relates to the challenge and the likelihood of success (p. 155). This view is in significant contrast to the basic, classical theory of behavioral leadership ascribing simple scenarios of rewards and punishment avoidance as drivers of behavior (Bass, 1990). Generally, there is no discussion of influencing circumstances or conditions in the behavioral leadership theory. The leader's role is to provoke a follower's task-oriented behavior (Bass, 1990). Likewise, classical situational theory is rigidly bound to those forces that dictate the behavior of the leader, ignoring the interplay and role of the leader as an individual (Bass, 1990, p. 40).

Hersey and Blanchard's (1972) expectancy view in the situational context asserts that availability or opportunity is a key variable for leadership behavior based on the likelihood of

attaining desirable results already experienced in the past (p. 19). If the expected outcome or result is highly desirable to the follower(s), it stands to reason that a leader will initiate behavior to reinforce situations, circumstances, environments, or conditions and shape those expectations and (follower) behaviors that yield a desired result (Stogdill, 1959).

A significant difference exists from basic theory in that the reinforcement arises from desirable behaviors. No framework for punishment exists, again in contrast to more commonly held principles of behavioral leadership theory, rewards, and punishment avoidance (Bass, 1990, p. 48). Manipulating situations through reinforcement of expectations ties the leader behavior to follower behavior. Leaders can be trained or taught to optimize behaviors and outcomes through reinforcement related to specific conditions or situations (Stogdill, 1959).

Early situational theory sought to place the leader in the context of time, place, and circumstances to realize their position or opportunity to lead (Bass, 1990). A key failure of great man, trait, and situational theories is that they do not take into account separately the relationships and interplay of those very factors of situation and individual traits (Bass, 1990).

This conflict evolves into personal-situational theory, connecting the person and the situation to define leadership behaviors (Bass, 1990). Theorists address this issue directly, arguing that behavioral leadership, as an individual attribute, is less consistent in individuals than a leadership attribute such as behavioral consistency (Bass, 1990, p. 40). Consistency is held up theoretically to be a stronger individual leadership characteristic that "transcends situations" than actual leadership behavior. This premise is supported by several scholars cited in Bass (Bass, 1990, p. 40).

Situational selection. As mentioned earlier, Tead (1935) discussed the conditions for the born leader as a possibility through those defined as "self driven," emerging from circumstances that are not easily explained, but generally "of a crucial hour" (p. 25). Place, time, environment, and circumstance create a scenario where the leader is the "servant to the opportunity" (p. 23). Two other leader emergence scenarios include those who are group selected and those appointed from powers above them (Tead, 1935). In all three scenarios, Tead (1935) maintained that given the conditions of timing (or birth), selection, or appointment, the leader is "an instrument and a tool of circumstances outside of themselves" (p.23). Leader and follower behaviors then correlate to the conditions the leader emerges from (Tead, 1935).

Nebeker and Mitchell (as cited in Bass, 1990) find that the personal attributes of the leader and different situational requirements must be considered together to determine a leader's effectiveness. They also theorize that the leader weighs the same conditions to determine a leadership behavior that will be effective in different situations (as cited in Bass, 1990, p. 563). Leadership behavior then depends on the specifics of given situations or on the way the leader reacts to the characteristics and circumstances of different situations (Bass, 1990).

Hersey and Blanchard (1972) expand the argument across the behavioral spectrum through a theory of "adaptive leadership" (p. 80). Leadership evolves and matures across relationships with followers, requiring the leader to consider both the people and conditions in every situation and adjust their leadership behavior accordingly (p. 80). Leader effectiveness is ultimately a measure of relations with followers in terms of the leadership behavior selected in a given situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1972).

Burns (1984) theorized that more narrowly focused types of leadership styles emerge given specific follower situations and conflict conditions. As a leader and follower affective process, situational influence represents the presence of opportunity (p. 427). The adaptive process requires key attributes and the ability to recognize an array of motives, goals, and conflict situations that the leader can shape into a desired behavioral response and outcomes (p. 38). Examples from the range of Burns' (1978) theories include the moral leader, who enables a behavioral response from followers seeking justice and empathy through ethical means (p. 42) to the heroic leader, where follower belief is placed purely in the person and the leader reflects "a symbolic solution of external and internal conflict," generally emerging from situations of "profound crisis and social chaos" (Burns, 1978, p. 244).

Synthesis. Bass (1990) acknowledged the significance of the personal-situational theory in contemporary leadership management, noting that it has become the preeminent practice for predicting the leadership potential of supervisors and managers (p. 41). It is a significant nod to the theoretical premise that individuals and situations are interdependent in the adaptive leadership context (Hersey & Blanchard, 1972).

The historical backdrop for these theories reasonably and logically connects the traits of the individual, the circumstances they are dealt, and the resultant leader and follower behavior that the combination produces. Scientifically making an effort to match potential leaders' attributes to specific situations or the individuals' ability to adapt their leadership effectively to changing situations is evidenced in fields such as firefighting and emergency room management (Hersey & Blanchard, 1972).

Agreement and disagreement emerge when approaching the theory from either the behavioral side or the situational side. Questions develop around leadership behavior and situations when viewing leadership response as a reactive or consequence driven action dependent on the circumstances, or as a pre-emptive, pro-active, and trait-driven behavior or skill.

Senge (1990) addressed the issue of situations and behaviors in a more forward thinking, transformational leadership development context. “Limits,” in Senge’s theory, are situational and circumstantial barriers in front of us where, if we understand them, we can change the leadership behaviors necessary to remove them (Senge, 1990, p. 101). A candidly more desirable and contrasting leadership model than that of the leader simply occupying space in a given time to act as the agent for a solution to a problem (as cited in Bass, 1990).

Transactional Theory

Transactional leadership theory evolves trait, situational, and behavioral study into how leaders and followers exchange rewards and outputs (Bass, 1990). The theory implies that the leader drives the relationship, seeking to get a behavior, specific performance, or other output from followers by having the ability to exchange a reward or some kind of return for the effort (Bass, 1990). Leadership is contingent on the interplay and conditions of traits and situations related to a leader and follower exchange (Bass, 1990). Trait theory applies as a variable, potentially involving anything from values and morality to personal charisma. All three variables; traits, behavior, and situation, interact along a range or continuum that seeks to optimize the results desired by both the leader and the follower.

Conceptually, transactional theory mirrors the basic premise of a contract. Offer and acceptance establish the relationship between the leader as buyer and the follower(s) as seller. The exchange requires that there be some measure of value for both parties. There is an expectation of performance based on the mutual exchange. The leader benefits from the performance or output and the follower(s) anticipate a reward contingent upon performance. As a seller and buyer exchange, the leader is the dominant party in the relationship, controlling the buying decision and reward.

Risk, conflict, and behavior. The behavioral component emerges around the perception and evaluation of risk involved. The level of aspiration model applies where the risk in the exchange to the parties is a variable of the relationship. A higher level of aspiration in the form of ambition, for example, may indicate a willingness for either or both the leader and follower to increase the level of acceptable risk in a transaction. Behavior bridges into the equation as both parties constantly weigh the escalation of risk and reward, testing the limits of the transaction in the context of the task (Lewin, as cited in Gold, 1999).

Successful attainment of the task, goal, or transaction for the leader and follower, affects the level of aspiration (ambition or goal) as the relationship matures. Transactional theory implies an ongoing test of the limits of risk and reward that leaders and followers are willing to pursue (Lewin in Gold, Ed., 1999). Finding the point where both parties align with risk and reward suggests optimization in a transactional theory model. Equilibrium then, as a range point of the level of aspiration, is a balance found between the amount of risk and the likelihood of successful execution of the transaction to get the desired reward (Lewin, as cited in Gold, 1999).

In contrast, Burns (1978) framed the risk variable as conflict in transactional theory. The role of the transactional leader is to shape conflict into the delivery of a desired behavior (p. 38). Conflict arises around the varying motives and needs of followers, the available resources, and goals of the leader (Burns, 1978, p. 38). Group equilibrium in a transactional context exists when entire organizations are able to remove, minimize, or control conflict and reinforce a position that the followers are an integral, equal, and permanent part of a "group enterprise" with the leaders (Tead, 1933, p. 144).

Burns' (1978) transactional leadership definition states that leadership occurs when "persons with defined motive and purpose mobilize in such a way to satisfy the motives of followers" (p. 18). Transactional equilibrium occurs in this model when leaders and followers are able to "exchange gratifications" as both sides seek a "bargain" for what they each perceive to be a "profit" in return (p. 258). Burns (1978) concludes that transactional equilibrium is not sustainable because leaders and followers tend to move on when they each find that the optimal "deal" is nearly impossible to repeat (p. 258).

Transaction and group behavior. Stogdill's (1959) group behavioral theory integrated inputs and outputs that leaders and followers exchange in a transactional parallel. The leadership role is to first understand how individuals collectively participate and function within a motivated group. The leader must then be able to construct a reinforceable transaction around group expectations, suggesting a more strategic approach to transactional theory (Stogdill, 1959). The operant variables in this model are the follower input behaviors of performance, group/leader interaction, and expectation (p. 273). The leader can manipulate and influence the variables of operations and organizational structure evolving from the inputs of the group. The

variable transactional outputs are productivity, group integration, and morale, any of which may be subject to reward contingency (Stogdill, 1959, pp. 273-278).

The group and the leader are constantly seeking and assumed to be in a state of equilibrium (Burns, 1978, p. 290). Conflict arises when the goals of the leader are not in line with the followers. As such, sustainability of purpose or goals is a noted pitfall of transactional theory (Burns, 1978). Any measure of sustainability requires leadership that continually and simultaneously pays attention to both current equilibrium and ongoing growth of everyone's goals, needs, and common purpose (Tead, 1933, p. 145).

Synthesis. Transactional theory serves to consolidate and build upon key components of trait, behavioral and situational theory. By 1960, it had become the primary model for the study of leadership (Bass, 1990). A key observation involves an emerging premise and assumption that some point of equilibrium exists that represents the goals of both leader and followers and some output and reward that both can agree to in the transaction. Over time and considering any variety of factors such as changes in risk, levels of aspiration, and conflict, sustainability of the equilibrium of goals becomes increasingly difficult (Tead, 1933; Burns, 1978).

A criticism of the theory is that there is a certain structural rigidity that does not allow for the consideration of higher order leader or follower needs (Bass, 1990). Freud (as cited in Bass, 1990) offers that there is more to leadership than a simple exchange. While transactional leadership integrates trait theory (Hollander, as cited in Bass, 1990), little discussion emerges around the applicability of deeper, more personal attributes such as morality, spirituality, compassion, and social responsibility. This is a clear gap that provides for the emergence of transformational theory.

Leader and organizational goals can be or become at odds with group or individual goals where goal interpretation between the groups may also be different (Burns, 1978). This becomes problematic when linking rewards to goal attainment, and is a general weakness in the theory (Burns, 1978, p. 375). Sustaining goal attainment and group morale is one of the critical leadership challenges in the transactional framework (Bradford & Cohen, 1984). In its most basic form, however, the theory of the exchange of value between leader and follower seeking equilibrium remains a core leadership application (Bass, 1990).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership theory connects leaders and followers in a more collaborative relationship with goals that both sides share (Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978). Higher order values and attributes such as morality, justice, empathy, and social responsibility differentiate transformational leadership definition from a simple exchange of value based on the transactional equilibrium of needs and goals (Burns, 1978). Transformational theory seeks to draw out a more substantive study of traits, circumstances and behavioral connections between leaders and followers. Bass (1990) argued that transformational leadership extends and expands transactional theory as leaders seek to move beyond short term gain and engage followers in a broader, long term commitment and vision.

Tead (1933) emphasized that the collective interplay of circumstances, behaviors, virtues, and attributes generate an environment for leaders to create a "harmony of purpose" (p. 149), an outcome consistent with transformational theory. Treatment of individuals, unity, and creating goodwill with followers are key measures of effective leadership in a transformational context. Gaining follower trust, support and a willingness to follow are critical to jointly reaching a

common goal (Tead, 1933). The optimal outcome or transformational result is the mobilization of energy of the largest possible group in a single direction (Burns, 1978, p. 439); not unlike the early concept of unity of purpose (Tead, 1933, p. 152).

Values, virtues, and morality. In the psychology context, creating a meeting of minds with followers and joining common desires and goals in a way that generates follower and leader fulfillment are central themes of early leadership theory that are also consistent with later transformational concepts (Tead, 1935, p. 162). Emotion, enthusiasm, friendliness, and affection are cited as attributes required of the "moral" leader (Tead, 1935). These virtues and attributes support leadership interpersonal behavior, building an environment of trust and follower confidence. In the moral leader framework, the application of virtue helps to guide both leader and follower behavior, supporting an overarching goal of modeling socially responsible behavior for others to follow (Senge, 1990, p. 162).

Needs, values, and moral development are environmental variables necessary to develop transformational leadership (Burns, 1978). Conflict and choice are additional variables that drive the interaction of leader values and morality to meet follower needs (p. 428). Organizationally, effective leadership is realized when leader and followers have the closest possible alignment of motivations, needs, and values at all levels, including higher order satisfactions such as spiritual or moral enrichment (Burns, 1978, p. 435). For the transformational leader, a broader moral principle includes recognition of values, mutual needs, and delivery of commitments supported by an overall sense of responsibility for followers (Burns (1978).

Tead (1935) critically emphasized the value of the emotional side of leadership, relating that "the power of the person is in the passion of the person" (p. 103). However, there was also a

warning that a leader could get too soft, causing followers to "lose their critical eye" on the leader (Tead, 1935, p. 106). This is an important observation relative to sustaining the necessary balance and equilibrium in the relationship between leader and followers. Conflict, risk, and tension are applicable variables discussed to this point, functioning critically in the leader/follower equation seeking equilibrium. From a trait perspective, Tead (1935) offers that the solution is to focus on and develop those traits that will naturally support the leader's edge and skills and maintain follower interest (p. 122).

Measures of transforming leadership effectiveness within the moral principle include the ability to affect social change and successfully deliver follower needs and expectations (Burns, 1978). Monitoring transformational leadership effectiveness on a broader, social scale is accomplished by considering the impacts on moral value structures such as liberty, justice and equality (Burns, 1978, p. 426).

Transformational teaching and learning models. Transformational theory reinforces the evolution away from the reactive manager, supervisor, and boss models to more proactive, supporting leader profiles of coach, mentor, and teacher. In the psychological view, the leader's role as teacher is the mechanism to build a collaborative relationship with followers (Tead, 1933). Burns (as cited in Bass, 1990) argues that the goal of the transforming, teaching leader is to ultimately develop followers as leaders themselves (p. 53). Senge (1990) describes the leadership and follower learning movement to a higher purpose as creating more social benefit from the work effort and the experience.

A contemporary leader-teacher transformational model exists in the five practices theory (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). As behavior supported by a set of skills and abilities, effective,

transforming leaders develop the success of followers by (a) modeling the way, (b) inspiring a shared vision, (c) challenging the process, (d) enabling others to act, and (e) encouraging the heart (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 14). 70 years earlier, Tead (1935) formulated similar and contrasting leader behavioral initiatives by first advocating leadership as an art to be individually cultivated rather than a rigid, professional practice (p. 152). The relationship and interaction with followers establishes the opportunity for the leader to develop followers as leaders themselves. Building this philosophy, Tead (1935) advocated that followers need to experience what the leader already has in order to reach the same conclusions and accept the same path to mutually desired outcomes (p. 144). Senge (1990) places the primary and exemplary obligation on the leader such that aspiring to lead means "having a purpose worthy of people's commitment" (p. 263).

Bradford and Cohen (1984) contributed a "post-heroic" leadership and learning theory that is transformational in profile and later supported by several Kouzes and Posner (2007) principles in their five practices theory. Establishing a more participatory and nurturing role, the leader seeks to create a relational environment that shares control, encourages joint responsibility and follower participation, and develops managerial and leader skills among followers (Bradford & Cohen, 1984, p. 60). The leader in this model functions as a "developer" (P. 61), fostering an environment of team and developing skills, morale, responsibility, goals, and common expectations (P. 61). Consistent with other transformational theories, the Bradford and Cohen (1984) model has three key leadership learning principles shared with followers: (a) team-shared responsibility, (b) continuous development of individual skills, and (c) development of a sustainable, common vision (pp. 60-63).

Senge's (1990) learning organization theory positions the role of transforming leadership as that of "designers, teachers and stewards," creating an historical continuity in the theoretical evidence (p. 321). Team learning, shared vision, and personal mastery are cornerstone principles of the learning organization in a transformational context (Senge, 1990). Through a people orientation, the manifestation of these principles emerges through motivated behavior, an awareness of spiritual need, and a common drive toward realizing higher order fulfillment (p. 130).

Transformational leadership learning is a process of focusing and integrating leaders and followers in an effort that ultimately creates an environment conducive to personal enrichment (Senge, 1990). The leader and follower transformational learning objectives of achieving shared vision and personal mastery are common in various but similar models by Senge, Tead, Kouzes and Posner, and Bradford and Cohen. Senge (1990) suggested that developing shared vision, for example, provides a focus and energy for learning and an environment for the follower buy-in necessary to attain higher order accomplishments (p. 192). In the transformation model, visions spread because of a reinforcing learning process of increasing clarity, enthusiasm, communication, and commitment (p. 211).

Synthesis. An underlying theme in the discussion of transformational leadership is the abandonment of classical plan, organize, and control concepts. Leaders and followers transcend basic task and reward relationships, seeking a more sustainable and collaborative interaction to reach mutually acceptable goals. The efficiency or success of the transformational relationship is dependent upon classical trait and behavioral assumptions and evidence.

Among the majority of theorists cited here, there is an advocacy for leadership centered on creating learning opportunity for followers and engaging them in the process of leading. The idea takes many forms, including behavior-driven teaching and leading. For example, the concept of modeling behavior in such a way that followers become leaders is a cornerstone of transformational theory (Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Senge, 1990; Tead, 1933, 1935). Senge (1990) crystallizes the teacher-modeler theory by emphasizing that in order to change behavior you have to "be the behavior" (p. 162).

Transformational theory relies on elements of trait theory where the traits, values, and attributes of the leader and follower integrate, creating a merger of motives and goals (Burns, 1978). Charismatic leadership theory profiles a higher order traits dimension of transformational theory such that charismatic model elevates the leader to a theological position with special gifts, vision, and a unique ability to solve extreme crisis (Burns, 1978, p. 185). Senge (1990) does not place the same weight on the charismatic model, arguing that the evidence indicates that charisma is not inherent but developed through a learning process that enhances clarity and persuasiveness of ideas, depth of leader commitment, and openness to continual learning (p. 339).

Transformational theory is distinct from transactional theory where higher order virtues such as compassion and spirituality emerge as leaders and follower interact to attain higher levels of motivational and moral achievement (Burns, 1978). Focusing on higher order needs, transformational leadership relies more consistently on traits and behaviors and minimizes the relevance of situations.

What Leadership Is

Tead (1993) argued that leadership is nothing more than a combination of normal human qualities. Everyone is a leader at some point, and the characteristics of a leader are "those of normal people, not geniuses" (Tead, 1933). Developing those traits and qualities that respond to improvement is a method to make a better leader (Tead, 1933).

Leadership is a condition and continuum of relationships with followers and can occur even among peers. Bass and Stogdill (as cited in Bass, 1990) concluded, after exhaustive comparative analysis of theory, that leadership can be reduced to a simple exchange between two or more individuals. The relationship is defined by conditions, perceptions, and the expectations of those involved (p .19).

Commonality of needs and goals, and alignment of motives, shared values, and purpose are all central to a definition of leadership structured around an equilibrium state between leaders and followers. It is not unreasonable to distill the equilibrium state down to the viability and variability of the relationship. Burns (1978) and later, Kouzes and Posner (2007), consolidate the position by defining leadership as a "reciprocal process between leaders and followers."

In contrast, Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999), Stogdill (1959), and Hersey and Blanchard (1972) adhered more strictly to behavioral and situational models and implied that leadership is accomplished by causing behavioral responses driven by follower expectations and conditions. Leaders develop themselves as motivators to be in front of or model behaviors that will create a desired response from followers (Stogdill, 1959).

Senge (1990) sees leadership as a condition of the individual where having a worthy purpose defines the leader (p. 263). The concept of purpose becomes the metaphor for a strategic architecture for lifelong learning for the leader and followers where the leader engages as a

designer, teacher, and steward (p. 321). This theory is supported where leadership reflects the profile of the inspirational coach. In the learning context, leadership occurs when followers are able to develop the capacity and capability as solvers and doers, enabled by the coaching/teaching of the leader (Bradford and Cohen, 1984). Consistent with contemporary theorists, Bass (1990) concludes that one theory or model applied to what leadership is simply does not make sense.

Breadth Synthesis

The summation of this review leads to the observation that leaders are born *and* leaders are made. Leaders are born in the theoretical context of the values, skills, attributes, and traits theoretically available to anyone to apply in the context of a leadership opportunity in everyday life. Kouzes and Posner (2007) contemplate a leadership definition that we possess the basic skills and abilities through life which allow ordinary people to get extraordinary things done on a regular basis (p. 23).

In contrast to that theory, a social romanticism perpetuates and validates larger-than-life charismatic, inspirational leadership. Bass (1990) positions charismatic leadership as a building block of transformational theory, while Tead (1933) advocates that charisma is a born leadership trait. The scope and breadth of individual traits appear to substantively and measurably contribute to the emergence of a leader. Traits, along with values, attributes, and virtues, can be enhanced and taught (Senge, 1990; Tead, 1933). Trait theory serves to help define what leadership looks like.

There is a broad integration and interaction of trait, behavior, and situational theory identified that indicates a critical, variable relationship contributing to leadership theory and

definition. The opportunity in the form of circumstances or situation is an integral part of the leadership equation. A forum must exist for leadership to occur, even if manufactured. Situational theory helps to define how and where leadership occurs. Based on the interaction of traits and circumstances or situations, how an individual performs the act of leadership is the behavioral response. The behavioral theory component helps to define what the affect or outcome of leadership will be.

The theorists reviewed in the Breadth section provided a framework to draw together trait, situational, behavioral, transactional, and transformational concepts. The analysis considered broad questions of whether leaders are born or made and how leadership is defined. The Depth section will contain an examination of contemporary research findings on the application of leadership theory in the context of leadership development.

DEPTH

AMDS 8522: CURRENT RESEARCH ON LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

DEPTH ANNOTATIONS

Agle, B. R., Nagarajan, N. J., Sonnenfeld, J. A., & Srinivasan, D. (2006). Does CEO charisma matter? An empirical analysis of the relationships among organizational performance, environmental uncertainty, and top management team perceptions of CEO charisma. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(1), 161-174.

The research behind this article compares charismatic CEOs and organizational performance. Through meta-analysis, the authors first established that charismatic leaders are more effective than peers with less charisma. For their research, 128 CEO's were randomly sampled from Financial 1000 and Yellow Book 1000 companies. CEOs completed a brief, 1-page questionnaire to determine their level of charisma. An additional 770 top management team executives from the sample companies also completed a questionnaire to measure relative perceptions relating performance and CEO charisma. CEO's averaged a 6.6 year tenure and came from firms of at least 55 years of age with an average of $6.6 billion in assets from all industries.

The researchers sought to address three hypotheses: (a) that organizational performance and later management perceptions of CEO charisma are positively related, (b) that management team perceptions of CEO charisma and later organizational performance are positively related, and (c) that positive relationships between CEO charisma and organization performance are higher under turbulent conditions. The results demonstrated a perceptual connection between organizational performance and perceived CEO charisma. Organizational performance measures

such as ROA, stock performance, and sales were even more dramatically related to charisma perceptions.

A downside research issue was self selection. CEO's may choose to participate themselves and include their firm because of their ego and self-perception as charismatic leaders, skewing the CEO sample and data. The research provides perspective on the relationship between charismatic and less or non-charismatic leaders and upper level followers associated with organizational performance. The research indicates that if CEOs are perceived to be charismatic they are also perceived to be more effective. This will be a valuable concept in looking at individual unit leaders in isolation, developing leaders from within ranks using charismatic models, and utilizing any charismatic attributes of the organization's primary leader to overcome situational unit management obstacles.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5), 901-910.

Authors Bono and Judge reported on a study of 384 correlations across 24 different studies to address the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership. Central to the analysis is the goal of creating a deeper understanding of any linkage between personality and the eight dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership. Asserting that some transformational leadership behaviors can be trained, the research tried to identify those personality factors that can be identified to further the selection, training, and development of contemporary leaders.

Using a range from 1887-2002, the PsychINFO database produced 41 articles and dissertations around critical keywords. Contacting current, published authors around this topic produced an additional seven studies to include in the analysis. The five-factors model of

personality (neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) provides the organizing framework. Personality traits related to three dimensions of transformational leadership included: (a) idealized influence-inspirational motivation, (b) intellectual stimulation, and (c) individualized consideration. Bono and Judge applied contingent reward, management by exception-active, and passive leadership as the transactional models.

The researchers pursued the project along a belief line that leaders are born not made. Thus, the pursuit of the five factors model is designed to specifically identify strong traits that can be further developed above and beyond the natural leadership traits. The research identified extroversion as the strongest personality trait associated with transformational and transactional leadership, including leadership outcomes and behaviors. Overall, however, they noted that the results of the research linking personality with ratings of transformational and transactional leadership were weak.

While the researchers were somewhat disappointed in the weaker-than-expected results of their findings, two important points emerged for addressing the application section. First, their analysis produced a strong indication that transformational leadership behaviors around the five factors model can be learned and, therefore, possibly applied to a project. Second, that extroversion is a strong leadership trait to develop in either a transformational or transactional setting or application.

Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Socialized charismatic leadership, values congruence, and deviance in the work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(4), 954-962.

Brown and Trevino used a field study to look at socialized charismatic leadership and work group deviance. They defined the socialized charismatic leader as one who is an ethical role model. Work group deviance can mean anything from simple dishonesty to theft and

intentional acts that interfere with the organization. Their goal was to establish the hypothesis that socialized charismatic leaders could in fact reduce and minimize various types of deviant group behavior. For the study, they gave surveys to 177 work groups in a major hospital organization with over 100 locations and 100,000 employees. Managers randomly selected 10 direct reports for the survey that yielded 882 completed surveys overall.

Both individual and work group deviance was considered for the study. Additionally, the research operated on the assumption that values congruence would be the mechanism for socialized charismatic leaders to assert their influence over workers. The emphasis on socialized charismatic leadership was intended to highlight the ethical values and more global rather than self-centered leader focus. The study demonstrated that work group deviance is reduced where a socialized charismatic leader is in charge. Testing the values congruence hypothesis as a mechanism to directly impact deviant behavior produced mixed results. Individuals responded to values congruence but group deviance did not appear to respond to the same degree. Respondents pointed to a potential weakness in the research suggesting that managers may have selected participants to create certain leadership measurement bias.

The research provides valuable insight into a leadership approach to correct or impact deviant behavior among members of work groups. The researchers noted that organizations are now training managers and supervisors in charismatic and transformational leadership techniques to have a positive impact on worker attitudes and behaviors.

Erez, A., Johnson, D. E., Misangyi, V. F., LePine, M. A., Halverson, K. C. (2008). Stirring the hearts of followers: Charismatic leadership as the transferal effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(3), 602-615.

The authors explored the direct relationship between charismatic leadership behaviors, effectiveness, and the resultant impact on followers as a process question, based on the premise that leader behavior and effectiveness are directly related to follower effectiveness, effort, job satisfaction, and commitment. Two studies confirmed that leader charisma was positively associated with follower affect. Further, the research considers leader disposition (such as happiness, etc.) in the form of "emotional contagion" as a direct influence on follower behavior and performance.

The authors conducted two studies. The first was in a laboratory setting with 386 college management students participating between ages 17 and 44. 80 leaders were randomly chosen and the remaining 306 served as group members in this study. The second study was conducted at a major fire department with 216 firefighters and 48 officers participating. The college group used a hypothetical "lost in the wilderness" program while the firefighters and the officers each individually completed a survey. In both studies, the results demonstrated that leader charisma was a positive influence on followers with corresponding follower behavior. Assuming that a fundamental human goal is to be happy, the research indicates that charismatic leaders who are happier and who spread their positive attitudes and emotions to followers create a cycle or "contagion" effect that has measurable results.

For the Application project, the authors framed positive leader behavior of all types, from smiling to demonstrable happiness, as having a measurable, positive effect on followers. Further, the findings indicate that charismatic leaders in particular may more directly enhance specific conditions that influence followers through their affective behaviors. In a work setting this has

implications from enhanced creativity to motivation, better decision-making, and overall better performance.

Gehring, D.R. (2007). Applying traits theory of leadership to project management. *Project Management Journal*, *38*(1), 44-54.

The author of this study explored the application of trait leadership theory to the project management environment. The purpose of the study was also to expand organizational-based trait theory to a more time and incident-specific application such as a major project. This necessarily implies some application of situational or other contingent factors in the review, and thus its value in being included in the Depth study. The research question revolves around whether or not specific traits are necessary for effective project leadership and if they could be matched to personality type indicators such as Myers-Briggs (MBTI). The author researched current literature on project leadership competencies and conducted a worldwide survey of 53 managers and members of professional project management organizations.

The authors identified three unique characteristics of projects that create leadership challenges: (a) they are temporary endeavors, (b) project managers are almost always placed as leaders at the apex of a matrix organization that they may run only part time, and (c) projects are almost always staffed by specialists who are unknown to each other and motivated by the work and their specialty contribution. These characteristics have strong tendencies to work as situational variables. Another critical issue is the assumption that a project manager can adapt to the situation, personalities, and behaviors, and can apply an appropriate leadership theory. The research suggests that the first best choice is to apply traits theory of leadership to projects, assuming that managers have the necessary traits to apply to the situation. Industry research literature provides evidence around project leadership traits associated with successful project

management. The Project Management Competence Development Framework outlines six personal competencies groupings required of the successful project manager: (a) achievement and action, (b) helping and human service, (c) impact and influence, (d) managerial, (e) cognitive, and (f) personal effectiveness.

The survey results validated the assertion that personality traits lead to or support the core project leadership competencies of knowledge, performance, and personal (interaction). The author concludes that there is a set of leadership traits that improve the chance of project success, which is significant when considering the situational variables in any project environment as discussed initially here. While the survey sample overall may have been small, which suggests that the findings should be considered with some caution, the basic research indicates further consideration of a traits and situational connection between change management and leadership and project management and leadership. This is a result that may be applicable to the Depth essay and may also be valid for the Application section.

Herold, D. M., Fedor, D. B., Caldwell, S., & Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of transformational and change leadership on employees' commitment to change: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(2), 346-357.

The authors explored the relationships between transformational and change leadership and the response of followers to that leadership in relation to how specific changes impact them. The research indicated that followers respond more favorably to transformational leadership. While this topic is covered in the next KAM, it is relevant to the direction of this Depth study and the subsequent Application project where some understanding of follower behavior in a change environment will be helpful.

Situational theory posits to have a direct bearing on leadership effectiveness given different leadership styles. The authors propose that transformational or charismatic leadership are the most effective styles in a change environment considering the situational approach. It is logical given the overall fluidity and flexibility of both styles. The purpose of the study was to examine how situations and leadership styles interact to affect follower behavior in change situations. Data for the study was obtained from 343 employees in 30 organizations. There were a wide variety of industries represented, predominantly from the Southeastern United States. Individual managers were the conduit for the study and each represented a recently completed change initiative in their organization that had a significant impact. Affected workers were the subjects of the study. Participants completed one of two online surveys that were randomly assigned so that half of the respondents rated transformational leadership and the other half rated change leadership styles. Transformational leadership was assessed with the Personal Change Survey and change leadership was assessed with the Organizational Change Survey.

The study concludes that transformational leadership matters significantly when there is high job impact associated with change. The more the workers are directly affected (the situational consideration) the more the transformational attributes of the leader matter in how the change gets implemented. Issues of relationships and trust with the leader emerge such that followers will embrace and execute change more readily, even if significantly affected, if they have a more transformational leader they have been involved with. This is an interesting issue in the context of public sector employees and the Application project. Where organized labor and job protection is in place, it will be worth further analysis and exploration to determine if the

assumptions about transformational leadership in change environments apply to the public sector workplace.

Hui, C.H., Chiu, W. C. K., Yu, P. L. H.,Cheng, K., and Tse, H. H. M. (2007). The effects of service climate and the effective leadership behavior of supervisors on frontline employee service quality: A multi-level analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *80*, 151-172.

The researchers compared the effects of leadership behavior in various internal and external customer service environments. When the team working conditions were poor and not supportive of providing good customer service to coworkers and customers, leader behavior had a significant impact. When conditions were good and service was good, the supervisor's leadership behavior did not make a significant difference. Interestingly, the researchers also hypothesized from the findings that favorable worker service delivery conditions and effective leadership behavior may have a negative outcome as role conflict emerges.

The findings were a result of looking at the service delivery of 511 frontline service workers sampled from 55 work groups in 6 different service organizations. Sampled work teams ranged in size from 5 to 20 members. The survey instrument was an anonymous questionnaire filled out by both supervisors and team members. The survey instrument measured leadership behavior based on 15 different items. The core research team premise for leadership behavior focused on: (a) task-oriented actions, (b) people-oriented actions, and (c) ethical leadership. The researchers identified limitations of the research that included: (a) over-sampling of an older age group, (b) groups that were too small, and (c) employee service quality rated by supervisors only.

This research and the findings are of particular interest in the context of the government work unit identified for the application section of this KAM. 911 emergency call centers serve both internal and external customers in a high stress, emotional, and intense environment.

Designing a cohesive approach to developing leadership skills for frontline workers and supervisors requires critical thinking, planning, and coordination. As suggested here, a good supervisor and a positive customer service environment may work at odds and may be a valid argument for changing existing practices and conditions. The findings provide appropriate and additional direction for employee and supervisor leadership behavior analysis in the application design.

Javidan, M., & Waldman, D. (2003). Exploring charismatic leadership in the public sector: Measurement and consequences. *Public Administration Review, 63*(2), 229-242.

The authors were concerned with the lack of research around charismatic, transformational, and visionary leadership in public sector organizations. A critical question is whether or not charismatic leadership is relevant in the public sector given the different organizational dynamics and the traditional absence of cultural factors such as entrepreneurism and related risk taking. The research addressed the bureaucratic organizational environment of the public sector that would necessarily constrict charismatic or transformational leadership while considering the emerging pressure for government organizations to be more creative and accountable.

The authors conducted a survey of 203 middle and upper-middle managers to assess their supervisors' factors of charismatic leadership and the extent of charismatic leadership in the public sector. The authors used the traditional Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) as a model to design their own instrument that would include more behavioral and personal leader attributes. The study was designed to measure: (a) energy and determination, (b) vision, (c) challenge and encouragement, and (d) risk taking. The authors note that this measure gives them leader profile data but does not cover any motivational or work unit performance information.

A critical issue raised as an impediment to more transformational and charismatic leadership practices in the public sector revolves around the issue of risk and reward structures. In short, there are rare instances of systems that allow for any kind of rewards for risk taking and innovation in government. However, there are emerging practices in agencies, such as the US Postal Service, testing management and performance reward systems using public resources. Several of the references cited address both the impediments and opportunities to expand transforming leadership into the public sector. The research findings reinforce the existence of political and bureaucratic influences that plague public sector organizations. Risk taking behavior is barely recognized, and in all, charismatic leadership behavior simply may not be able to generate the same types of results found in the private sector. The authors did note that environmental factors, such as budget cuts and natural disasters, tend to enhance the charismatic leader's position in a public sector setting. This article is relevant to the Application in the context of leader effectiveness, style, and motivations in a public sector project, and serves to reinforce the context of subordinate leadership development in a high leader turnover work unit.

Masood, S. A., Dani, S.S., Burns, N. D., & Backhouse, C. J. (2006). Transformational leadership and organizational culture: the situational strength perspective. *The Journal of Engineering Manufacture*, *220*(6), 941-949.

The authors examined the relationship between leadership behavior, organizational cultures, and situational strength to develop leadership models for different units and environments in organizations. The research not only covered individual leadership behavior but also examined the broader effects in the context of the organization as a culture. The researchers administered a 23-item transformational leadership questionnaire to 339 followers for 76 leaders

in five different manufacturing companies. The leaders in turn completed a questionnaire designed to evaluate the organizations' respective cultures and situational strength factors.

Addressing leadership in the transformational context, the authors tested both organizational culture and situational strength factors as variables moderating leadership behavior and overall effectiveness. Relating leadership style to culture, the researchers used four different cultural models to define leadership style: (a) adhocracy, (b) clan, (c) hierarchy, and (d) market. Situational strength, defined as strong situation or weak situation, is used in this project to help study leadership behavior. Based on a four-quadrant model, the study hypothesized that transformational leaders prefer a weak situation environment where followers can be empowered to make their own decisions in a very creative, family-like environment. Non-transformational leaders prefer that their subordinates follow the rules, understand the chain of command, and have limited decision authority.

The research model may be helpful in deciding, for example, how to evaluate situational strength factors and cultural models in determining leadership training and education recommendations for the application project. Other research reviewed in the Depth section addresses specific differences between public and private sector settings for leadership styles, applications, and follower behavioral issues. A discussion of the interaction between leader style, situational factors, and organizational culture will be part of the Depth essay.

Ng, K.Y., Ang, S., & Chan, K.Y. (2008). Personality and leader effectiveness: A moderated mediation model of leadership self efficacy, job demands, and job autonomy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(4), 733-743.

The authors examined the trait theory of leadership in the context of Leadership Self Efficacy (LSE) - which they defined as the "leader's perceived capabilities to perform leader

roles." The study sought to further examine the relationship of the big five personality traits to leadership effectiveness as a tool for predicting leadership behavior. Additionally, the research addressed the relationship of situations or conditions to trait theory and leader behavior. The authors took a position on this point that theory and research have not adequately examined or explained the conditions under which different traits operate. The core premise of the research suggests that leaders with greater self efficacy (LSE) are ultimately more effective because they are willing to work harder and longer to complete a leadership goal or mission on the belief that they have the capability to do so.

394 military recruits in Singapore made up the sample for this study. All participants were male recruits who had enlisted for compulsory service. Respondents ranged in age from 20 to 26 years. The authors administered two leadership effectiveness surveys, one at the beginning of the study and another two years later. Participants rated their supervisors after having been under their direct leadership for that two year period.

The findings from this research indicate that LSE, as a motivational component of leadership, has a direct bearing on the personality of leaders as it relates to leader effectiveness. Further, the study supports existing research indicating that LSE mediates the effects for all three personality traits of neuroticism, extraversion, and conscientiousness for leadership effectiveness in low job demand situations and extends existing research finding that high demand jobs have a debilitating effect on LSE related to leadership effectiveness. This is a significant consideration in the context of the Application project. The particular government unit for the Application is a 911 emergency call center. These are high stress and tense environments that currently suffer from unstable leadership and management due to frequent turnover. Given the findings, there is

reasonable cause to consider personality traits as selection tools for leadership potential. If job demands weaken leader effectiveness, matching traits and reinforcing and supporting leaders' self efficacy will be worth considering as recommended strategies.

Parry, K, & Sinha, P. (2005). Researching the trainability of transformational organizational leadership. *Human Resources Development International*, *8*(2), 165-183.

The authors explored the overall effectiveness and applicability of transformational leadership training on leadership behavior and relationships. In this research project, Parry and Sinha measured the outcomes of specifically applying transformational leadership training concepts on pre and post training managers. The research was conducted as a semi-field experiment, using a total of 50 subjects in seven different groups. Both public (28) and private (22) sector employees were used in the study. The authors trained all participants using the Full Range Leadership Development (FRLD) program (Avolio & Bass, 1991), an instrument used for transformational leadership training and development.

The research assumes that the value of leadership training on the organization has already been established in the range of experiences including: (a) mentoring, (b) job assignment, (c) feedback systems, (d) on-the-job experience, (e) leader-follower relations and (f) formal training as set out in McCauley et al. (1998) and Conger and Benjamin (1999). They noted, however, that little research has been done to measure the individual effectiveness of transformational leadership training, while the favorable impact on the organization is already known. The research goal is to determine: (a) how effective FRLD is in developing transformational competencies, (b) what impact transformational leadership training has on transactional leadership behaviors, and (c) what leadership outcomes show improvement after transformational training.

The study finds that transformational leadership training does result in more effective leadership behavior and that the FRLD program is an effective training tool. Further, transactional leadership does not decrease as a result of transformational training—but tends to stabilize as the training takes hold. The authors acknowledge that a larger sample would likely provide more significant results around the research goals. However, this research does provide a viable situational evaluation framework and possible training instrument for the application section of this project.

Robie, C., Brown, D.J., & Bly, P. R (2008). Relationship between major personality traits and managerial performance: Moderating effects of derailing traits. *International Journal of Management, 25*(1), 131-140.

Tying into an old maxim that "an executive is hired on experience and fired on personality," the research question addressed the relationship of derailing traits with personality and performance in executive leadership. The authors identified derailing traits as those that are related to unexpected failure to reach a top position in an organization. Those traits include: (a) ego centered, (b) intimidating, (c) manipulating, (d) micro-managing, and (e) passive-aggressive. The authors measured these traits against the big five major personality traits of: (a) openness, (b) conscientiousness, (c) extraversion, (d) agreeableness, and (e) emotional stability. The research revealed that derailing traits are possibly more functional than what was expected entering the project.

The researchers studied 144 mid and upper level executives who were participating in a management development center. The sample consisted primarily of white (90%), male (80%), college graduates (92%), with a median age of 43 years. The authors assessed both personality and derailment factors for research evaluation purposes. The goal of the study was to measure

specific character attributes against personality traits and job performance as a means of assessing executive leadership. For example, one measure was to determine if a derailing trait such as manipulating, which may also indicate a transactional leadership style, was directly related, either positively or negatively, to organization or leader performance in general. To the surprise of the authors, the findings indicated that overall work performance and derailing traits were positively related. The authors believe that this finding is due in part to their sample of upper management and not inclusive of subordinates. Dysfunctional behavior generally is revealed to subordinates first and supervisors last (Hogan, 2001). Supervisors may actually rate derailing behaviors as productive and functional in the absence of direct experience.

The researchers concluded that high derailing traits scores may lead to high performance scores when measured against executive or leadership success factors. The authors suggested that some tyrannical leadership may have to be considered in extremely competitive fields, industries, or environments. They argued this on the premise that ignoring this factor could provide competitors with an advantage. This conclusion is in stark contrast to many of the principles of charismatic and other leadership models reviewed to this point. However, the value of this research in the Depth discussion and Application revolves around a clearer understanding of derailing traits and their potential use in addressing leadership situational issues.

Rooke, D., & Torbert, W. R. (2005). Seven transformations of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 1-12.

The authors pursued leadership profiles and development around the theory of action logic where leaders interpret their surroundings and react to actions that impact either their safety or their power. The research was conducted using a sentence-completion survey tool called the Leadership Development Profile. The instrument consists of 36 sentences that respondents must

complete. The profile created emerged around seven developmental action logics: (a) Opportunist, (b) Diplomat, (c) Expert, (d) Achiever, (e) Individualist, (f) Strategist, or (g) Alchemist. These profiles define a leader's dominant way of thinking. The results have been collected over a 25 year period through surveys administered to corporate, government and non-profit managers and executives between the ages of 25 and 55 in the US and Europe.

The results found that 55% of the sample fell into the categories of Opportunists, Diplomats, and Experts, which accounted for below-average performance. 30% of the sample measured as Achievers, and 15% measured as Individualists, Alchemists, and Strategists. The latter group showed the greatest potential as innovators and successful organizational transformers. The authors also found that leaders can favorably and positively transform from one action logic to another as a result of: (a) external events, (b) personal changes, (c) manager work practices, (d) process, and (e) environment changes. Finally, planned and structured development actions can help to facilitate transformation into other action logics. The shortcomings of this research include the lack of hard number data to review in terms of the total sample size involved.

The most effective and desirable levels are the Alchemist and Strategist where leaders seek mutual mentoring with peers and look to create a sustainable group of people who constantly challenge the emergent leader's position and practices. The research notes that over time, the most effective teams have a Strategist culture. These profiles have value to the Application section as both evaluation and application tools.

Russon, C., & Reinelt, C. (2004). The results of an evaluation scan of 55 leadership development programs. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 10*(3), 104-107.

Going back to the 1930's, the Kellogg Foundation has had a rich history in supporting leadership development around the world in organizations, communities, non-profit, and public sector agencies. For the purposes of the Depth section, a review and evaluation of leadership development programming and practices is appropriate. The purpose of their critical evaluation was to ascertain the current practices relevant to measurement of outcomes in leadership development. 55 different programs from around the world participated in a scan project. The participation criteria included those programs that: (a) target non-traditional leaders, (b) provide a cohort experience, and (c) build individuals, organizations, and/or communities. Personal interviews and program materials review constituted the research and evaluation process.

Kellogg set out to determine how leadership programs were defining outcomes and impacts. The research defined outcome measures as: (a) changes in attitudes, (b) behavior, (c) knowledge, (d) skills, and (e) status, or level of functioning as a result of the program inputs. Researchers defined impacts as long term social change that a program works to create. Key findings indicated that few leadership development programs have a program theory—a platform of how and why a program is supposed to deliver outcomes and impacts. Secondly, they found that many programs are constrained by short term management policies and lack the long term commitment to allow actual outcomes and impacts to develop, emerge, and be measured. Many programs fail to properly evaluate the outcomes based on the unique needs of the individuals receiving the leadership training. The researchers also suggested that qualitative and quantitative methods be employed in evaluating leadership development programs to capture the complexities and nuances of specific programs and the outcomes and impacts. Private and public

sector interaction and program sharing was identified as a means to further leadership development as a larger practice.

A key learning from this study is the issue of proper evaluation of actual impacts and outcomes. Short term change as a result of a program, good or bad, may clearly mask the actual outcomes as well as impede the full execution of leadership development goals. This is noteworthy and raises questions about further consideration of the role of organizational culture in implementing a leadership development project.

Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S.S.K., & Cha, S.E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(4), 1020-1030.

Schaubroeck, Lam, and Cha (2007) considered the effectiveness of transformational leadership on group or team performance. In the research, they focused on team values and beliefs in relation to leader behaviors in the transformational context. The group's initial meta-analysis identifies a gap in analysis of the effects of transformational leadership behavior on team performance.

The research instrument is a questionnaire administered to 218 financial services teams in U.S. and Hong Kong offices of a large, multinational bank. Team sizes ranged from four to seven members. Transformational leadership was measured with a 23-item scale developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990). The deliverables include: (a) indexes of transformational leadership behavior, (b) team performance, (c) team potency, (d) power distance, and (e) collectivism. Branch supervisors were rated by their direct reports. A distinguishing element of the study is a focus on the group level of analysis through stable work teams. Such teams are characterized as having identifiable members who have been working together over time and whose behavior and

performance is influenced by group norms and values (Hackman, 1992; Levine & Moreland, 1991).

The study demonstrates how team values impact followers in relation to transformational leadership behaviors and how the response of followers in turn relates to team performance. The study indicates that team values moderate the effects of transformational leadership on team performance. Team value systems are strong and indicate an opportunity for transformationally-oriented leaders to influence team performance by focusing on shared values and by identifying and developing individuals who fit into shared value groups. A key shortcoming of this research is the single organization and single industry orientation. Outcomes might also be different if conducting the same research in higher level executive ranks of management where more strategic relationships, issues, and initiatives come into play.

The research provides an application to address leadership behavior in relation to team or group values. In the context of stable work groups with high turnover leadership, this study provides potential behavior modeling concepts to improve leader effectiveness and follower performance.

Shertzer, J.E., & Schuh, J. H. (2004). College student perceptions of leadership: Empowering and constraining beliefs. *NASPA Journal*, *42*(1), 111-131.

The researchers in this study set out to gain an understanding of what factors directly influence young adults in a decision to engage or not engage in leadership behavior. The study included college students who are already leaders and those who were not in positions of leadership. Students who are in leadership positions define leadership as requiring personal qualities or traits and positions of power and influence, which aligns with situational leadership theory. In contrast, those who were not engaged in leadership identify both the lack of

opportunity (situation) and personal attributes (trait) as constraining forces. The study used qualitative methods which included: (a) focus groups, (b) interviews, and (c) document review. The methodology selected provides the opportunity to gain insight into student perceptual views, allow for continuous questioning, and conduct deeper probing. The sample consisted of 24 student leaders and five disengaged students at one Midwestern college. Five focus groups were conducted with student leaders. The disengaged students participated in personal interviews.

The research produced several themes as a result of broad questioning designed to get students to articulate what they perceived leadership to be. The student perceptions process indicates beliefs that: (a) leadership is something an individual does or has ownership in, (b) that it is a position, (c) that leaders possess unique traits and skills, and (d) that leaders act based on specific internal motivations. A bright line emerges between the beliefs of engaged and disengaged students around being involved in leadership. Opportunity, capability, and personal traits distinctly separate the leadership perceptions of the two groups.

The weakness in the research involves the small sample size and the single site for the study. Additionally, there was no mention of the sociodemographic makeup of the respondents. While such sample-limited data indicates caution, it does provide some direction with regards to designing an approach going forward. It would be worthwhile to test for similar beliefs among natural and non-leaders in work groups, looking for corroborating attitudes and perceptions about leadership.

Literature Review Essay

The Breadth section covers 12 different theorists and focuses thematically on addressing two central questions: (a) whether leaders are born or made, and (b) how leadership is defined by classical and contemporary leadership scholars. Unanimously, the theorists reviewed concluded that leaders are not born. However, this position is qualified and refined by most with a caveat that acknowledges those traits and attributes that perhaps are of genetic, social, or biological origin. Traits such as compassion, natural ability, instinct, resourcefulness, determination, patience, and vision are a sample of those attributes identified in the Breadth section as perhaps being natural or "born with" as opposed to being of a learned origin. This is noteworthy in the context of contemporary leadership development theory and practices such as will be discussed around charismatic and transformational theory.

Previewing transformational principles, Tead (1935) offered relatively early in the last century, that creating higher order performance, behavior, or response requires those leadership traits and abilities that can inspire followers to a higher purpose. Senge (2006) further tied higher order virtues such as spirituality to the leader's ability to guide follower behavior and posited that leaders and followers advance through a common need and desire to learn.

Shertzer and Schuh (2004) examined leadership perceptions among college students and learned that both engaged and disengaged students held several common beliefs about leadership. Those who were identified as leaders believe they possess certain qualities that made them leaders while those who lacked interest in being leaders were not engaged because they believed that they did not possess special attributes and traits that leaders had. Further, both

sampled groups believe circumstances, conditions, or situations, in the form of opportunity, are central to being in a position to be a leader (Shertzer & Schuh, 2004).

Amongst the Breadth theorists, there was observed a consensus view that to the degree we can train or teach traits, attributes, and values that manifest themselves as leader behavior, there is an argument for a position that leaders can be made. As a learning advocate, Senge (2006) supported the made argument in discussing charisma for example, noting that charisma is a leadership trait that can be developed through learning (p. 339). Traditional theories and ideas have been explored along the path of learning process and effective leadership development. Raelin (2004) argues, however, that simply working from a leadership development list of the right attributes to develop or supposing that whatever development that occurs is specifically to prepare someone for a leadership position, ignores the potential for followers to be active participants in leadership in general. Raelin (2004), as did Tead (1933, 1935), Senge (2006), Bradford and Cohen (1984), and Kouzes and Posner (2007), advocates for the relationship between knowledge, learning, and follower engagement as central to a 21st century model of leadership development. The premise of follower empowerment, as a strategic leadership development concept, is an important component for the Application section of this project that will be explored thematically in the Depth essay.

Combining the theoretical observations around traits, behavior, and situations, there are three conclusions that will be explored further in the Depth section in discussing contemporary leadership development: (a) that leaders are, to defined degrees via naturally occurring traits, born, (b) that leaders are to defined degrees, made, by way of those traits, attributes, and values that can be taught or enhanced through learning processes, and (c) that critical to this assumption

is an integration and logical interaction of traits, behavior, and situations necessary to support a definition of what leadership is, under what conditions it exists, and how it is executed. The evolution of these theoretical platforms from trait theory to charismatic and transformational theory becomes the guiding theme for exploring and understanding contemporary leadership development.

Traits & Leadership

Late 19th century quantitative analysis framed trait theory around the premises that: (a) leadership is defined by a collection of extraordinary individuals who have the power to change and shape history, and (b) that these leaders have attributes that were entirely hereditary, passed among generations, and were a result of genetic makeup (Zaccaro, 2007, p. 6). By the early 1940's, Zaccaro (2007) notes that trait theory had given way to behavioral and situational models only to come full circle in the 1980's to acknowledge those unique characteristics of individuals that were central to charismatic and transformational leadership theory (p. 6).

Based on research efforts, Zaccaro himself defines traits as "relatively coherent and integrated patterns of personal characteristics, reflecting a range of individual differences that foster consistent leadership effectiveness across a variety of situations" (p. 7). The key points being made are that: (a) traits cannot be considered in isolation but rather as integrated components, (b) the definition of traits includes a variety of personal qualities and attributes that includes motives, values, cognitive abilities, social and problem solving skills, and expertise, and (c) leader traits are enduring and stable across varieties of situations (Zaccaro, 2007, p. 8). Zaccaro's (2007) trait argument supports the born and made premise of leadership as it remains difficult to separate out those attributes that may be taught and those that one may be born with.

Traits and the five factor model. The basis of the personality traits discussion relative to leadership revolves around the Five Factor Model of personality. It essentially presents personality in terms of five global traits and suggests that personality traits can be identified and explained in hierarchical order (George, 2007). The five general traits are: (a) extroversion-- which generally is regarded as one having positive moods and emotions, and tendencies to be sociable, friendly, outgoing, assertive, and dominant, (b) neuroticism-- generally regarded as experiencing negative moods and emotions, being distressed, and generally having a negative view of self and others, (c) agreeableness—one who generally gets along well with others, is likeable, kind, sympathetic, empathetic, and caring, (d) conscientiousness—reflects a personality that is persevering, dependable, reliable, conformist, organized, and generally works hard and drives to reach goals, and (e) openness to experience—represents a person who is original, imaginative, curious, takes risks, has broad interests, and can access a variety of thoughts, feelings, and experiences (George, 2007, p. 1-2). Hundreds of personality traits have been identified, but the five core traits are generally accepted globally as having the most direct relationship to understanding the role of personality in organizational behavior and leadership (George, 2007, p. 1).

To better understand the relationship between leadership and personality traits, Johnson, Vernon, Harris, and Jang (2004) examined the question in terms of genetic alignment. Maintaining that research had demonstrated that leadership and many personality traits had been proven to be independently heritable, Johnson et al. (2004) conducted a behavior genetic investigation seeking to correlate leadership behavior and the big five personality traits. Their findings showed a strong genetic connection between leadership and personality (p. 31). For

example, transformational leadership shows a positive genetic correlation with the big five traits of conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness to experience. Conversely, disagreeableness positively correlates with transactional leadership while conscientiousness and extraversion are negatively correlated with transactional leadership (Johnson et al., 2004, p. 31). The research advances the existence of a verifiable genetic relationship between the big five personality traits and certain leadership styles, including the difference between transactional and transformational or charismatic leaders (Johnson et al., 2004).

Traits and leader self perception. As highlighted in the college student study, the individual's definition of leadership and perceptions of the importance of personal traits in particular significantly influenced whether or not they perceived themselves as leaders or even potential leaders (Shertzer & Schuh, 2004, p. 112). Constraining beliefs, such as may exist around an individual's perception of their own leadership traits or characteristics, were observed to limit a student's self perception and thus, participation in leadership activities (Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). Students who were leaders indicated that extroversion and charisma were necessary core traits. Interestingly, non-leaders among students revealed that introverted individuals could be leaders and tended to lead by example and in "less traditional ways," suggesting a personality correlation that will be addressed later (p. 119). It is noteworthy here that the research involving college students implies that attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of leaders and leadership, including self perceptions of one's position relative to leaders and leadership, are opinions likely formed at a relatively young age.

Students unanimously cited transformational and charismatic-type attributes such as persuasiveness, morality, empathy, vision, intelligence, and ethics as requisite leadership traits

(Shertzer & Schuh, 2004, p. 120). This brings particular attention to the weight and relevance of traits in a contemporary leadership development discussion, especially considering individual perceptions of what leadership is and what it does or does not require in terms of personal attributes.

From a development perspective, there is an argument to forge a connection between traits, behavior, and situations and leader self perceptions. This is exemplified when considering the context of constraining and empowering beliefs. Shertzer and Schuh (2004) integrate belief systems in the mix of leadership variance where empowering beliefs include: (a) support from others, (b) opportunities, and (c) background and environment (p. 122). This parallels Zaccaro's (2007) integration of traits, situations and behaviors. In contrast, constraining beliefs include: (a) lack of capabilities, (b) lack of confidence, and (c) lack of opportunities, recognizing a negative relationship of traits and situation in particular (p. 124).

How leaders and non-leaders perceive themselves seems to be relevant to how they emerge and develop and to what degree their skills and attributes are useful. There are at least a basic set of skills and attributes that an individual must possess if they are to be a leader and not simply another manager (Gehring, 2007). Zaccaro (2007) narrows the relevance of traits in a leadership development context down to a "range of qualities that can consistently and reliably differentiate leaders from non leaders and can serve as the basis for leader assessment, selection, training and development" (p. 8). An interesting analysis would be to compare and contrast the various definitions of non leaders in relation to those constraining beliefs identified by students who merely choose not to be engaged in leadership.

Traits, personality, and leader self efficacy. Ng, Ang and Chan (2008) explored the relationship of personality traits to leader self efficacy (LSE). LSE is defined as "the leader's perceived capabilities to perform specific leader roles effectively" (Ng et al., 2008). The researchers hypothesized that LSE was a strong and even dominant factor relative to various combinations of the five factors model of personality traits and that leaders with a greater LSE would perform better overall, leading to measurable leader effectiveness (Ng et al., 2008, p. 734). A critical finding of their research suggests that there are significant relationships between the traits neuroticism, extraversion, and conscientiousness, leader self efficacy (LSE) and leader effectiveness (Ng et al., 2008). They further postulate that this supports the relationships between the "big five" personality traits, making a case for using personality traits as tools for identifying leadership potential (Ng et al., 2008, p. 741).

The study by Ng et al. (2008) highlights the value of developing leaders' self efficacy in leading. They further recommend ways to improve a leader's self efficacy that includes: (a) observe and emulate a role model, (b) take on new leadership roles to practice and hone leadership capabilities, and (c) seek advice and encouragement from a mentor (Ng et al., 2008, p. 741).

Traits and learning leaders. Several theorists have suggested that everyone has the capacity, capability, and even opportunity to be a leader at some point (e.g., Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Tead, 1935). Tead (1935) advocated that leadership development should include enhancing those traits that would respond to learning or training such as reasoning and imagination (p. 122). Senge (2006) later suggested that teaching charisma and other more

transformational traits is possible. His learning organization model emphasizes processes that ultimately create follower based leadership through individual empowerment (Senge, 2006).

Bono and Judge's (2004) research specifically linked personality traits to transactional and transformational leadership. They argue that the integrated relationships provide a method to develop such leaders (p. 901). Supporting Senge's (2006) theory, Bono and Judge (2004) demonstrated that transformational leadership traits respond to the degree that transformational leader behaviors can be trained. There is also significant research evidence that transformational leadership behavior is something that can be learned (Bono & Judge, 2004). The implication is that understanding and indentifying key personality traits plays a role in leadership development, tailoring training to specific leader personality profiles (Bono & Judge, 2004).

Traits and applications. On a narrow scale, Stogdill (1959) conducted surveys that identified task-related characteristics that he considered predictive traits applicable to leadership in project settings (as cited in Gehring, 2007). These narrow traits include: (a) a high need for achievement and responsibility, (b) a high degree of task orientation, and (c) responsible and dependable in the pursuit of goals (Gehring, 2007, p. 46).

Gehring's (2007) project leadership research points out that in a narrowly focused application, that it may be possible to identify specific traits that fit successful project leaders. The research cautions however, that trait theory has two specific limitations to consider when applying trait-based leadership development to project management: (a) the subjectiveness of defining good or successful leadership, and (b) too many traits to apply that may difficult to obtain agreement on (Gehring, 2007).

Broadening the contemporary perspective, Zaccaro's (2007) research consolidates four critical issues that relate traits, attributes, and the variance in leadership in relation to the argument here that leadership traits, situations, and behavior are theoretically and practically integrated. In support of this, Zaccaro (2007) posits that: (a) leadership represents complex behaviors that are driven by multiple, complex attributes, (b) the integration of complex traits drives the leader behavior, (c) trait and attribute theory has to account for the role of situations as a source of leadership variance, and (d) that some attributes will be more stable and cross-situational where others may be strictly situation-bound. Zaccaro's (2007) research suggests clearly and specifically that there is a strong relationship and sensitivity (leadership variance) connecting traits, situations, and leader behavior (p. 7).

Traits, learning leaders, and the organizational perspective. Considering Bono and Judge's (2004) premise of learning leaders, Braford and Cohen (1984), Senge (2006), and Raelin's (2004) arguments about building leadership into organizations as opposed to positions or simply people in positions is explored further. Whether noted as empowerment, coaching, team building, mentoring, or any of several appropriate descriptive analogies, the critical concept is that developing leadership is more affectively employed when approached for the benefit of a larger, integrated group. It is defined more clearly in the learning leader's role.

The argument is extended by Raelin (2004) who cites the work of the Boston Consortium for Higher Education and the Educational Testing Service as models for defining attributes of learning leaders. He suggests that learning leaders: (a) commit to their own and others' continuous learning, (b) develop self awareness, insight, and a defensive mechanism to reactions that might inhibit leadership learning, (c) develop the ability to make relevant judgments, (d)

develop a peripheral awareness of others, (e) give time to colleagues, listen well and suspend personal beliefs so they can let knowledge in, and (f) develop a perspective that recognizes the organization as an integrated set of relationships (p. 134). The field application of these principles highlights the role of the leader as both teacher and student in developing specific leadership traits and attributes in themselves and others, including higher order or more transformational ideals. This position is attainable through a leadership learning environment (Raelin, 2004; Senge, 2006).

Defending the models, Raelin (2004) dismissed contemporary off-the-shelf practices such as leadership behavior lists and train-for-the-position programs for leadership learning and development. His arguments against these development approaches suggest that position development is isolationist to the degree that only the people who participate have and understand the leadership learning and knowledge to the exclusion of everyone else (Raelin, 2004). Therefore, those not trained are merely left behind and left out of the learning and potential team building (Raelin, 2004). Similarly, he maintains that the list approach of focusing on an off-the-shelf menu of leadership skills simply assumes that everyone can learn, absorb, and retain the same leadership attributes and skills (p. 131).

Charisma. The trait of charisma and thus charismatic leadership theory in contemporary research is repetitiously tied to key leadership concepts and discussion, primarily focused on transformation, vision, and motivation (Javidan & Waldman, 2003). Charisma derives its initial terminology from a Greek word meaning “a gift” and has been expanded in the leadership literature to refer to an individual’s unique personality that separates them from ordinary people and defines the nature of their influence or authority (Choi, 2006; Senge, 2006). Javidan and

Waldman (2003) ultimately concluded that most all theories around charismatic leadership are quite similar. They also add to the knowledge around charismatic leadership through research findings supporting the view that charismatic leaders have an emotional impact on followers (Javidan & Waldman, 2003).

Additionally, there is evidence that charismatic leadership is directly associated with leadership effectiveness as well as follower or subordinate "effectiveness, effort, job satisfaction, and commitment" (Erez, Johnson, Misangyi, LePine, & Halverson, 2008). As such, two themes around contemporary charismatic leadership study appear to emerge: (a) one that focuses on the personality traits of the charismatic leader and the related leader behaviors toward followers, and (b) the affects of the charismatic leader on followers and follower behavior (Choi, 2006).

Charismatic attributes. As a trait theorist, Tead (1933, 1935) initially discussed the charismatic leader as "a scarce resource requiring little or no development;" suggesting that they possessed unique qualities that they came by naturally (p. 157). Interestingly, he advanced an extraordinary list of both functional and virtuous attributes. Functional attributes would include intelligent, imaginative, persistent, technically proficient, and self confident; the hallmarks of a cheerleader and commander. He even noted physical size and personal features as distinguishing, born-with attributes of charismatic or special leaders (Tead, 1933, pp. 153-157). Virtuous attributes would include courage, heart, trustworthiness, affection, morality, and spirituality; more closely aligned with a coach and mentor (Tead, 1935, pp. 83-110). Variations of the same traits, attributes, and virtues have been explored by many of the theorists and scholars reviewed here who address charismatic and transformational leadership.

For example, Burns' (1978) heroic leader model paralleled many characteristics of the charismatic leader behavioral and trait profile, including descriptions such as compassionate, resourceful, competent, and dynamic (p. 244). Senge (2006) believed that charisma develops through a learning process, acknowledging that the common threads are the attributes of clarity, persuasiveness, depth of commitment, and openness to learning (p. 339).

Contemporary researchers identify several key characteristics or personal attributes that distinguish charismatic from non-charismatic leaders: (a) charismatic leaders are self-confident and sure of their moral position in the vision they support, (b) charismatic leaders are eloquent; possessing effective communication and rhetorical skills, (c) charismatic leaders have a persistence and willingness to work hard to see a vision fulfilled, and (d) charismatic leaders have a strong will to seek change and act as change agents (Javidan & Waldman, 2003). Continuing from the Breadth examination, there is an unmistakable continuity of thought about those traits, attributes, and virtues that are associated with the profile of a charismatic leader.

Charisma and behavior. Javidan and Waldman (2003) concluded that a consensus in the literature supports several common behaviors that charismatic leaders perform: (a) articulation of a future vision, (b) building credibility and commitment to the vision, and (c) creating emotional challenges and encouragement for followers (Javidan & Waldman, 2003, p. 230). Choi (2006) examined charismatic leadership behavior in the context of envisioning, creating empathy, and empowerment (pp. 27-28). In motivational terms, Choi's (2006) research creates a charismatic behavioral model that he identifies as socialized charismatic leadership and defines as: (a) being non-exploitative, (b) being supportive of follower needs, and (c) instilling a sense of power for followers to achieve goals (p. 26).

On a physical or outward level, Erez et al. (2008) note that charismatic leaders show more aroused behaviors than do non-charismatic leaders (p. 606). They also present charismatic leaders as having "an engaging and captivating tone of voice and facial expression" (Erez et al., 2008, p. 606). Additionally, charismatic leaders who make extended eye contact, animated facial expression, and demonstrate different vocal patterns, were able to affect follower satisfaction and performance at a higher level than non-charismatic leaders (Erez et al., 2008, p. 606). The result of the research found that charismatic leaders outwardly: (a) enhance followers' positive affective state, (b) are happier and thus generally make followers happier, and (c) as a collective result, get people to think better; make better decisions; perform better; and be more creative and motivated (Erez et al., 2008, p. 612).

Transformational and charismatic leadership behavior. Transformational and charismatic leadership appear to be interchangeable terms in much of contemporary leadership discussion (Bono & Judge, 2004). Two leadership behaviors associated specifically with transformational leadership that are also used to define a measure of charismatic leadership behavior include: (a) *idealized influence*, described as having high standards of moral and ethical conduct, being held in high personal regard and commanding follower loyalty, and (b) *inspirational motivation*, described as having a strong vision and being able to build confidence, enthusiasm and generally inspiring followers (Bono & Judge, 2004, p. 901).

The research and transformational leadership behavior model further concluded that *intellectual stimulation* and *individual consideration* were also unique behavioral traits of the charismatic or transformational leader (Bono & Judge, 2004). Intellectual stimulation includes challenging norms, encouraging creative thinking, and pushing followers to innovate (Bono &

Judge, 2004, p. 901). Individual consideration includes coaching, mentoring, and recognizing and developing followers professionally (Bono & Judge, 2004, p. 901).

These various and similar profiles of charismatic or transformational leader behavior have evolved and were supported in variations of theory presented in the Breadth section by Tead (1933, 1935), Burns (1978), Stogdill (1959), Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999), Senge (2006), Bradford and Cohen (1984), and Kouzes and Posner (2007).

The impact of the charisma trait. As has been stated, charisma, as a leadership trait, is widely associated with leadership effectiveness (Erez et al., 2008). Agle, Nagarajan, Sonnenfeld, and Srinivasan (2006) offer that research supports the hypothesis that charismatic leaders can be more effective than non-charismatic or less charismatic peers. There are varying degrees of agreement on the role the charismatic leader actually plays on organizations or individuals, however. Agle et al. (2006) also point out that charismatic leaders have mixed results when measured against organizational effectiveness, thus creating a conceptual separation between leader behavior and individual and organizational response (p. 161).

The research of Erez et al. (2008) suggests overall that an area requiring further study is to examine how charismatic leaders actually impact their followers at a broader, personal level (p. 602). They address the question of charismatic affect as a measurable trait characteristic. The discussion around charismatic affect leads to a question of whether or not there are negative traits associated with charismatic leadership that should also be considered in the context of leader effectiveness and performance and follower performance and behavior. Robie, Brown, and Bly (2008) examined the relationship between the big five personality traits and derailing traits in the context of leader effectiveness in the organization. They define a derailing trait as

"one that is associated with unexpected failure (of a leader) to reach a top position in an organization" (p. 131).

The research aligned derailing traits with an individual's character, supported by a composite scale that included: (a) ego-centered, (b) intimidating, (c) manipulating, (d) micro-managing, and (e) passive-aggressive (Robie et al., 2008). Surprisingly, the research indicated that with high derailing trait ratings (which translates to a lack of character, [p.131]) leaders had higher levels of performance, subverting a commonly held position that a lack of character is always detrimental to both leader and follower performance (Robie et al., 2008). It presents a question of how the same analysis would fare against similar traits and characteristics of the charismatic or transformational leader.

At a basic behavioral level, it is not unreasonable to link an intimidating, manipulative, ego-centric leader with individual and/or organizational success. As offered in the Breadth section, tyrannical leaders have their historical place. And appropriately, the merit, relative success, or social value is noted as legitimate subject matter. Robie et al. (2008) cite the very public history of Jack Welch, the extremely successful former CEO of General Electric, as a contemporary example. Welch had a widely publicized, Machiavellian style of leadership. His top executives were attributed as referring to the environment created by Welch's leadership behavior as not going off to work, but "going off to war" (Robie et al., 2008, p. 134).

Charisma and motivation. From a purely motivational perspective, researchers examined the theoretical basis and connection of the relationship between charismatic leaders and their followers (Javidan & Waldman, 2003). They identified three motivationally-related effects that

charismatic leaders have on followers: (a) self worth or esteem, (b) loyalty and commitment, and (c) performance (Javidan & Waldman, 2003).

Charismatic leaders affect follower self esteem and self worth because of the leader's higher level values, thus increasing the same in followers as a matter of association (p. 234). Loyalty and commitment are enhanced because of the trust placed in the charismatic leader's vision, values, morality, and motives (p. 234). Javidan and Waldman (2003) cite research that supports the positive performance-related effects of charismatic leaders, noting that they generally enjoy more and greater success personally and within their work groups than do less or non-charismatic leaders.

They conclude from their research, however, that in the public sector, risk taking and other charismatic leader traits and behaviors may be limited and constrained because of the culture and environment generally associated with public sector organizations (Javidan & Waldman, 2003, p. 239). It is worth contemplating whether or not this observation is or should be strictly limited to charismatic leadership and the public sector. This is practical input for consideration in the Application section of this project.

Synthesis. The trait relationship to leadership indicates that there are direct connections to the personality profile and behavior of the leader. As found by Johnson et al. (2004), genetic associations can be drawn between the big five personality traits and those behaviors associated with both transformational and transactional leadership. There is reason to suggest that their research supports the view that leaders may be born with certain traits and characteristics associated with leadership. In contrast, Senge (2006) and Bono and Judge (2004) advocate that leaders are essentially made and can be taught a battery of effective attributes and leadership

characteristics. The learning leader premise extends this hypothesis in the context of traits and behaviors associated with transformational leadership (Bono & Judge, 2004).

Yet to be discussed are environment and circumstances or situations, where Javidan and Waldman (2003) posit that at least in the public sector, leadership traits and performance may be held back, intentionally or otherwise, because of the politicized environment associated with public sector cultures. The scope of the trait discussion also implies to some degree that self perception is a critical issue in leadership development. Environmental influences may also detract from or mitigate leadership traits when self perceptions and constraining beliefs form the basis of how individuals perceive themselves and others when defining leaders (Shertzer & Schuh, 2004).

In the context of leadership development, further study may be helpful to understand if there is such a state that might be characterized as latent leadership. Discussions of charismatic influence on performance and transformational empowerment explain the leadership role in motivating follower behavior and helping to define leader effectiveness. But there is perhaps further discussion to pursue around uncovering those individuals who do not yet know, otherwise recognize, or find themselves with the opportunity or position to lead. In the learning leader or other models there may be ways to uncover and demonstrate to the latent leader that they have the traits and capacity to be opened up to their leadership capability. The social value is that if misplaced self perceptions and under-developed, genetically supported traits are present, there may be a viable mechanism to draw out those talents to develop and foster a larger pool of leaders in the future.

Behavior and Leadership

The Breadth section suggests that based on the interaction of traits and circumstances, or situations, how an individual performs the act of leadership is the behavioral response. The behavioral theory component helps to define what the affect or outcome of leadership will be. The interdependence and interaction of traits and circumstances or situations thus appear to compel the behavioral response. Zaccaro (2007) noted that leadership was comprised of complex behaviors explained in part by leader traits. Furthermore, he explained that it was very important to consider the integration and interaction of various combinations of personality traits and leader characteristics and how they influenced leadership behavior (Zaccaro, 2007, p.6).

Rooke and Torbert (2005) defined leader behavior in a scenario that couples interpretations of surroundings to a particular leader profile, described as leadership "action logic" (p. 1). Across 25 years of continuous research using a sentence completion survey tool, they were able to determine how leaders defined their own behaviors as a reaction to the environment around them (Rooke & Torbert, 2005). Seven action logic profiles emerged from their research that identifies a leader's dominant way of thinking and behaving: (a) Opportunist, (b) Diplomat, (c) Expert, (d) Achiever, (e) Individualist, (f) Strategist, and (g) Alchemist (pp. 1-2).

Most notable from this trait-related behavioral profiling is that the action logic categories are ordered from least (Opportunist) to most effective (Alchemist) in terms of personal and organizational performance success (Rooke & Torbert, 2005). For example, the Opportunist is the least successful and is defined by trait profiles and behavioral drivers that include egocentrism, manipulativeness, and mistrust (p. 2). On the other end is the Alchemist, a transformational leader; charismatic, demonstrating high moral standards, capable of achieving

great social and organizational change, and demonstrably reinventing themselves and their organizations in significant ways (p. 6).

In the action logic model there is also a progression of thinking that necessitates the integration of situational theory. The model is reliant on the leader's self awareness in terms of defining action logic as a reaction to environments and circumstances (p. 1). Additionally, Rooke and Torbert (2005) discovered from their research that by applying planned and structured leadership development interventions, that leaders could be taught to progress upwards through the various action logic behavior profiles, thus attaining organizational, social and personal transformations (pp. 3-8). This is noteworthy in affirmatively supporting the question of whether or not leaders are made. In their research framework, leaders are made and can be advanced in their leadership acumen by way of a continuum of behavioral learning; i.e.; action logic steps.

Finally, they discovered that the action logic categories represented by leadership styles and behaviors could be used to describe teams and organizations, acknowledging in particular that Strategist teams were the most desirable and successful overall (Rooke & Torbert, 2005, p. 10). This may also suggest that leadership development, using the seven transformations models, could be designed and employed in alignment with given organizational environments for the benefit of individuals, teams, or both.

Relating transformational leader behavior and teams. In Rook and Torbert's (2005) seven transformations model, the Strategist behavioral profile is the ideal, transformational leadership model for both the individual as well as teams (pp. 3-10). The profile is characterized by transformational traits, thus implying that teams are also: (a) effective change agents, (b) ethical and moral, (c) collaborative, (d) sensitive to personal and organizational relationships,

and (e) capable of carrying out socially conscious and responsible visions (p. 6). However, the group and individual parallel application raises the question of compatibility and whether or not there is transference of transformational attributes and behaviors between Strategist teams and Strategist leaders that can occur concurrently. This is a question to consider going forward.

In the transformational context, Schaubroeck, Cha, and Lam (2007) assert that leadership behavior has a direct and measurable effect on team values. Across a host of research, transformational behavior has been found to be positively associated with individual performance (Schaubroeck et al., 2007). In teams, Schaubroeck et al. (2007) found that leader behavior was closely associated with group behavior and performance influenced by norms, values, and other forces that occur in teams.

They conclude through the results of their survey of 218 financial services teams that transformational leadership behavior in particular, creates team potency- defined as the team members' generalized "beliefs about the capabilities of the team across tasks and contexts" (Schaubroeck et al., 2007, p. 1021). They further demonstrated that this effect was empowered by specific leadership behavior mechanisms: (a) the leader communicates high level confidence in the team's ability to achieve ambitious goals, having a contagious effect on team members' own level of confidence, (b) transformational leaders model behaviors and push followers to engage in analysis, (c) leaders show genuine concern for followers' needs, providing critical and outwardly supportive behavior, and (d) transformational leaders openly promote and demonstrate cooperation among team members (Schaubroeck et al., 2007).

Hui, Chiu, Yu, Cheng, and Tse (2007) expanded on the leadership behavioral relationship to team performance by analyzing performance related to a given service climate. As a

behavioral concept, service climate reflects an understanding within a group of how to behave in different settings and with different customer populations; including the team's appraisal of the organizations attitude towards employee well being and the concern shown by the organization for customer well being (Hui et al., 2007). Citing transformational leadership behaviors, Hui et al. (2007) posit that moral character, ethical leadership, fairness, trust building, and impartial and non-favoring treatment are effective leader behaviors measurably associated with transformational leadership and the quality of work of teams.

They further argue that leaders who build positive relationships with team members will in turn influence the level of discretionary behavior of empowered and happier colleagues, directly related to favorable service delivery to both internal and external customers (Hui et al., 2007). The end result is that a favorable service climate generated by transformational leadership behavior is associated with excellent service and team or follower satisfaction (Hui et al., 2007, p.153). This is a viable leadership and team development concept to carry forward into the Application section.

Leadership behavior, teams, and the role of conflict. It is worth discussing briefly the role of conflict in the team consideration and in relation to leadership behavior. Conflict in and of itself can be considered a situational, contingent, or conditional issue in team or group scenarios (Igor & Karakowsky, 2007). As such, leadership behavior is critical for successful team or organizational functioning and performance (Igor & Karakowsky, 2007). As team decision making becomes more popular, team leadership becomes more important and it is known that teams that make good decisions are those that can manage conflict successfully (Igor & Karakowsky, 2007).

Conflict is distinguished in two categories: (a) cognitive or task conflict- which focuses on substantive issues associated with team tasks, involving differences of opinion, viewpoints, and ideas, and (b) affective conflict—which is characterized by negative, emotional conflict that plays off of team member incompatibility (Igor & Karakowsky, 2007). Leader behavior can impact the performance of the team decision making process by stimulating cognitive conflict and my reducing or minimizing the instances of cognitive conflict becoming affective conflict (Igor & Karakowsky, 2007).

Burns (1978) theorized that conflict was central to the execution of leadership and that effective leadership could shape conflict into an output of desired behavior (p. 38). In his view, conflict was exemplified in areas such as competition for resources, disagreement on goals, and even job competition (Burns, 1978). Additionally, Burns (1978) postulates that the leader's behavioral role is to exploit (cognitive) conflict in higher order issues such as values conflict, where a transformational approach can help followers or teams see an issue from a higher order level (pp. 42-43). Burns (1978) defined the highest conflict leadership model as that of the Intellectual Leader—a transforming leader with a conscious, analytical, and creative purpose (p. 142).

Leadership behavior can affect team behavior where the leader focuses on clear rules of conduct and emphasizes those leader behaviors that affect patterns of team conflict- good or bad (Igor & Karakowsky, 2007). Interestingly, Igor & Karakowsky's (2007) research indicated that appropriate leadership behaviors ascribed to team conflict management are generally recognized as being associated with transactional leadership (p. 42). They further note that these leadership behaviors are best suited to minimize the transmission of affective conflict from cognitive

conflict (Igor & Karakowsky, 2007). Finally, transformational leadership behaviors are cited as being the most suitable for promoting a vision and motivating team members to engage in and maintain a level of cognitive conflict and thus a more successful team (Igor & Karakowsky, 2007).

Moral leadership behavior and social impact. Tead (1933, 1935) addressed the role of moral leadership as a core attribute, important societal consideration, and critical construct of proper leadership behavior. Brown and Trevino (2006) consider moral leadership, referred to as socialized charismatic leadership (p. 954), which they defined as those leaders who serve as ethical role models and who are able to arouse in followers and teams a collective sense of mission (p. 954; also Choi, 2006). A significant amount of values-based charismatic and socialized transformational leadership theory support their research and conclusions. They use traditional theory to draw a correlation between ethical leader behavior and its influence on the values and various behaviors of teams, followers, and work groups (Brown & Trevino, 2006).

Brown and Trevino (2006) cite normative theory and argue that leaders should in fact play an "ethical authority role" in the leadership context (p. 955). Therefore, the trait and behavioral profile of the socialized charismatic or transformational leader also implies socially-transforming leadership behaviors that include: (a) conveying ethical values, (b) are other-centered rather than self-centered, and (c) outwardly role model ethical conduct (Brown & Trevino, 2006, p. 955; also Choi, 2006).

While a focus of their research was to determine the effect of socialized charismatic leadership on reducing team, follower, and workgroup deviance, Brown & Trevino's (2006) work has significant implications for ethics, leadership, conduct, and values in team or group

environments. Developing socialized transformational leadership represents a proactive social change measure with both internal and external benefits given the assumption that it is a trainable skill and attributes (Brown & Trevino, 2006). Who would argue against training leaders to actively promote ethical and moral conduct, ethical values, and focus followers, regardless of capacity, on "collective rather than selfish interest?" (Brown & Trevino, 2006)

Synthesis. The traits and characteristics of transformational leadership provide a key theme in the contemporary discussion of leadership behavior. Traditional theories such as transactional leadership and emerging concepts that includes the seven transformations model, provide new insights into leadership and team development strategies related to specific leader attributes and behavior (Rooke & Torbert, 2007).

This research in particular supports traditional behavioral theory advanced by: (a) Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999), who created linkages between follower and leader traits, will, motive, intentions, and aspiration and the resultant desired behavior, (b) Stogdill (1959), who advocated leadership training that would maximize, influence, and optimize group performance through the leaders' shaping of group values, (c) Bradford and Cohen's (1984) post heroic leader "developer" behavioral model designed to evolve team skills, morale, goals, and common expectations, (d) Senge's (1999) learning organization and transformational leadership model that promotes continuous leadership demonstration, including the exemplary philosophy of "changing behavior by being the behavior" (p. 162), and (e) Kouzes and Posner's (2007) five practices leadership behavior model that advocates learning leaders who inspire, model, challenge, enable, and encourage through a learned set of skills and abilities (pp. 14-23).

The outcrop of contemporary analysis is the common thread of evidence-based belief that leadership -including certain traits and the requisite behaviors to effectively execute leadership- can be taught, and that leaders can be made.

The Situational Perspective and Leadership

The Breadth section concludes that the trifecta of traits, behavior, and situations constitute the platform for leadership to occur. The situation or circumstances represent the external, environmental condition that contributes to leadership. Hackman and Wageman (2007) suggest that understanding the role of the situation requires distinguishing both theoretically and empirically between those situations where leader actions have a direct relationship to an outcome and those where leader behaviors make no difference at all. They go on to add the question of how leaders' personal attributes interact with situational properties to shape specific outcomes (Hackman & Wageman, 2007). They ultimately conclude that neither traits nor situations alone are sufficient to explain leader behavior, but that the interactions between traits and situations are what counts in relation to the outcome of leadership behavior (Vroom & Jago, 2007; as cited in Hackman & Wageman, 2007).

Contingency relationship. From this perspective evolves the discussion of contingency models to understand the relationships between traits, situations, and behavior (Hackman & Wageman, 2007). The contingency leadership model addressed the relationship of leader traits and situational variables. The leadership development value of the contingency model suggests that the most desirable scenario places a leader in a situation that is most favorable to their individual style (Hackman & Wageman, 2007). However, contingency models can become overly complex as moderators and variables are added (Hackman & Wageman, 2007).

Situational relationship to leader behavior. In a more simplified model, leaders' traits represent the mechanism of selection such that their leadership behavior is then constrained, manipulated, controlled, or otherwise dictated by the situations they face (Vroom & Jago, 2007). In relation to other theoretical contexts, Ng et al. (2008) raised concerns about the lack of examination given the big five personality traits in relation to situations. They specifically questioned the "conditions under which specific traits operate" (p. 733).The question has relevance in connection to the next discussion about executive leadership and job demands.

As discussed briefly in the behavioral section, Zaccaro (2007) noted that certain attributes such as leadership skills and expertise, are bound and constrained by situational requirements which in turn determine a specific application of leader behavior. He posed three arguments related to leader behavior in relation to situations (p. 9). Someone with one particular set of leadership skills and expertise may thrive in one situation but not another (Zaccaro, 2007). He argued additionally that the behavioral acts needed by the leader to be effective will vary widely across different situations (Zaccaro, 2007, p. 9). Finally, Zaccaro (2007) expands the second argument by pointing out that contemporary leaders, to be effective, need to be able to adapt specific traits, attributes and behaviors according to a range of changing and emerging situations. The attributes include: (a) cognitive complexity and flexibility, (b) social and emotional intelligence, (c) openness and adaptability, and (d) a tolerance for ambiguity. It is worth noting that many of these specific attributes appear throughout in relation to transformational leadership attributes.

In a contemporary leadership research project, Hambrick, Finkelstein, and Mooney (2005) examined executive job demands as a situational or environmental variable affecting

leader behavior and how those behaviors affect the organization and follower behaviors. For example, job demands, as a situational variable, can influence an executive's leadership behavior in such a way that they transfer their pressure onto followers proportionately (Hambrick et al., 2005, p. 482).

Citing that leadership or executive job demands can emanate from task challenges, performance challenges, and executive aspirations (p. 486), they also postulate that job demands as a situational factor can potentially evolve into bullying and threatening leader behavior and have negative ethical and social implications (Hambrick et al., 2005, pp. 482-486). The integration of situational variables and behavior is evident in examples from Enron to the constant crisis-based pressure of a 911 emergency call center.

Strong and weak situations. Hambrick et al. (2005) also addressed the relevance of weak situation environments. Defined as the ambiguity of stimuli, weak situations influence leadership behavior by causing a leader to draw from personal experience and dominant traits driven by the circumstances at hand (p. 479). Masood, Dani, Burns, and Backhouse (2006) expanded on weak and strong situational influence, citing that situations can constrain or facilitate leader behavior allowing leaders to change aspects of a situation in order to be more effective. The variableness of a strong or weak situation then has a direct relationship to leadership behavior. Additionally, weak situations are reliant on traits and individual differences of leaders, since no clear direction is provided by the situation (Masood et al., 2006). Conversely, the research indicates that strong situations—where direction, rules, demands, or other influences are clear— tend to minimize the effects that traits have on leader behavior (Masood et al., 2006, p. 945).

Connecting back to contingency principles, Masood et al. (2006) assert that there is no one way to lead. Good leaders, however, will assess situational strengths and weaknesses and adapt their behaviors to each unique situation.

Synthesis. The situational component of leadership appears to be one of the more complex issues and variables in the interaction and integration of traits, behaviors, and situations. Vroom and Jago (2007) suggested that one of the most important aspects of leader behavioral research, for example, was the acknowledgement of the role played by situation, environment or context in leadership. As opposed to traits, they postulate that leader behavior is as much influenced by the situation faced by the leader as by their disposition (Vroom and Jago, 2007, p. 19). As the role of situations unfolds, contemporary researchers are including situational variables in their projects as a mechanism to determine leader behavior or as moderating variables measured for their effect and integration with traits or behavior (Vroom & Jago, 2007, p. 19).

Zaccaro (2007) framed the distinction and integration of attributes, behavior, and situations, noting that qualities of the leader foster "behavioral variability in response to situational variability" (p. 10). In clarifying the relationship, he notes in conclusion that situational parameters then drive leader behavior and "what the leader does," complementing the role of traits in defining "who the leader is" (Zaccaro, 2007, p. 10).

The implications for the Application section relevant to the role of situations are drawn from the conclusions of Masood et al. (2006) and Vroom and Jago (2007). To affect transformational change, weak situations are desirable where employees are given the freedom to make decisions in their work—a condition that can improve employee morale and confidence

(Masood et al., 2006, p. 948). Where the leader is concerned, Vroom and Jago (2007) conclude that: (a) organizational and/or follower effectiveness is affected by situational factors not under the control of the leader, (b) situations shape how leaders behave, and (c) situations influence the consequences of leader behavior (pp. 22-23).

Literature Essay: Depth Synthesis

”There are no generally accepted definitions of what leadership is, no dominant paradigms for studying it, and little agreement about the best strategies for developing and exercising it” (Hackman & Wagemen, 2007).

The statement shapes a relatively current directive with regards to the need for further examination of leadership and leadership development. Like an emerging technology, leadership has to be pushed forward to be and remain relevant. Certain beliefs, however, seem to withstand the ongoing scrutiny of leadership study. Those principles that are upheld over time through rigorous challenge give hope to the novice inquiry. For example, Tead’s (1933, 1935) beliefs about the leadership potential in everyone are still supported and furthered in the most basic terms such that “every follower is, at least potentially, a leader” (Hackman & Wageman, 2007, p. 46). The notion is carried further to suggest that leadership and followership have evolved to the point of being “inextricably bound together,” such that the distinction between leaders and followers is truly blurred and recast as “shared leadership” (Hackman & Wageman, 2007, p. 46). This is important conceptually for developing the Application section. In the absence of consistent leadership presence and behavior, a changing environmental issue, it seems logical to consider focusing on the potential of followers to become more directly engaged in leading

themselves. Supporting this thought are the concepts and research findings explored in both the Breadth and Depth sections.

As the blurring lines are advanced, and traits, behavior, and situations become more apparently interconnected, concepts such as self leadership begin to emerge among contemporary forms including transformational, contingent, and charismatic leadership (Houghton & Yoho, 2005). Organizations are becoming more decentralized and focusing more on pushing down responsibility and empowering members at all levels to take more responsibility (p. 65). As a result, empowering leadership styles and self leading behaviors are encouraged, taught, and implemented.

Studies done by Parry and Sinha (2005) reinforced existing empirical evidence that leadership training does in fact result in more effective leadership behavior among leaders and followers in both public and private sector environments. The result is greater individual feelings of autonomy, commitment, creativity, independence, and overall satisfaction (Houghton & Yoho, 2005).

It is a hopeful thought to successfully apply forward thinking leadership concepts to a public service environment. Regardless, the potential for measurable social change is certainly encouraging and perhaps even feasible.

APPLICATION

AMDS 8532: PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE APPLICATION OF A THEORY OF LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Contemporary theory obtained from the Breadth and Depth sections will address how executives can effectively use leadership development strategies as an empowerment tool within a public sector organization with multiple represented employee groups. Specific recommendations will target the issue of employee empowerment within highly transient public sector management and supervisory structures. The Application demonstration will generate a leadership development recommendation for represented staff employees in specific division units in a public sector organization. The program will also provide the CEO and human resources management unit with leadership development concepts and strategies to stabilize and improve the performance of divisions and/or division units that have frequent management or supervisory turnover in the public sector.

Background

The King County Sheriff's Office (KCSO) serves over 1.8 million citizens spread across 2100 square miles in Washington State. King County is the 12th largest county in the United States with the city of Seattle as the primary urban center (KCSO web site, 2008; KCSO Annual Report, 2007). There are 39 additional suburban cities throughout the county, served by the Sheriff in a role of concurrent jurisdiction as a regional service provider. The Sheriff's Office has over 1,100 employees with an annual budget of over 147 million dollars. The Sheriff is a separately elected, non-partisan official mandated by law to function as the chief peace officer of the county (KCSO web site, 2008). Within the organization, there are five distinct labor unions

that represent both commissioned law enforcement personnel (70%) and civilian employees (30%). This includes a unique bargaining unit for the rank of captain, a senior layer of 21 commissioned law enforcement officers who primarily function as mid-level managers, supervising both commissioned and civilian staff.

As a separate bargaining unit, the captains have the right to compete for and transfer at will to other opportunities (within their narrow ranks) and may also be involuntarily rotated or moved to different assignments within the organization with relatively little notice. Most captains stay in a specific assignment for a period of two to four years, depending on the complexity of the assignment. While there is a variety of specialized law enforcement and management training available on an ongoing basis, the KCSO does not a have a specific career or strategic management development program for captains.

On the other end, civilian represented employees tend to stay in specific positions longer (often related to unique skills, training, or expertise) with comparatively fewer opportunities for movement or advancement within the organization (Kirk & Wohrle, 2008).

This application project specifically addresses a leadership gap within the organization involving highly trained civilian employees who work in the emergency 911 call center and their transient commissioned staff (captains) management structure.

E911 Emergency Communications Centers

One of the essential functions of a Sheriff's Office is to provide emergency 911 (e911) call handling services. This statutory duty includes: (a) handling all e911 calls for the unincorporated areas of the county and cities that contract for police and e911 call services, (b) dispatching of all calls for service of Sheriff's deputies, and (c) dispatching calls for animal

control, fire, metro transit, and transfer of medical emergency calls handling (KCSO, 2008). On any given day, the KCSO e911 Communications Center (Comm Center) handles an average of 1750 calls in a 24 hour period (Kirk & Wohrle, 2008).

Operational structure and staffing. With an annual budget of approximately 5 million dollars, the unit is supported financially through the county general fund, contracts for services, and Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) funds. The PSAP grant funding is 100% performance based, requiring call receivers to answer 90% of the calls coming in within 10 seconds 80% of the time (KCSO, 2008). Software tracks this performance in real time. Unit, shift, and individual employee performance reports are generated monthly (KCSO, 2008). The performance requirement is noteworthy relative to the high intensity and high stress work environment.

The KCSO Comm Center is a separately housed and fully self contained unit with an authorized strength of 94 full time employees. This includes: (a) 79 call receivers and dispatchers, (b) eight civilian line supervisors, (c) one civilian operations manager, (d) a captain as the senior manager in charge, and (e) five support personnel (Kirk & Wohrle, 2008).

The Comm Center operates three shifts, 24 hours per day, seven days per week. The captain and the operations manager work the primary day shift Monday through Friday from 7:00AM to 3:30PM. On that shift, the lowest and highest minimum staffing requirements of eight and twenty one call receivers and dispatchers are required respectively (KCSO, 2008). Therefore, at the peak time, the span of control (or direct supervision by the captain) is relatively small because of the presence of the operations manager. The remaining two day shifts and the two other shifts spanning all seven days have no supervision (or direct leadership) above line level managers, who are generally peers who have been promoted from within (Kirk & Wohrle,

2008). There are two supervisors on day shift with the captain and operations manager, but only two supervisors alone on the graveyard shift and three supervisors on the swing shift at a supervisor to employee ratio of about seven to one during peak times.

Minimum staffing requirements for all shifts are determined using a model developed by the Association of Public Safety Communications Officials (APCO) that merges call volume, transaction time, and service quality standards to project and determine the number of call takers required (KCSO, 2008). However, there are no published standards for direct span of control, supervision, or shift team leadership above the level of shift supervisors in this highly charged environment.

Personnel investment: training, tenure, and turnover. Considering parallels in the private sector, Mahesh and Kasturi (2006) note that organizations often fail to capture and exploit the overall strategic value of their call center operations. More importantly, they note that the literature indicates a conflict between personnel management and the overall operational focus of call centers (p. 137). Research also linked the performance of call center employees to factors such as customer satisfaction, loyalty, organizational performance, and overall execution of strategy (Mahesh & Kasturi, 2006). Similarly, it is noted that with the stress, job satisfactions, skills and knowledge, emotions management, and work environment controls, that call center personnel are notoriously "underpaid, undertrained, overworked, and highly stressed," (P. 139). This is a significant point in this project given that emergency call center workers are required to make life and death decisions at any given moment during any given shift. Their life revolves around that call coming to them without notice.

Understanding the personnel environment is critical to establishing key issues related to leadership, employee performance, behavior, and morale in the unit. Using 2003-2006 data, the average captain in charge of this unit stays for two years or less. Call receivers and dispatchers have an average length of stay of 7.72 years and line supervisors average 9 years on the job (Kirk & Wohrle, 2008). Each call receiver requires a total of 920 hours of training to be fully functional on the job. Using an average rate of $24.72 per hour based on a five year employee, it costs $22,742 to train one call receiver (Kirk & Wohrle, 2008). This does not include recruitment, civil service, background, training, and human resources staff expense.

The average number of vacant positions during the period was 8.125 on a monthly basis with the number of separations for all reasons averaging 15 annually. This translated into a 26% employee turnover rate for the period (KCSO, 2008). Therefore, the organization was losing $341,130 on average annually in direct training investments alone through separations plus the administrative and support costs and the mandatory overtime expense to cover the ongoing average vacancies. It was further calculated that call receivers were averaging 362 hours of leave time (52% of the leave time attributable to absenteeism) and another 282 hours of lost time due to position turnover (KCSO, 2008; Paton, 2005; benefits.org, 2008; Management Services, 2006). As a result, existing employees were available to work only 69% of the available scheduled hours, thus creating a significant overtime need, often on a mandatory basis.

Management Issues and Contributing Factors

A national survey by APCO revealed that the primary reasons for voluntary separations from call receiver and dispatcher positions was due to mandatory overtime (KCSO, 2008). Mandatory overtime has been a historical issue for the KCSO. Mandatory overtime coupled with

the pressure of having to meet and maintain PSAP response standards for call receivers contribute to an extremely high stress environment and high turnover rates among newer employees in particular.

Research concerning police officer fatigue and burnout suggest parallels with call receivers and dispatchers (Vila, Kenney, Morrison, & Reuland, 2000). Fatigue among police officers occurs as a result of an integration of factors including (a) unrealistic emotional expectations, (b) constant pressure to resolve complicated, emotionally charged situations, (c) irregular sleep patterns caused by excessive overtime and shift changes, and (d) the compounding effects of shifting moods, behaviors, increasing anxiety, and declining performance (Vila et al., 2000).

Often engaged directly with these same police officers, call receiver work also requires a significant emotional investment. Display rules are those that define the parameters of emotional behavior that a call receiver is expected and allowed to express with callers, regardless of whether they are citizens or a deputy in this case (Wilk & Moynihan, 2005). This "emotional labor" often requires a certain amount of ongoing acting between the call receiver and caller that ultimately leads to emotional exhaustion, extreme stress, and job burnout in call center work (p. 917). Wilk and Moynihan (2005) also suggest that the stress and ultimately conflict compound as call workers attempt to adjust to the different interpretations and demands of changing supervisors. These subordinate adjustments must also occur in the same environment and at the same time as calls from deputies and citizens are coming in. Emotionally, call receivers also go through a roller coaster of highs and lows throughout a shift. Workers describe the job as boredom interrupted by the occasional high stakes personal drama and endless barking dog

complaints. In parallel, extreme fatigue mixed with crushing boredom in police work increases the likelihood for extreme responses, anxiety, fearfulness, mood swings, and the likelihood of poor decision making and stress related illness (Vila et al., 2000).

The manager and supervisor role. Beyond the concrete affects of overtime fatigue, KCSO exit interviews also indicated that untenable working conditions related to unchecked management, coworker, and supervisor behaviors were creating a hostile work environment and extremely low morale, especially among newly recruited call receivers (Kirk & Wohrle, 2008).

Research demonstrates that where service workers feel that the organization has failed them in some way, that the perception can lead to a variety of results including higher turnover, moodiness, cynicism, and declining job satisfaction (Deery, Iverson, & Walsh, 2006). Psychological contract breach is that condition where organizational trust declines, employee relations are negative, and absenteeism is generally higher as workers compensate for the complete loss of faith in a reciprocal exchange between themselves and the organization (p. 167). In the KCSO scenario, the breach may be in part attributable to management and supervisor behavior. Regardless, the outcome is higher absenteeism as noted earlier in the application discussion.

Research by Harrison, Newman, and Roth (2006) extend the breach concept into the area of job attitudes, performance, and overall organizational commitment, framed as Organizational Citizenship Behavior {OCB} (p. 306). Collectively, the idea of "contextual performance" ties together the net outcome of attitude, commitment, satisfaction, and performance as a total behavior (pp. 306-307). On one end, the negative effects of management and supervisor behaviors can be measured in turnover and absenteeism. However, in a reformatory or attitudinal

commitment context, individual and group efforts from line workers (call receivers) have the potential to minimize the effects of the supervisors and in fact, can potentially create a more inclusive and cohesive working group (Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006). Identified as contextual performance, a more interpersonally focused behavior emerges where coworkers help one another more frequently, encourage and self direct the improvement of morale, and support and defend organizational objectives (Harrison et al., 2006). Of greatest significance, contextual performance drives formal and informal connections among workers, the work, and the organization that reduce employee turnover (p. 307).

Supervision and leadership engagement. On the management level, there are several issues contributing to a negative work environment. Two full shifts per week have only minimum line level supervisors present. There is no direct contact from the captain or the operations manager during the graveyard, swing, and two day shifts, leaving these employees disconnected from the organization on several levels. Changing senior management via the captains contributes to negative employee morale. Differing management styles, personalities, and behaviors have been a disruptive influence to the unit as a whole (Kirk & Wohrle, 2008). As a result, it has been extremely difficult to establish any continuity or team unity among workers and their chain of supervision (Kirk & Wohrle, 2008). Employees, including line supervisors, note informally that as soon as they have become used to the management style of a captain, they leave the unit and the process starts all over again, contributing to stress, operational confusion, and eventually, employee conflict and absenteeism (Kirk & Wohrle, 2008).

Unprepared leadership. There is no specific training for captains particular to this unit. It has been the general practice that accepting the assignment entitles the captain to evaluate the

operation and make whatever changes they deem suitable. The operations manager is a protected, long time employee who deals with the changing management in the mode of a "survivor." Kirk and Wohrle (2008) noted that resentment has built up over time because of the lack of leadership in the unit combined with the lack of opportunity for the different shifts to be more directly involved in their own decisions and management. It is difficult for a third shift call receiver to proactively embrace or even take seriously the directives of a captain or operations manager whom they most likely have never seen or met on the job.

Structural conflict. Line supervisors interact with call receivers more as peers because they have usually advanced to their position from the same ranks. Peer supervisors are more empathetic, but tend to lead less and may be too personally familiar and less engaged because of a lack of developed leadership skills (Kirk & Wohrle, 2008). Additionally, civilian supervisors and call receivers (as well as the operations manager) all have the same bargaining unit, creating a conflict of interest, especially concerning issues such as discipline, the granting of overtime, and other types of leave. While this is more an operations policy issue, the organization understands anecdotally that supervisors (both commissioned and noncommissioned) have difficulty in decision making because of the lack of separation between managers and line workers. This is especially an issue in discipline cases and overtime management.

Leader selection. To date, there has not been an organized effort to match the traits, personalities, and attributes of captains interested in the assignment to the leadership needs prescribed by the profiles sought after in call receivers (Kirk & Wohrle, 2008). While this may be an issue that requires bargaining with the guild, captains could realize a long term benefit to their individual career development if better job fit translates into overall improved unit

performance. Several theorists suggest that closer alignment of leaders and followers is likely to have a positive effect on morale, behaviors, satisfactions, and the operation of the unit overall (Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978; Tead, 1933).

Leadership Development Program

The Application specifically targets the Communications Center of the King County Sheriff's Office with recommendations for innovative leadership development strategies primarily targeting call receivers. The goal of the program is to help the organization: (a) reduce the negative impact of changing leadership, (b) develop call receiver self-leadership capacity and team identity, (c) improve the overall morale of call receivers, and (d) reduce call receiver turnover.

The strategies specifically focus on two underlying themes: (a) mitigation of the negative impacts of changing leadership through a transformational and transactional leadership intervention, and (b) increase overall call receiver empowerment through self leadership development training.

Theoretical Framework

Hersey and Blanchard (1972) and Senge (1990) advocated that leadership can be taught when an available opportunity is recognized. Stogdill (1959) suggested that leadership, as a behavioral outcome, exists within people as a natural ability to draw on. Hersey and Blanchard's (1972) discussion of emergency room workers and firefighters provided a relevant framework for defining "available opportunity," a clearly comparable parallel to the environment of E911 call receivers and dispatchers.

There is a narrow operational and performance platform in the e911 work environment that provides the opportunity to apply specific leadership concepts. Combining the mentioned theories with Burns' (1978) moral leadership model, e911 call receivers can be appealed to from the perspective that: (a) they perform a critical societal function in helping to protect and save lives and property, (b) they are responsible for the safety and lives of first responders (police officers, fire fighters, search & rescue workers, emergency medical technicians, etc.), whom they dispatch into life and death situations, (c) they have a moral duty to the humans calling for help as their actions and decisions carry the weight of one way power and control over lives on the other end of the line, and (d) that by accepting and performing to extremely high performance standards, they directly affect and control the likelihood of a positive outcome in life and death situations when moments and split second decisions count.

Rationale. These are powerful and compelling attributes of the work that create an opportunity to empower the call receivers, unify them in shift teams, and appeal to higher order needs. Lewin (as cited in Gold, 1999) is relevant in the behavioral context, especially considering a moral, emotional, and more purposeful order in the prescribed work. He noted that given the opportunity, we will "set goals at the boundary of our ability" (p. 144). Because of the intimate and individualized interface with the public they serve and direct line role as life savers, call receivers are a viable audience for applying a self leadership development model.

The Building Blocks: Incremental Influence, Autonomy, and Shared Leadership

Merely attempting to train leadership over simplifies the complex relationship between individuals collectively sharing space in a given work environment. Various literature and theory brought to this project suggest that a person can be a leader without formal position or title (Betts

& Santoro, 2007). Likewise, a manager may direct effectively but does not naturally assume the role of a leader nor do they necessarily have the ability to lead. There is a distinct separation between the manager's role of command and control and a deliberate effort to create interpersonal exchanges between people with the intent to inspire and motivate. Characterizing the individualized nature of leadership through values and virtues, Betts and Santoro (2007) noted that leaders are people who do the right thing while managers simply do things right. To get to actually applying a self leadership design, it is critical to first consider several research based discussions that provide a foundation for individual and shared contributions to the concept.

It is also important to keep in mind that this application is addressing issues directly related to a public sector organization, working conditions, and employees. Perceptions and applications of leadership seem to differ significantly as noted in extensive federal employee surveys that noted that leadership overall is lacking, thus impacting worker satisfaction, motivation, and performance (Ingraham & Getha-Taylor, 2004). However, the research also reveals that those public agencies that have engaged in individualized leadership development have discovered that (a) entrepreneurial challenges uncover individuals who want to make a difference, (b) the effort to draw out leadership fosters determination and optimism, (c) leadership is a core capacity that can be learned and developed in individual employees, (d) a successful effort translates into individual empowerment, self direction, and group inclusiveness, and (e) that training leadership at all levels creates a viable culture for achieving vision and implementing change (Ingraham & Getha-Taylor, 2004).

Incremental influence as autonomy's precursor. Campbell, Dardis, and Campbell (2006) explored the individualization of leadership around the concept of incremental influence as a system of elevating and enhancing intrapersonal qualities and interpersonal skills (p. 30). Intuitively, the research indicates and implies that focusing leadership development in terms of a common set of enhanced leadership tools will ultimately produce a social influence process that affects workers as individual participants in the collective (Campbell, Dardis, and Campbell (2006). The relevant emphasis is on the development of the incremental influence of the individual. Strategically and in the context of this application, the contribution of incremental influence is in individual leadership skill and behavior that rises over and above the influence that comes from position, whether it be from a line supervisor, civilian manager, or a captain.

The specific skill components of incremental influence critical to individualized leadership development are (a) intrapersonal skill development, (b) interpersonal skill development, (c) cognitive skill development, (d) communication skill development, and (e) development of task specific skills (Campbell, Dardis, & Campbell, 2006).

Intrapersonal skills should reflect value systems and a moral compass that provide the social framework of a decision making leader. The cornerstone intrapersonal skills include heightened self awareness, self regulation, and self motivation (Campbell, Dardis, & Campbell, 2006). In the context of the call center, intrapersonal skills development may focus on empathy, patience, and a heightened sense of justice.

Interpersonal skills focus more on the working relationships in order to generate trust, respect, and commitment as a collective competence and ability. This skill set highlights

improved sensitivity, empathetic listening, constructive feedback, and team building (Campbell, Dardis, & Campbell, 2006).

Cognitive skills development focuses again on highly individualized capabilities including problem detection, problem analysis, and problem solving (p. 31). The research indicates that this ultimately leads to improved personal creativity and heightened self confidence (Campbell, Dardis, & Campbell, 2006). Individual call receivers functioning on a common plane when dealing with conflict, problems, and solutions may become less reliant on immediate supervisors for those needs and look more to managers and supervisors for more basic, operational oversight and problem solving.

Communication skills are an interpersonal process, but are closely integrated with transformational and charismatic leadership models to the degree that the topic is addressed separately (p. 33). From tasks to vision and conflict resolution, developed and enhanced communication skill is critical to incremental influence as an individualized leadership asset (Campbell, Dardis, & Campbell, 2006). To the call center application, internal, interpersonal, and external communications issues are central to the work environment and the solution of the fundamental problems between line workers and all supervisors. Campbell et al. (2006) also note that incremental influence via communications (skill) has powerful impacts on improving trust and confidence as well as creates more acutely sensitized skills for addressing real crisis and conflict and in resolving personal conflict and differences.

Finally, the incremental influence model posits that providing technical and professional training provides a common point of reference for basic management, decision making, and team development concepts (p. 34). Campbell et al. (2006) suggest that job rotation is a powerful

leadership teaching tool as broadening skills creates a common and unifying understanding. A call center application might consider rotating shift supervision responsibilities among workers on a regular basis combined with regular shift information sharing and problem solving meetings. By sharing responsibility for the operation, call receivers stand to gain new knowledge, perspective, and expertise common to all. The research indicates that offering guidance, sharing ideas, solving problems, and providing general task facilitation helps individuals gain influence, confidence, and a shared sense of direction (Campbell, Dardis, & Campbell, 2006). Armed with a better overall understanding of tasks, call receivers may be able to emerge to a broad sharing of the mission, vision, and common goals of the unit and organization at large. This provides a basis for a clearer separation between management's operational supervision and tasks and a higher level of leadership function and behavior at the call receiver level.

Incremental influence and self leadership. The overarching goal of developing incremental influence is to transform and help ordinary individuals to contribute on a daily basis as leaders while appropriately and legitimately overcoming any negative effects of managerial influence (Campbell, Dardis, & Campbell, 2006). Campbell et al. (2006) also note that the key advantages of developing incremental influence include (a) using leadership development as a means to get a group to defined goals, (b) separating leadership from managers as a way to empower individuals, and (c) a means to foster commitment beyond the basic requirements of the situation. At a higher values level, incremental influence moves the person toward a self leadership model. Campbell et al. also found that the higher values engendered loyalty, respect, and trust. It can be viewed as a social exchange process characterized by (a) the acquisition of

qualities and skills above the individuals' position, (b) improved individual interest in leadership behavior and the ability to actually participate, and (c) the acquisition of interpersonal capital used to execute leadership (Campbell, Dardis, & Campbell, 2006). At a core skills level for call receivers, the goal of incremental influence would be to attain problem defining and solving capacity, task facilitation (rotating supervision), and strong communications via self awareness and inspiration.

The focus of this discussion is on building leadership capacity in the individual call receivers, but not to the absolute exclusion of managers and supervisors. There is a leadership role at the managerial level. Many of the incremental influence concepts, for example, apply readily to developing leadership capability and sensitivity in individual managers and supervisors. Clearly, it may be self defeating to exclude supervisors from any of the same development steps as their charges.

Autonomy. The implementation of the application requires a significant level of change within the unit at large, within management and supervisory structures, and within the individuals at the call receiver and dispatcher level. Along with incremental influence, developing and fostering employee autonomy successfully supports certain types of organizational change (Hornung & Rousseau, 2007). Autonomy promotes positive worker proactivity in response to a variety of structural changes, transcending long standing environments characterized by managerial rigidity, compliance with orders, formal rules, narrow roles, and generally constrained employee behaviors (p. 401). Broadly, autonomy represents an environment that fosters self determination and personal initiative, empowering workers to engage in active, self directed behavior (p. 402). In the context of self leadership, autonomy is a

characteristic that shapes worker attitudes, motivation, team interaction, and behavior in an environment of freedom, independence, and personal discretion (Hornung & Rousseau, 2007).

Key findings of Hornung and Rousseau's (2007) study applied here to a strategy of developing self leadership determined that (a) supporting autonomy promotes responsibility and accountability in workers, (b) providing decision latitude (a characteristic of worker autonomy) yields flexibility and independence, (c) autonomy is directly related to coping with stress, and (d) autonomy improves workers' ability to creatively innovate and problem solve.

Autonomy is synonymous with proactivity, translating for workers into job control. The research further suggests that a direct benefit in the work environment is individualized initiative and job innovation (Hornung & Rousseau, 2007). The researchers tie proactivity and initiative (PI) to a critical mechanism called Role Breadth Self Efficacy (RBSE), defined as the perceived ability to carry out a more active, effective role that goes beyond the technical requirements of the job (p. 404). The study further indicates that desirable behaviors and self aware beliefs emerge as RBSE increases that include (a) strong self perception fostered by increased opportunity and ability to go beyond duties, (b) significant increase in self confidence, (c) increased willingness to take greater and more appropriate risks, (d) more self starting activity, and (e) significant increases in innovation around job processes (p. 404).

Hornung and Rousseau (2007) noted that RBSE increases with autonomy, personal control, and the prospect of influence on the job (p. 404). For the purposes of this application, there is a strong relationship between RBSE and the life changing role of call receivers where RBSE functions to validate the importance and direct engagement of the call receiver in the lives of others. RBSE and LSE potentially combine to establish a powerful baseline for engaging,

driving, supporting, and ultimately measuring a self leadership development model for call receivers (Hornung & Rousseau, 2007; Ng, Ang, & Chan, 2008).

Building toward a self leadership model, autonomy provides an empowering mechanism to constructively develop, support, and reinforce call receivers' beliefs and attitudes related to (a) the power to change and improve their work life, (b) the power to change and improve the product and its delivery to their various constituents, (c) constructive deviant behavior defined as the power to innovate, create, and challenge the units rules and norms to the benefit of their constituents, and (d) the power to proactively problem solve, taking on duties and responsibilities that reflect a new complexity in their role as individuals functioning on a broader organizational scale (Hornung & Rousseau, 2007, pp. 420-423).

Application of incremental influence and autonomy. Both incremental influence and autonomy provide mechanisms to help call receivers to develop individual self leadership skills. The ultimate goal should be to have a unit workforce that feels directly engaged in and responsible for the overall success of the unit as gauged by public, organizational, and managerial recognition of individual and collective achievement. In the existing call receiver environment, the most basic ways to apply incremental influence and autonomy principles would include (a) regular problem solving and teaching meetings among shifts, (b) regularly scheduled, individual professional training opportunities, and (c) community and internal outreach efforts to engage citizens and the organization in the role of the unit.

Evolving autonomy and self leadership to shared leadership. Contemporary studies indicate that members with common knowledge, skills, and abilities in a work group or unit can effectively share leadership through a rotation process in the leader role (Pearce, 2004). As an

evolving knowledge work environment, the call center provides unique and ongoing individual challenges where the needs of various caller groups and individual callers are constantly changing. As an example, growing immigrant communities alone push the boundaries and skills of individual call receivers, creating a constant learning environment. In this application, the individual challenges create the situational requirements of successful shared leadership (a) interdependency, (b) creativity, and (c) complexity (Pearce, 2004).

In the new immigrant example, language and cultural barriers alone provide unique and ongoing learning opportunities and experiences for individuals that create an ever changing problem solving and innovation environment for every shift. For shared leadership to be effective in this scenario, members must be fully engaged, participating, and equally guiding and influencing the problem solving aspect of a challenge (Pearce, 2004). In order for this group interaction to be successful as a leadership model, it is critical that simultaneous, ongoing, and mutual influence exists, creating a strong tie to individual leadership development (Pearce, 2004). To that end, the learning cycle created by the shared leadership experience strongly suggests that shared leadership drives and reinforces self leadership capacity. In the scenario where the group learns from the shared individual experiences, Betts and Santoro (2007) note that self leadership behavior succeeds as it raises the level of collective and individual achievement above the "organizations existing goals and expectations" (p. 8).

In the shared leadership application, Kaiser, Hogan, and Craig (2008) cite that the overall effect is a strengthening and reinforcement of self leadership practice. The team effort translates as a successful coordination of the individuals' efforts moving in the same direction to get to certain outcomes through jointly developed yet individualized mechanisms (p. 105). Kaiser et al.

(2008) further note that the collective knowledge building process results ultimately in the group sharing a preferred course of action while supporting and acknowledging individualism and autonomy. The research provides a foundation for a certain level of group maintenance behaviors around critical self leadership and transformational parameters that include (a) trust, (b) harmony, (c) cohesion, (d) conflict resolution, (e) cooperation, and (f) communication (Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008).

Kaiser et al. (2008) further note that the process amounts to a social problem solving capacity where the self directed members individually learn and develop skills and ultimately make contributions. In the call center, this might manifest itself as ongoing development of new ways to address and resolve caller conflicts. As a strategy, Kaiser et al. suggest that the self leadership contributions should ultimately achieve Lewin's "climate" scenario, where the individual reaction to the evolving environment directly and positively impacts motivation and behavior (p. 105). As the individuals contribute as leaders, the shared interpretation shapes a work group climate. If this scenario is working, the ultimate outcome is the positive shaping of norms, values, and culture that become the standard for the group as prescribed by the collective, individual behavior (Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008).

Program Recommendation

Call Receiver Self Leadership Program

Self leadership strategies help call receivers to integrate the powerful motivating realities of the work into a more self directed work life structure. Carmeli, Meitar, and Weisberg (2006) describe self leadership as a "process through which employees motivate and navigate themselves to attain desired behaviors and ends" (p. 79). They also note that this approach drives

improved self efficacy (Carmeli, Meitar, & Weisberg, 2006). Ng, Ang and Chan (2008) provide additional support, demonstrating that leader self efficacy (LSE) in particular is a critical driver of individual leadership success. They defined LSE as "the leader's perceived capabilities to perform specific leader roles effectively" (Ng, Ang and Chan, 2008). The purpose of a call center self leadership program focus is to empower and thus engage individuals while driving behavior and productivity toward a shared leadership and team structure that all members proactively support. As noted, developing individual leadership capacity around incremental influence and autonomy contributes to job satisfaction, group harmony, loyalty, and ultimately, a reduction in absenteeism and turnover.

Self leadership is characterized most notably by innovative behavior, defined as a process where (a) an individual recognizes a problem, (b) comes up with new solutions and ideas and actively promotes them in the context of their work environment, and (c) realizes the solution or idea by creating a model or prototype that can be experienced, applied, or otherwise used somehow in any variety of settings or applications (Carmeli, Meitar, & Weisberg, 2006, p. 78). Further discussion of creative self leadership frames the behavior as a reflective inner process where a conscious and constructive effort takes place to direct individual inner thoughts and intentions toward the successful creation of changes, improvements, and innovations (p. 78). The critical value is the individualized challenge to problem solve and achieve outcomes above and beyond the expectations of the organization or the group. Supported by evidence of a positive connection between self leadership and work outcomes, developing self leadership involves three strategies which include (a) renewed cognitive construction of beliefs, assumptions, perceptions, and ways of thinking, (b) creative mental imagery driven by dilemmas and problems involving

creative behaviors, and (c) creative internal dialog and feedback that enhance an individual's ability to achieve sought after outcomes (Carmeli, Meitar, & Weisberg, 2006). Focusing on unique problems and issues faced commonly and separately by call receivers is one mechanism to exploit this self leadership strategy. Dealing with the complexities of diverse immigrant communities on an individual and collective basis provides a clear example for the application and certainly an opportunity to build upon with relatively immediate feedback. With increasing mental health issues in the community, call receivers face growing numbers of youth and adult callers in crisis. Emerging trends such as domestic violence cut across cultural and socio demographic lines, thus creating a scenario where call receivers must problem solve and innovate literally "on the fly." These are real world challenges that provide the opportunity to advance a self leadership and shared leadership intervention. Currently, these issues do not rise to the level of other than the most basic training. There is a platform here to immediately engage call receivers in self leadership practice while focusing managers and supervisors on a new and innovative practice.

Reinforcing higher order value. Carmeli et al. (2006) indicate that training is effective to develop worker self leadership skills, improving their work performance and thus the performance of the organization. Self leadership for call receivers entails positioning their role through a set of higher order values, including emphasizing a more critical valuation of their social contribution. Specific and ongoing public recognition for contributing to the preservation of life and property in the community is a key element of this strategy. Additionally, the PSAP performance goal attainment is both a motivational driver and the reward, given the attributes of the work and the immediate feedback from callers.

Personalizing leadership. In the context of the call receivers' environment, the work is a one on one relationship with a caller; someone in a dependent position requiring immediate help. Vogelaar (2007) suggests that the military's "leading from the edge" model is an appropriate concept to integrate self leadership practices. Specifically, he notes that the concept of "edge" refers to individuals operating at the periphery of the organization at the point where the organization interacts with its environment to have a direct affect or impact on that environment (p. 28). In relation to self leadership, the edge mentality provides the framework where call receivers, for example, apply behavior focused, natural reward, and psychological empowerment strategies to an uncertain, fast-changing, and ambiguous environment (Vogelaar, 2007).

Betts and Santoro (2007) also support the concept, noting that successful self leadership goes beyond the established processes and norms. As a viable substitute for external leadership, self leadership is concerned with "behaviors which raise the level of achievement beyond the organization's existing goals and expectations" (p. 8). It would be reasonable to ask the call receivers to define this idea in their terms and for the benefit of the people needing them in a crisis. The relationship to the caller in the moment, the immediacy of a solution and response delivered, caller feedback, and overall satisfactions from outcomes are all experiences that can be amplified into an individualized leadership framework. Mahesh and Kasturi (2006) noted positive effects and outcomes when focusing call receivers on intrinsic motivational factors such as purpose, humanizing callers, self education and improvement, and personal motivation and achievement. Building on the processes as shared experiences could help to facilitate more team development and congruence.

The supervisors' role in developing self leadership. In order to build the leadership of the call receivers, a key step is to integrate the direct management and supervision chain into the self leadership concept. Not to eliminate them from their management role per se, but to improve their effectiveness and increase the likelihood that managers and supervisors will both positively support and proactively help to facilitate the self leadership model.

A mixed transformational and transactional leadership training model for the captain, operations manager, and shift supervisors is recommended. The deliverables of this strategy are to (a) compensate for the changing personalities and leadership styles, (b) establish a supervisory culture and practice that supports and complements higher order subordinate needs and the self leadership design, (c) minimize the negative effects of existing supervision by reducing and limiting the scope of the leadership influence beyond clearly defined and accepted operations, and (d) create continuity in general approaches to leading and managing the unit across all supervisory levels consistent with shared leadership principles.

As note by Burns (1978) and Bass (1990), transformational and transactional strategies can be applied in a mixed approach to achieve both leader and follower effectiveness and higher order satisfactions. Research supports the theoretical assertion advanced by Bono and Judge (2004) that demonstrated a linkage between personality traits in leaders and success in training and implementing transformational and transactional leadership skills. In this case, the goal would be to establish behavioral continuity and a more collaborative environment vis-à-vis the existing leadership structure so that self leadership objectives can be developed and successfully implemented with call receivers. As different captains rotate through the unit, changing

personalities and styles should not be an imposing or disruptive factor if performance, empowerment, collaboration, and service focused objectives evolve as norms of the unit culture.

Supervisors should be engaged in the shared leadership strategy. They have peer relationships and alignment that would be beneficial in developing a more team oriented environment. Performance metrics, attendance, and other basic operational details should be among limiting factors guiding their direct management role relative to executing a self leadership model (transactional framework). It is also critical to eliminate the "control paradigm" that supervisors have been set up to manage to (Mahesh & Kasturi, 2006). Pearce's (2004) research addresses the critical role that the vertical leader plays in supporting a self leadership model by carefully keeping the operational side of the unit on task. Examples of this type of support include (a) strategically supplying rewards tied to desired organizational behaviors and performance, (b) providing core task direction and structure, and (c) driving the self leadership and shared leadership model by supporting peer encouragement, self goal setting, self evaluation, self development, and self reward (Pearce, 2004, p. 54).

More transformational leadership concepts (such as team building, career development, job satisfaction, and intrinsic rewards) should be the proactive contribution that supervisors make in support of self leadership development programming. Vogelaar (2007) frames this idea as a shared leadership strategy within the leadership from the edge concept, suggesting that the catalyst is a dynamic, interactive process that exists among the players where they share a goal of leading one another toward common goals. Other research supports transformational vertical leader behaviors to help shared behaviors and the self leadership model to stay on course. The leader can affect transformational behaviors by (a) supporting the overall commitment to the

organizations vision, values, and mission, (b) creating and encouraging emotional engagement, and (c) reinforcing and maintaining an outward focus on higher order needs (Pearce, 2004). This is viable in the context of the life and death nature and social importance of the work of the call receivers and the achievement of very high performance objectives.

Additionally, support of self leadership implementation requires that vertical leaders understand and model empowering leadership practices, sometimes referred to as servant leadership (Pearce, 2004). Specific vertical leader trainings could include (a) practicing judicious intervention, (b) constant reinforcement and demonstration of trust and confidence in individuals, (c) teaching and modeling constructive conflict management, (d) asking for rather than proposing solutions to even operational challenges, (e) encouraging goal setting and problem solving, and (f) demonstrating the willingness to be a receiver of influence as much as an engaging influencer (Pearce, 2004). Strategically engaging managers, captains, and supervisors is critical from the perspective of defining, aligning, and orchestrating the execution of their respective roles in a shared and self leadership development strategy for subordinates. As will be discussed, this same commitment will be required of the organizations management team in order to affect the type of cultural changes and long term results that are possible through this type of intervention.

Transformational application for supervisors and managers. As part of the intervention for the unit's command structure, management should also incorporate concepts from Rook and Torbert's (2005) Strategist transformational model. Characteristics of the model advocate that members become (a) ethical and moral leaders, (b) collaborative, (c) sensitive to personal and

organizational relationships, (d) effective change agents, and (e) capable of carrying out socially conscious and responsible visions (Rook and Torbert, 2005).

This approach aligns the unit's leadership with call receivers using Burns' (1978) moral leader model. Additionally, KCSO management should consider using the Full Range Leadership Development (FRLD) training instrument for captains, the operations manager, and supervisors. Parry and Sinha (2005) examined the Full Range Leadership Development (FRLD) training program in the context of its effects on transformational and transactional leader behaviors. The study finds that transformational leadership training does result in more effective leadership behavior and that the FRLD program is an effective training tool. Further, transactional leadership does not decrease as a result of transformational training—but tends to stabilize as the training takes hold (Parry & Sinha (2005).

The organization's role in developing e911 call center self leadership. The call receivers are the first line and the front line to the public. Within the organization, they are probably the least recognized and most left out group. They operate from a remote facility 20 miles from the organization's main headquarters yet have daily voice contact with employees at every work site throughout the county. Mahesh & Kasturi's (2006) call center research yielded some credible recommendations for establishing meaningful call center recognition that would be applicable to an e911 call center. In the KCSO, the Sheriff and key command staff could readily adapt an outreach and recognition effort to help support a self leadership development strategy. Implementation steps could include: (a) promoting the crucial role of the e911 call center internally and to the community, (b) make relevant links between the e911 center and the rest of the organization, (c) drive opportunities for managers throughout the organization to interact

with and acknowledge call center employees, (d) be visible, active, and consistent participants in relevant training and education, and (e) create timely and valuable information flow between the e911 center and other units of the organization and community (Mahesh & Kasturi, 2006). The overarching objective should be to create, drive, and sustain a broader public profile that elevates the unit, its mission and value to the community, and its valued members.

Leader emergence. New, undiscovered leaders may naturally evolve through this process among the call receivers. Among self managed teams, (a desired outcome of this program), a member or members of the various work groups could step forward informally to carry out any number of leadership functions for the group (Carte, Chidambaram, & Becker, 2006). This is especially likely on the shifts with the fewest numbers of direct supervisors. Research indicates that this is both acceptable and appropriate because: (a) natural selection will result in the most qualified and capable persons(s) coming forward to assume leadership responsibilities and (b) the group doing the work will naturally select the person(s) who should assume leadership role responsibilities (Carte, Chidambaram, & Becker, 2006).

Betts and Santoro (2007) noted that strong self leadership is a function of successfully self managed, self organized teams. Their research also indicates that leader emergence is a natural occurrence as a process of the team membership (p. 11). Leaders will naturally emerge in intentionally leaderless groups, providing inspiration and encouragement to group members (Betts & Santoro, 2007). This should be of particular note to the minimally supervised call center shifts as Betts and Santoro (2007) also found that transformational leadership training provides direction for the emerging leader as well as fosters group cohesion and commitment.

Implementation. In order to implement the recommendations, the King County Sheriff's Office should consider some tools to gather input and data to support an overall strategy. For example, it may be appropriate to use an instrument such as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to gain an understanding of call receiver perceptions and attitudes about leadership in this field, their own unit leadership in general including Leadership Self Efficacy (LSE), and to identify potential leaders from within the ranks (Javidan & Waldman, 2003). To facilitate and sustain open communication, the KCSO may want to construct an anonymous, ongoing questionnaire and feedback system for call receivers using an instrument such as survey monkey to gather general perceptual information related to the attributes of the work, their values towards their own role, training and education needs, and general attitudes that could be applicable to self leadership interventions. Updating and administering the survey tool regularly will provide continuous feedback on the progress and effectiveness of the implementation. Management should also conduct semi-annual focus groups with the call receivers on all shifts to probe more deeply into issues identified in the surveys.

Conducting an anonymous survey of past captains should be considered to gain insights into their perceptions, attitudes, and personalities. The HR manager may also want to bargain with the captains' guild to gain the rights to administer personality tests such as Myers-Briggs in an effort to more closely align captains with the job in the future (Gehring, 2007). Applying Bass' (1990) personal-situational theory model is an option going forward to support efforts to more effectively recruit and match captains with the environment (situational), personalities, roles, and responsibilities of the call center.

Application Synthesis

Deliverables for the Application recommendations are fairly straight forward. The primary target of the effort is the call receiver population. The outcomes of the recommended leadership development programming and specific interventions should be qualitatively and quantitatively measureable (Russon & Reinelt, 2004). Specifically, reducing and stabilizing the turnover rate of 26% at some lower rate is determinable and can be associated against the collective efforts aimed at call receivers. Measuring and tracking call receiver morale and attitudes can coincide with self leadership training as well as the effects of leadership training for captains, the operations manager, and supervisors. Surveying citizens who have had to call 911 for help can measure performance and customer satisfaction as well as overall call receiver "attitude." The recommendations also include an ongoing feedback mechanism (anonymous survey instrument) to help track, manage, and monitor the effectiveness of the program on call receivers as well as gain their ongoing engagement in the process.

While the e911 call center environment is significantly different compared to other units, the organization should evaluate the findings and outcomes for conceptual and practical transferability. For example, a strategy to develop self leadership in this unit may be a valid platform and method to mitigate turnover, absenteeism, low productivity and morale, and conflict in units with similar operational, labor relations, and managerial structures. Concerted efforts to reach down into the ranks as a means to build out leadership might prove to be a viable mechanism to develop leaders unknown today to themselves or the organization.

References

Agle, B. R., Nagarajan, N. J., Sonnenfeld, J. A., & Srinivasan, D. (2006). Does CEO charisma matter? An empirical analysis of the relationships among organizational performance, environmental uncertainty, and top management team perceptions of CEO charisma. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(1), 161-174.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Benefits.org (2008). Introduction to attendance management. Retrieved from http://www.benefits.org/interface/cost/absent.htm

Betts, S.C., & Santoro, M.D. (2007). Integrating leadership theories and team research: A conceptual framework based on level of analysis and type of control. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict*, *11*(1), 1-17.

Bolden, R., & Gosling, J. (2006). Leadership competencies: Time to change the tune? *Leadership*, *2*, 147-163.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5), 901-910.

Bradford, D. L., & Cohen, A. R. (1984). *Managing for excellence: The guide to developing high performance in contemporary organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Socialized charismatic leadership, values congruence, and deviance in the work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(4), 954-962.

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

Campbell, D.J., Dardis, G., & Campbell, K.M. (2003). Enhancing incremental influence: A focused approach to leadership development. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 10*(1), 29-44.

Carmeli, A. Meitar, R., & Weisberg, J. (2006). Self-leadership skills and innovative behavior at work. *International Journal of Manpower: Leadership in organizations, 27*(1), 75.

Carte, T.A., Chidambaram, L., & Becker, A. (2006). Emergent leadership in self-managed virtual teams :A longitudinal study of concentrated and shared leadership behaviors. *Group Decision and Negotiation, 15*(4), 323-343.

Chan, S., & Brief, A. R. (2005). When leadership matters and when it does not: A commentary. In D. M. Messick & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), *The psychology of leadership* (pp. 321-332). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Deery, S.J., Iverson, R.D., & Walsh, J. T. (2006). Toward a better understanding of psychological contract breach: A study of customer service employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(1), 166-175.

Erez, A., Johnson, D. E., Misangyi, V. F., LePine, M. A., & Halverson, K. C. (2008). Stirring the hearts of followers: Charismatic leadership as the transferal effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(3), 602-615.

Gehring, D. R. (2007). Applying traits theory of leadership to project management. *Project Management Journal, 38*(1), 44-54.

George, J. M. (2007). Personality, Five-Factor Model. *International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies*. [Electronic version]. SAGE Publications ereference. Retrieved August 18, 2008, from http://sage-ereference.com/organization/Article_n422.html.

Gold, M. (Ed.). (1999). *The complete social scientist: A Kurt Lewin reader.* Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Hackman, J. R. & Wageman, R. (2007). Asking the right questions about leadership. *American Psychologist, 62* (1), 43-47.

Hambrick, D. C., Finkelstein, S., & Mooney, A. C. (2005). Executive job demands: New insights for explaining strategic decisions and leader behavior. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(3), 472-491.

Harrison, D.A., Newman, D.A., & Roth, P.L. (2006). How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(2), 305-325.

Herold, D. M., Fedor, D. B., Caldwell, S., & Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of transformational and change leadership on employees' commitment to change: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(2), 346-357.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1972). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hornung, S., & Roussea, D.M. (2007). Active on the job - proactive in change: How autonomy at work contributes to employee support for organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 43*(4), 401-426.

Houghton, J. D. & Yoho, S. K. (2005). Toward a contingency model of leadership and psychological empowerment: when should self-leadership be encouraged? *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 11*(4), 65-83.

Hui, C. H., Chiu,W. C. K., Yu, P. L. H., Cheng, K., & Tse, H. H. M. (2007). The effects of service climate and the effective leadership behavior of supervisors on frontline employee service quality: A multi-level analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*, 151-172.

Ingraham, P.W., & Getha-Taylor, H. (2004). Leadership in the public sector: Models and assumptions for leadership development in the federal government. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 24*(2), 95-112.

Institute of Management Services (2006). Tackling absenteeism in the workplace. *Management Services*, Autumn edition.

Javidan, M., & Waldman, D. (2003). Exploring charismatic leadership in the public sector: Measurement and consequences. *Public Administration Review, 63*(2), 229-242.

Johnson, A. M., Vernon, P. A., Aitken-Harris, J., & Jang, K. L. (2004). A behavior genetic investigation of the relationship between leadership and personality. *Twin Research, 7*(1), 27-32.

Kaiser, R.B., Hogan, R., & Craig, S.B. (2008). Leadership and the fate of organizations. *American Psychologist, 63*(2), 96-110.

King County Sheriff's Office (2008). *Facts and figures*. Home web page data. Retrieved from http://www.kingcounty.gov/safety/sheriff.aspx

King County Sheriff's Office (2007). *2007 Annual Report*. [Brochure]. Seattle, WA: Author. Also available from: http://www.kingcounty.gov/safety/sheriff/~/media/safety/sheriff/documents/a/2007KCSOAnnualReport.ashx

King County Sheriff's Office (2008, January). *Regional communications center and emergency coordination center staffing analysis update*. Seattle, WA: Author.

Kirk, V., & Wohrle, M. (2008, October). [King County Sheriff's Office communications center operational data]. Unpublished raw data.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Mahesh, V.S., & Anand Kasturi, A. (2006). Improving call centre agent performance: A UK-India study based on the agents' point of view. *International Journal of Service Industry Management, 17*(2), 136-157.

Masood, S. A., Dani, S. S., Burns, N. D., & Backhouse, C. J. (2006). Transformational leadership and organizational culture: the situational strength perspective. *The Journal of Engineering Manufacture, 220*(6), 941-949.

Ng, K. Y., Ang, S., & Chan, K. Y. (2008). Personality and leader effectiveness: A moderated mediation model of leadership self efficacy, job demands, and job autonomy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(4), 733-743.

Parry, K, & Sinha, P. (2005). Researching the trainability of transformational organizational leadership. *Human Resources Development International*, *8*(2), 165-183.

Paton, N. (2005). Work life balance is key in cutting workplace absence. *Occupational Health*, *57*(6), 7.

Pearce, C.L. (2004). The future of leadership: Combining vertical and shared leadership to transform knowledge work. *Academy of Management Executive, 18*(1), 47-57.

Raelin, J. A. (2004). Don't bother putting leadership into people. *Academy of Management Executive, 16*(3), 131-135.

Robie, C., Brown, D. J., & Bly, P. R. (2008). Relationship between major personality traits and managerial performance: Moderating effects of derailing traits. *International Journal of Management, 25*(1), 131-140.

Rooke, D., & Torbert, W. R. (2005). Seven transformations of leadership. *Harvard Business Review,* 1-12.

Russon, C., & Reinelt, C. (2004). The results of an evaluation scan of 55 leadership development programs. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 10*(3), 104-107.

Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K., & Cha, S. E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(4), 1020-1030.

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Currency Doubleday.

Shertzer, J. E., & Schuh, J. H. (2004). College student perceptions of leadership: Empowering and constraining beliefs. *NASPA Journal, 42*(1), 111-131.

Stogdill, R. M. (1959). *Individual behavior and group achievement: A theory, the experimental evidence.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Tead, O. (1933). *Human nature and management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tead, O. (1935). *The art of leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Vila, B.J., Kenney, D.J., Morrison, G.B., & Reuland, M. (2000). *Evaluating the effects of fatigue on police patrol officers*. Police Executive Research Forum Final Report. Research funded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

Vogelaar, A.D.L. (2007). Leadership from the edge: A matter of balance. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 13*(3), 27-42.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, *62*(1), 17-24.

Wilk, S.L., & Moynihan, L.M. (2005). Display rule regulators: The relationship between supervisors and worker emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 917-927.

Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, *62*(1), 6-16.