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Leading people effectively is a tremendous challenge, a great opportunity, and a serious responsibility. Today’s organizations, more than ever, need effective leaders who understand the complexities of our ever-changing global environment and have the intelligence, sensitivity, and ability to empathize with others necessary to motivate their followers to strive to achieve excellence. We have always been interested in leadership. All civilizations throughout history have focused on their leaders, revering them or reviling them. As long as we have organized into groups to accomplish a task, there have been leaders and followers. Throughout history, the fate of millions has depended on the leadership qualities of kings and queens and on their battles for succession. Children in many countries learn very early through listening to fairy tales that the happiness and misery of people depend on the goodness (or evilness) of leaders.

We are truly fascinated by those who lead us. To some, leadership is a magical process. Indeed, when we read about historical figures or meet some of the leaders of our times, we are sometimes transfixed by their seemingly magical exploits. They move armies, create new countries, and destroy whole civilizations through what often appears to be the sheer strength of their will. They affect our very existence on this planet. Although our leaders are the ones who dazzle us, we sometimes fail to consider that leaders alone could accomplish very little. It is the strength of their followers that moves history. It is the hard work of employees that turns a profit in a faltering company. It is the initiative of volunteers that achieves an institution’s goals. We also must remember that many magical, extraordinary leaders have found themselves shunned and rejected by the people who once admired them. President Charles DeGaulle’s road to the leadership of France was long, tortuous, and fraught with failure: After coming to office as a hero after World War II, he was forced out of office twice. Winston Churchill was removed from office twice and faced long periods in his life during which his leadership was neither valued nor wanted. Julius Caesar experienced many ups and downs in his battles with the Roman Senate. More recently, Margaret Thatcher has seen her fortunes come and go with the mood of the British public and the economic upheaval in Europe. Henry Cisneros, once mayor of San Antonio and recently secretary of housing and urban development under President Clinton, fell into disfavor with the electorate before he regained his popularity. Benazir Butho of Pakistan has moved from national hero to national villain several times. Lee Iaccoca of Chrysler was not always the hero that some consider him to be today. George Watson Jr. was booted out of office after successfully leading IBM for many years. If the powers of these leaders are truly magical, why do they wax and wane? Why are they not effective all the time? This question, along with many others, will be addressed in this book.

For our organizations to be effective and for our society to move successfully, we must be able to select the right leaders and help them succeed. This book presents a broad review and analysis of the field of leadership with application to business and
other organizations because the processes of leading others to achieve organizational
goals are applicable in any institutional setting. Our current research has done much to
demystify leadership and teach it to the rest of us mortals. Although we still come
across some leaders whose performance and behavior escape the bounds of scientific
explanation, by and large we know a good deal about leadership and how to train peo-
ple to be leaders. The cornerstone to our new knowledge is that most of us can learn to
become better leaders. Maybe only a very few of us will someday shape human civi-
lization, but most of us are capable of improving our leadership skills and shaping our
own organizations and communities. Despite all the knowledge that various disciplines
have accumulated about leadership over the past 70 to 80 years, there are deep divi-
sions in the field. Few scholars and practitioners even agree on how to define leader-
ship and its key elements. There is much debate about whether a leader’s personality or
behavior should be the focus of our inquiry. Additionally, the role of followers and their
characteristics are also the subject of much discussion.

Something Old: Keeping the Good

The second edition of this book builds on the strengths of the first edition and intro-
duces some new emphases and new features. The many debates and controversies
within the field of leadership are presented in this second edition as they were in the
first. I continue to emphasize integration of the concepts and distill useful and practical
concepts from each theory while taking a cross-cultural perspective. The guiding phi-
losophy and assumption remain the same:

• We can all learn to become better leaders. For some of us, the learning will come
easier in some areas than others; but with practice and support from our organi-
sations, we can all improve our leadership capabilities. Like many of my readers,
I have occasionally come across incredibly charismatic leaders who seem to
have special talents at moving others. Although it is tempting to attribute to
them a special leadership “gift” that defies systematic explanation, with some
effort and critical thinking, one can analyze in an objective manner their style
and the situations in which they are effective. Such analysis demystifies their
performance. Although it still may not be easy to teach others to perform the
same way, the charismatic leader’s actions lose their magical qualities and
become both understandable and predictable.

Most of us are not trying to change civilizations—although maybe we
should be. Instead, we are trying to move our teams, departments, and organiza-
tions toward higher levels of effectiveness and efficiency. We want better deci-
sion making, more satisfied employees, better quality products and services, and
more satisfied constituencies and customers. These are all difficult to achieve,
but there is no magic involved in achieving them. We can use the many existing
leadership theories to achieve those goals.

• Application focus. Along with strong theoretical coverage and analysis, the book
continues to be application focused.

• Cross-cultural focus. Leadership is not a culture-free process. It occurs within
the context of a culture. Which styles and behaviors are considered key to effec-
tiveness differs from one culture to the next. There also are some common
threads that run through different cultures. Many leadership theories presented
in this book do not consider the cultural context, either globally or internally
within the United States. Issues of race and gender are often also not addressed.
Part of the goal for this book is to include cross-cultural, racial, and gender-
based analyses of leadership as a regular part of the discourse about leadership effectiveness. The changing demographics within the United States and the globalization of our economy make such analysis essential.

- **Looking at the Future.** I continue to keep an eye on the future by addressing the dramatic changes that organizations are undergoing. Both businesses and not-for-profit organizations are reorganizing and redefining the role of leaders. The reliance on teams is becoming a mainstay of our institutions. Quality and customer focus have moved from the academic domain to the everyday language of many in work organizations. These structural changes and redefinitions of our institutions’ focus on their internal and external customers require a new look at the role and functions of leadership. Our old theories do not explain all the current changes adequately. Throughout the chapters, I have established the link between the old and the new and attempt to present how what we have known and used can help the reader deal with the current and future trends in leadership, particularly the focus on teams and nonhierarchical organizations.

- **Exercises and self-assessments.** The end-of-chapter exercises and self-assessments are still there. They have been revised, and several new ones have been added.

**Something New: Introducing New Focus and New Features**

Several new themes and features make this second edition even more distinctive:

- **Expanded cross-cultural and global coverage integrated in every chapter.** I have expanded the coverage of cross-cultural leadership issues throughout the chapters and integrated their coverage in the chapters. I have expanded the presentation of cultural models and used them more thoroughly to explain challenges leaders face in cross-cultural situations and how we can use knowledge from one culture to lead in another.

- **In-depth theoretical and increased research focus.** In addition to updating theoretical and empirical coverage, I have increased the theoretical analysis and discussion while maintaining the practical and approachable tone of the book.

- **New “real life” examples throughout the chapters.** I have added a number of “real-life” current examples of leaders and organizations throughout the chapters to illustrate the concepts and theories.

- **Four new features in each chapter.** You will find four new features in each chapter.
  1. “Leadership on the Cutting Edge” presents current empirical or theoretical research studies relevant to the chapter.
  2. “Leading Change” highlights examples of innovative practices in organizations.
  3. “Leadership Dilemmas” poses ethical questions that leaders may face in today’s organizations.
  4. “Leadership in Action Case” is a short case of a “real-life” leader at the end of every chapter. Each case is written to illustrate the topics covered in the particular chapter.

- **Expanded coverage of individual differences in chapter 3.** Chapter 3 has been considerably revised to increase the coverage of individual differences. The chapter now discusses individual differences including the Big Five personality traits, abilities (including emotional intelligence), values, and skills.
• New coverage in chapter 5: Chapter 5 has been revised to include discussion of the Cognitive Resource Theory.
• Updated and increased presentation of teams in chapter 7: Chapter 7 presents a more thorough discussion of teams and team leadership and provides a more in-depth analysis of super- and self-leadership.
• Focus on change-oriented leadership in Chapter 8: Because of the continued importance of leading change in today’s organization and the continued interest in change-oriented leadership theories, I have expanded the coverage of these theories in chapter 8 to include discussions of visionary leadership.
• Integrated coverage of upper-echelon leadership in chapter 9, which has been revised to reflect the growing body of research in the area of upper-echelon leadership.

Who Should Read This Book
This book is targeted to the students of leadership—whether they are advanced undergraduate and graduate students or managers who continue to learn and grow. It is written for those who want not only to understand the various theories and research in the field but also to apply that knowledge to becoming leaders and to improving the leadership of their organizations. The examples and cases used are from different types of industries and from both the private and public sectors. Although the theories are often developed and tested by psychology and management researchers, they have broad applicability to all students of organizational functioning and leadership.
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Leadership is a complex process that results from the interaction among a leader, followers, and the situation. All three of these elements are key to the leadership process. Since the formal study of leadership started in the late nineteenth century in the Western world, we have developed many definitions of this concept. As with any social phenomenon, culture strongly influences how we lead and what we expect of our leaders. Furthermore, although leadership evolves and changes, the history of the field can inform us and help us understand leadership today. We must also be aware of how the process of leadership, and our images and expectations of effective leaders, changes along with organizational, social, and cultural evolutions.

The first part of the book lays the foundation for understanding the process of leadership. It provides you with a sense of the history of the field of leadership and its current state and helps you understand the building blocks of the leadership process. These building blocks include a working definition of leaders and effectiveness, a cultural framework for understanding the process, a definition of leadership roles and functions, a presentation of individual characteristics of leaders, and an analysis of power and its role in leadership. After studying the chapters in this section, you will be able to define the basic elements of leadership and be ready to integrate them to understand more complex leadership processes.
Definition and Significance of Leadership

Anyone who stops learning is old, whether at 20 or 80.  
Anyone who keeps learning stays young.  
The greatest thing in life is to keep your mind young.  
HENRY FORD

After studying this chapter, you will be able to:
1. Define leadership and leadership effectiveness.
2. Identify the cultural values that have the potential to affect leadership.
3. Discuss the major obstacles to effective leadership.
4. Compare and contrast leadership and management and understand their similarities and differences.
5. List the roles and functions of management and be aware of cultural differences in the use and application of those functions.
6. Summarize the debate over the role and impact of leadership in organizations.

Who is a leader? When are leaders effective? These age-old questions appear simple, but their answers have kept philosophers, social scientists, and other scholars, researchers, and practitioners busy for many years. We can easily define bad leadership, but defining and understanding effective leadership is more complex. This chapter defines leadership and its many aspects, roles, and functions. It also highlights the key role of culture in leadership.
What Is an Effective Leader?

We recognize effective leaders when we work with them or observe them; however, there are many different ways of defining who leaders are and when they are effective.

WHO IS A LEADER?

Dictionaries usually define leading as guiding and directing on a course and as serving as a channel. A leader is someone who has commanding authority or influence. Researchers have also developed many working definitions of leadership. Although these definitions have much in common, they each consider different aspects of leadership. Some researchers define leadership as an integral part of the group process (Krech and Crutchfield 1948). Others define it primarily as an influence process (Bass 1960; Cartwright 1965; Katz and Kahn 1966). Still others see leadership as the initiation of structure (Homans 1950) and the instrument of goal achievement. Recent views even consider leaders to be servants of their followers (Greenleaf 1998). In spite of the differences, these definitions of leadership have three elements in common:

- First, leadership is a group phenomenon; there are no leaders without followers. As such, leadership always involves interpersonal influence or persuasion.
- Second, leaders use influence to guide groups of people through a certain course of action or toward the achievement of certain goals. Therefore, leadership is goal directed and plays an active role in groups and organizations.
- Third, the presence of leaders assumes some form of hierarchy within a group. In some cases, the hierarchy is formal and well defined, with the leader at the top; in other cases, it is informal and flexible.

When the preceding three elements are combined, a leader is defined as any person who influences individuals and groups within an organization, helps them in the establishment of goals, and guides them toward achievement of those goals, thereby allowing them to be effective.

WHAT IS EFFECTIVENESS?

What does it mean to be an effective leader? As is the case with the definition of leadership, there is considerable variability in how we define effectiveness. Some researchers, such as Fiedler, whose contingency model is discussed in chapter 5, have defined leadership effectiveness in terms of group performance. According to this view, a leader is effective when his or her group performs well. Other models, for example, House’s Path goal theory presented in chapter 6, consider follower satisfaction as a primary factor in determining leadership effectiveness: leaders are effective when their followers are satisfied. Still others, namely, researchers working on the transformational and visionary leadership models described in chapter 8, define effectiveness as the successful implementation of large-scale change in an organization.
The definitions of leadership effectiveness are as diverse as the definitions of organizational effectiveness. The choice of a certain definition depends mostly on the point of view of the person trying to determine effectiveness and on the constituents who are being considered. For example, Barbara Waugh, a 1960s civil rights and antidiscrimination activist and current worldwide personnel manager of Hewlett Packard Laboratories (often known as the “World’s Best Industrial Research Laboratory”—WBIRL), defines effectiveness as helping people communicate more, collaborate more, and innovate more (Mieszkowski 1998). For John Norquist, the 49-year-old mayor of the city of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, “success should be measured by outcomes” (Terry 1998, 160). He looks at how much he has cut the city’s tax rates and reduced its spending while there has also been a drop in unemployment and an increase in property value. For Michael Price, president of Heine Securities, effectiveness means getting the best deals for himself and his shareholders (Serwer 1996).

Clearly, there is no best way to define when a leader is effective. Luthans (1988) proposes an interesting twist on the concept of leadership effectiveness by distinguishing between effective and successful managers. According to Luthans, effective managers are those who have satisfied and productive employees, whereas successful man-

---

**LEADERSHIP ON THE CUTTING EDGE**

Effectiveness Is in the Eye of the Beholder

A recent study has considered how leadership effectiveness depends on the point of view of the person who is evaluating the leader. The longitudinal field study of 526 subordinates, 73 leaders, and 37 managers of a defense electronics firm in the United States conducted by Salam, Cox, and Sims (1997) indicates that how high or low the leaders’ effectiveness were rated was related to the position of those doing the evaluating. Most interesting, the leaders’ managers rated them lower when the leaders were seen as challenging the status quo and allowing their followers to be independent. On the other hand, leaders who exercised more control were rated more positively by their boss. However, followers and the leaders themselves considered the same challenge to the status quo to be a positive factor. Castaneda and Nahavandi (1991) found similar effects in an earlier study in the insurance industry, where a manager’s supervisor focused primarily on outcomes and followers sought more openness and consideration of their needs.

The organization Salam, Cox, and Sims studied was facing a turbulent environment. The researchers suggest that, during such times, top managers may be seeking support and demonstration of loyalty and the ability to be a “team player.” These top managers can easily interpret challenges to the status quo as lack of support and disloyalty, thereby leading to low ratings of supervisors who are challenging and seek change. However, when facing turbulence that can lead to layoffs and other threats to job security, followers are likely to see a supervisor who is willing to take risks as an advocate and therefore rate them more positively. Based on these findings, a leader’s effectiveness is in the eye of the beholder.

The study’s results pose a challenge to leaders. Should they engage in behaviors that satisfy their own managers or should they address the needs of their followers? Although there are no simple answers, the organization’s culture and the leader’s own value system may provide some guidance.

---

agers are those who are promoted quickly. After studying a group of managers, Luthans suggested that successful managers and effective managers engage in different types of activities. Whereas effective managers spend their time communicating with subordinates, managing conflict, training, developing, and motivating employees, the primary focus of successful managers is not on employees. Instead, they concentrate on networking, which involves interacting with outsiders, socializing, and politicking.

Both the internal and external activities that effective and successful managers undertake are important in order for a leader to achieve his or her goals. However, Luthans found that only 10 percent of the managers in his study were both effective and successful. The results of this study can have grave implications for how we measure our leaders’ effectiveness and reward them. In order to encourage and reward performance, organizations need to reward the leadership activities that will lead to effectiveness rather than those that lead to quick promotion. If an organization cannot achieve balance, it may quickly find itself with a majority of flashy but incompetent leaders.

Ideally, any definition of leadership effectiveness should take into consideration all the different roles and functions that a leader performs and then factor those into the evaluation. However, few organizations perform such a thorough analysis, and we often fall back on simplistic measures. For example, stockholders and analysts consider the chief executive officer (CEO) of a company to be effective if company stock prices keep increasing regardless of how satisfied the company’s employees are. A politician is effective if the polls indicate his or her popularity and if he or she is reelected. A football coach is effective when the team is winning. A school principal’s effectiveness is often determined by the students’ scores on standardized tests.

Linda Wachner, president of Warnarco, an undergarment manufacturer, is one of the highest-earning female business executives in the United States. Although her company’s stock has done very well and she has satisfied her shareholders, she has the reputation of being one of the toughest bosses in the United States, partly because she does not focus on internal employee morale. Another example of the complexity of defining effectiveness is President Clinton. Despite calls for his impeachment and being tried in the Senate, he maintained his popularity at the polls in 1998 and 1999, and many voters continued to consider him to be effective.

The common theme of these examples is the focus on outcome. Process issues are rarely taken into account. For instance, employee satisfaction is sometimes measured but rarely considered to be the main indicator of an organization’s effectiveness. Linda Wachner delivers the financial results. Voters consider President Clinton to have managed the economy well. Similarly, in a school system, faculty morale and turnover, which are keys to the facilitation of student learning, are not a primary criterion for determining effectiveness.

Although many leadership studies have considered process issues in determining effectiveness, their focus has been primarily on the productivity of the work group. One way to take a broad view of effectiveness is to consider a leader effective when his or her group is successful in maintaining internal stability and external adaptability while achieving its goals. Overall, then, a leader is effective when his or her followers achieve their goals, can function well together, and can adapt to the changing demands from external forces. The definition of leadership effectiveness therefore contains three elements:

- Goal achievement, which may include financial goals, quality products or services, addressing the needs of customers, and so forth.
• Internal smooth processes, including group cohesion, follower satisfaction, and efficient operations.
• External adaptability, which refers to a group ability to change and evolve successfully.

Culture and Leadership

Leadership is a social and cultural phenomenon. A leader considered to be effective in Singapore may seem too authoritarian in Sweden. The charisma of an Egyptian political leader has no effect on the French or the Germans. Understanding leadership requires understanding the cultural context in which it takes place.

Culture consists of the commonly held values within a group of people. It is a set of norms, customs, values, and assumptions that guides the behavior of a particular group of people. Culture gives each group its uniqueness and differentiates it from other groups. We are strongly influenced by our culture; it determines what we consider right and wrong and influences what and who we value, what we pay attention to, and how we behave. Culture affects values and beliefs and influences leadership and interpersonal styles. We learn about culture formally through various teachings and informally through observation (Hall 1973).

LEVELS OF CULTURE

Culture exists at three levels. The first is national culture, defined as a set of values and beliefs shared by people within a nation. In addition to an overall national culture, there may be ethnic and other cultural groups within each nation. Although these groups share national cultural values, they also have their unique culture. The ethnic or group cultures form the second level of culture. Some nations, such as the United States, Canada, and Indonesia, have many such subcultures. The many different cultural, ethnic, and religious groups are part of the overall culture of these nations, leading to considerable cultural diversity. Other subcultures are based on religious, regional, or gender characteristics. For example, as discussed in chapter 8, religious beliefs in a savior contribute to the rise of charismatic leadership. Similarly, cultural differences based on gender influence who we consider to be a leader. In particular, widely held gender stereotypes affect our views of leadership (Broverman et al. 1975; Safilios-Rothschild 1977).

The third level of culture is organizational culture, the set of values, norms, and beliefs shared by members of an organization. Given time, all organizations develop a unique culture or character wherein employees share common values and beliefs about work-related issues. These organizational values often include deeply held beliefs about leadership (Schein 1985). In many cases, leaders and, particularly, founders are instrumental in creating and encouraging the culture.

Richard Tuck, cofounder and CEO of Lander International, a company based in El Cerrito, California, encourages his employees to spend less time at work (Fromartz 1998). When Jon Westberg, the company’s executive recruiter, hit a performance slump and sought Tuck’s advice, Tuck suggested “that maybe he was spending too much time at work, that he needed to devote more time to his art” (Fromartz 1998, 125). Tuck wants the people in his company to have outside hobbies and commitments. He hates rules. As a result, the company’s culture is loose, with an emphasis on “anything goes.” Office manager Helen Winters notes, “I kept waiting for policies to be firmed up, but he
just wouldn’t do it” (Fromartz 1998, 126). Compare Lander’s culture with the culture of the Atlantic Group Furniture Procurement and Project Management, Inc., an office-furniture distributor in New York City. The company president, Roger Abramson, is obsessed with time and productivity (Fenn 1998). He has announced, “If you are not producing revenue, do not call me during the day” (Fenn 1998, 61). Atlantic has a fast-paced culture in which only those who are highly competitive survive. The focus is on pay for performance. The two organizational cultures have two different models of leadership effectiveness. At Lander’s, the leader is supportive and almost spiritual; at Atlantic, the leader pushes for performance and outcomes.

Because national culture addresses many different aspects of life, it has a strong and pervasive influence on people’s behavior, both in everyday activities and in organizations. The influence of organizational culture is generally limited to work-related values and behaviors. However, organizational culture is strongly influenced by both national culture and cultural diversity. All French companies, for instance, share some characteristics that make them different from companies in other countries. For example, as compared to their Swedish counterparts, French companies are more hierarchical and status oriented.

All three levels of culture shape our views and expectations of our leaders. Whereas people in the United States do not expect leaders to be failure-proof, in many other cultures, a leader’s admission of mistakes would be intolerable and a deadly blow to his or her authority and ability to lead. For example, many U.S. presidents, most recently President Clinton, when faced with no other option, have recognized their mistakes openly and proclaimed to have learned from them. Such admissions are rarely forthcoming in other countries. However, when in 1998, Indonesian President Suharto apparently admitted mistakes that contributed to his country’s economic crisis, he was seen as weak. Indonesians did not forgive him, and he eventually resigned.

Each country and region in the world has developed a particular organizational and management style largely based on its national culture. This style is called the national organizational heritage. Although there are many differences from one organization to another and from one manager to another, research indicates that this national heritage is noticeable and distinct (Bartlett and Ghoshal 1989, 1992; Bettis and Prahalad, 1995).

MODELS OF CULTURE

Researchers have developed several models to understand national cultures. This section reviews three models that have direct application to organizations and to understanding leadership.

Hall’s High-Context and Low-Context Cultural Framework

One of the simplest cultural models focuses on differentiating communication styles within cultures in two groups, one high context and one low context (Hall 1976). In this model, context refers to the environment and the information that provide the background for interaction and communication. Leaders from high-context cultures rely heavily on the context, including nonverbal cues and situational factors, to communicate with others and understand the world around them. They rely on personal relationships to establish communication. Leaders from low-context cultures focus on explicit, specific verbal and written messages to understand people and situations (Munter 1993).

For example, Saudi Arabia, Italy, France, Vietnam, Korea, and China are all high-context cultures, where subtle body posture, tone of voice, detailed rituals, and a per-
son’s title and status all convey strong messages that determine behavior. Communication does not always need to be explicit and specific. Trust is viewed as more important than written communication or legal contracts. In low-context cultures, such as Germany, Scandinavia, Switzerland, the United States, Great Britain, and Canada, people pay attention to the verbal message. What is said or written is more important than nonverbal messages or the situation. People are therefore specific and clear in their communication with others.

The difference between high and low context can explain many cross-cultural communication problems that leaders face around the world. The low-context European and North American leaders may get frustrated working with followers from high-context Asian or Middle Eastern cultures. Whereas the low-context leaders focus on specific instructions, the high-context followers aim at developing relationships. Similarly, a high-context leader may be offended by her low-context followers’ directness, which she can interpret as rudeness.

**Hofstede’s Five Cultural Dimensions**

Researcher Geert Hofstede developed one of the best-known classifications of culture, known as Hofstede’s dimensions (Hofstede 1980, 1992). Hofstede originally conducted over 100,000 surveys of IBM employees in 40 countries, supplemented later by another scale based on Confucian dynamism (Hofstede 1996). He used the results to develop the five basic cultural dimensions along which cultures differ: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, masculinity, and time orientation (see Table 1.1). The combination of these five dimensions lends each national culture its distinctiveness and unique character.

For example, when compared to 40 other nations, the United States is below average on power distance and uncertainty avoidance, highest in individualism (closely followed by Australia), above average on masculinity, and has a moderate–to–short-term time orientation. These scores indicate that the United States is a somewhat egalitarian culture in which uncertainty and ambiguity are well tolerated, a high value is placed on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1.1 Hofstede’s Five Cultural Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power distance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertainty avoidance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time orientation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

individual achievements, assertiveness, performance, and independence, sex roles are relatively well defined, and organizations look for quick results with a focus on the present. Japan, on the other hand, tends to be higher than the United States in power distance, masculinity (one of the highest scores), and uncertainty avoidance but considerably lower for individualism and with a long-term orientation. These rankings are consistent with the popular image of Japan as a country in which social structures such as family and organizations are very important, power and obedience to them tend to be absolute, risk and uncertainty are averted, gender roles are highly differentiated, and high value is placed on achievement.

**Trompenaars’s Dimensions of Culture**

Fons Trompenaars provides a complex model that helps leaders understand national culture and its effect on organizational and corporate cultures (Trompenaars 1994). He developed the model based on 15,000 people surveyed in organizations in 47 cultures. Trompenaars suggests that, although understanding national culture requires many different dimensions, cross-cultural organizational cultures can be more efficiently classified based on two dimensions (Trompenaars 1994). These dimensions are (1) egalitarian-hierarchical and (2) orientation to the person or to the task. When combined, they yield four general cross-cultural organizational cultures: incubator, guided missile, family, and Eiffel tower (see Figure 1.1). The four general types Trompenaars proposes combine national and organizational cultures. The leader’s role in each type differs, as do methods of employee motivation and evaluation.

Incubator cultures are egalitarian and focus on taking care of individual needs. Examples of incubator cultures can be found in many start-up high-technology firms in the United States and Great Britain (Trompenaars 1994, 173). These are typically individualist cultures in which professionals are given considerable latitude to do their jobs. Leaders in such organizations emerge from the group rather than being assigned. Leadership is therefore based on competence and expertise, and the leader’s role is to provide resources, manage conflict, and remove obstacles.

The guided missile is also an egalitarian culture, but the focus here is on task completion rather than individual needs. As a result, the organizational culture is impersonal.
and as indicated by its name, directed toward accomplishing the job. Trompenaars uses the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) as an example of the guided missile. In NASA and other guided-missile organizations, leadership is based on expertise and follower participation is expected. People work in teams of professionals who have equal status, with performance being the primary criterion for effectiveness.

The family and Eiffel tower cultures are both hierarchical. Whereas the Eiffel tower is focused on the task, the family takes care of individuals. As its name indicates, the family culture functions like a traditional family. The leader’s role is that of a powerful father figure who is responsible for the welfare of all members. Trompenaars suggests that family organizational cultures are found in Greece, Italy, Singapore, South Korea, and Japan. Finally, the Eiffel tower is both hierarchical and task focused. Consistent with the name, many French organizations have an Eiffel tower culture, characterized by a steep, stable, and rigid organization. The focus is on performance through order and obedience of legal and legitimate authority. The leader is the undisputed head of the organization and has full responsibility for all that occurs.

The three models of culture provide differing ways of understanding national and organizational culture. Each model is useful, but each can also be misapplied if used to stereotype national or organizational cultures. Whereas Hall and Hofstede focus primarily on national culture, Trompenaars provides a model that combines national and organizational cultural characteristics and that addresses leadership more directly. All three models are used throughout the book to provide a cross-cultural perspective on leadership.

Obstacles to Effective Leadership

In all cultures and all organizational settings, being an effective leader is much harder to achieve than to define. We all may know what makes a leader effective, but it is still a challenge to be one; meanwhile, organizations pay a heavy price for bad and ineffective leadership (Bedeian and Armenakis 1998). The key to becoming an effective leader is taking the opportunity to learn. Becoming a good leader takes practice and involves learning from one’s mistakes. Unfortunately, organizations often do not provide an environment in which leaders can practice new skills, try out new behaviors, and observe their impact. Without such practice, it is difficult for leaders to become effective. The question is, therefore, what are the obstacles to learning to be an effective leader? Aside from different levels of skills and aptitudes that may prevent a leader from being effective, there are also several other obstacles to effective leadership:

- First, organizations face considerable uncertainty that creates pressure for quick responses and solutions. The external factors demand immediate attention. In such an atmosphere of crisis, there is no time or patience for learning. Ironically, the implementation of new methods of leadership, if they were allowed, would make dealing with complexity and uncertainty easier in the long run. There is, therefore, a vicious cycle whereby there is no time for the learning that would help current crises. The lack of learning and experimentation in turn causes the continuation of the crises, which makes it impossible to have time to learn and practice innovative behaviors.

- Second, organizations are often rigid and unforgiving. In their push for short-term and immediate performance, they do not allow any room for mistakes and experimentation. A few organizations, such as W.L. Gore and 3M, that encourage taking risks and making mistakes are the exception. The rigidity and rewards systems of many institutions discourage such endeavors.
Third, organizations fall back on old ideas about what effective leadership is and therefore rely on simplistic solutions that do not fit new and complex problems. The use of simple ideas such as those proposed in *The One-Minute Manager* (Blanchard and Johnson 1982) or *In Search of Excellence* (Peters and Waterman 1982) provide only temporary solutions.

Finally, another factor that may pose an obstacle to effective leadership is the difficulty involved in understanding and applying the findings of academic research. In the laudable search for precision and scientific rigor, academic researchers sometimes do not clarify the application of their research. The complex and never-ending learning process of becoming an effective leader requires both experimentation and organizational support. The inaccessibility of academic research to many practitioners and the short-term orientation of organizations in which many managers operate provide difficult obstacles to effective leadership. Except for the few individuals who are very talented and learn quickly and easily, or those rare leaders who have the luxury of time, these obstacles are not easily surmounted.

Organizations that allow their leaders at all levels to make mistakes, learn, and develop new skills are training effective leaders.

---

**LEADING CHANGE**

**Pete and Laura Wakeman Call Their Bread Company a University**

“We’re a bread company, but we’re also a university” (Row 1998, 46). With this premise in mind, Pete and Laura Wakeman, founders of the Great Harvest Bread Company, have created an organization that is focused on learning as much as on making bread. Part of the company’s mission is to be “loose and have fun.” In a highly unusual move for a franchise business, the Wakemans give their franchisees considerable autonomy to run their businesses. There are few rules and even fewer top-down standardized procedures. Great Harvest has broken the mold in the franchise business. Instead of rules and standards, the common bond and the key to success for the company is the focus on learning and experimentation.

New owners learn the business by attending weeklong training sessions on bread making and on running a small business. Together with more experienced owners, they also learn from observing one another. The company pays for half the travel cost of franchise owners to visit one another so that they can share ideas. Great Harvest also has a company-wide Intranet full of recipes and management tips. With the emphasis on autonomy and continuous learning, Great Harvest and its leaders Pete and Paula Wakeman have been able to open 130 stores in 34 states and generate annual sales of $60 million.

The stores provide a relaxed homey atmosphere where customers are encouraged to browse while they sample thick slices of bread. The Chapel Hill, North Carolina, Great Harvest store calls itself the “village bakery,” plays music, and prides itself on taking care of its customers and employees. Owners Mark and Leslie Zimmerman want their customers to enjoy their bread as much as they enjoy making it (http://www.citysearch11.com).

Leadership and Management

What is the difference between leaders and managers? Are the two basically the same or are there sharp distinctions between them? These questions have moved to the forefront of the discussion of leadership in the past few years. Carol Hymowitz, currently a writer with the Wall Street Journal, considers herself lucky to have worked for two bosses who, in her words, were “leaders more than managers” (Hymowitz 1998a, B1). She believes leaders inspire their followers to take risks. Carol Bartz, chief executive at Autodesk suggests that managers “know how to write business plans, while leaders get companies—and people—to change” (Hymowitz 1998a, B1).

Table 1.2 presents the major distinctions between leadership and management. Whereas leaders have long-term and future-oriented perspectives and provide a vision for their followers that looks beyond their immediate surroundings, managers have short-term perspectives and focus on routine issues within their own immediate departments or groups (Gardner 1986). Zaleznik (1990) further suggests that leaders, but not managers, are charismatic and can create a sense of excitement and purpose in their followers. Kotter (1990) takes a historical perspective in the debate and proposes that, whereas leadership is an age-old concept, management has developed in the past 100 years as a result of the complex organizations that were created after the industrial revolution. A manager’s role is to bring order and consistency through planning, budgeting, and controlling. Leadership, on the other hand, is aimed at producing movement and change (Kotter 1990, 1996).

The debates suggest that, for those who draw a distinction between leaders and managers, leaders are assigned attributes that allow them to energize their followers, whereas managers are simply the individuals who take care of the mundane and routine details. Both are necessary for organizations to function, and one cannot replace the other. By considering the issue of effectiveness, many of the arguments regarding the differences between leadership and management can be clarified. Being an effective manager involves performing many of the functions that are attributed to leaders with or without some degree of charisma. For example, is a manager who motivates his or her followers and whose department achieves all its goals simply an effective manager, or is the manager also a leader? The distinctions drawn between leadership and management may be more related to effectiveness than to the difference between the two concepts. An effective manager of people has to motivate them and provide them with a sense of mission and purpose. Therefore, effective managers can be considered to be leaders (Gardner 1986; Grove 1986).

Following the definition of leadership presented previously, any manager who guides a group toward goal accomplishment can be considered a leader. Much of the distinction between management and leadership seems to come from the assumption that the title of leader assumes competence. Therefore, an effective and successful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the future</td>
<td>Focus on the present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create change</td>
<td>Maintain status quo and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a culture based on shared values</td>
<td>Implement policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish an emotional link with followers</td>
<td>Remain aloof to maintain objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use personal power</td>
<td>Use position power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
manager can be considered to be a leader, but a less-competent manager is not a leader. Overall, the debate over the difference between the two concepts does not add much to our understanding of what constitutes good leadership or good management and how to achieve them. It does, however, point to the need felt by many organizations for effective, competent, and visionary leadership/management. This book does not dwell on the distinction between the two concepts and uses the terms interchangeably.

Roles and Functions of Leaders

Although leaders in different cultures may perform different functions and play different roles, researchers have identified a number of managerial roles and functions.

MANAGERIAL ROLES

In order to be effective, leaders perform a number of different roles. The roles are sets of expected behavior ascribed to the person by virtue of his or her leadership position. Along with the basic managerial functions of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling, leaders are ascribed a number of strategic and external roles as well (which are discussed in detail in chapter 9). Furthermore, one of the major functions of leaders is to provide their group or organization with a sense of vision and mission. For example, a department manager needs to plan and organize his or her department’s activities and assign various people to perform tasks. A department manager also has to monitor his or her subordinates’ performance and correct their actions when needed. Aside from these internal functions, the manager has to negotiate with his or her boss and other department managers for resources and coordination of activities. Additionally, in many organizations, managers and leaders at all levels must participate in strategic planning and the development of their organization’s mission.

Many different taxonomies of managerial activities have been developed (Komaki 1986; Luthans and Lockwood 1984). One of the most cited is that proposed by Mintzberg (1973), who added the 10 executive roles of figurehead, leader, liaison, monitor, disseminator, spokesperson, entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator to an already-long list of what leaders do. Mintzberg’s research further suggests that few, if any, managers perform these roles in an organized, compartmentalized, and coherent fashion. Instead, their days are characterized by a wide variety of tasks, frequent interruptions, and little time to think or to connect with their subordinates. Mintzberg’s findings have become an integral part of many definitions of leadership and management. The roles he defined are typically considered to be the major roles and functions of leaders.

Interestingly, research indicates that there are gender differences in how managers perform their roles. In 1990, Sally Helgesen published her book The Female Advantage: Women’s Way of Leadership and questioned many myths about the universality of management behaviors. Through case studies of five female executives, Helgesen faithfully replicated the methodology used 20 years earlier by Mintzberg in his study of seven male managers. Mintzberg had found that his managers often worked at an unrelenting pace, with many interruptions, and very few non-work-related activities. They felt that their identity was directly tied to their job and often reported feeling isolated, with no time to reflect, plan, and share information with others. They also reported having a complex network of colleagues outside of work and preferring face-to-face interaction to all other means of communication.

Helgesen’s findings of female managers matched Mintzberg’s only in the last two categories. Her female managers also had a complex network and preferred face-to-face communication. However, the other findings were surprisingly different. The
women reported working at a calm, steady pace with frequent breaks. They did not consider unscheduled events to be interruptions; they instead viewed them as a normal part of their work. All of them reported having a number of non-work-related activities. They each had multifaceted identities and therefore did not feel isolated. They found themselves having time to read and reflect on the big picture. Additionally, the female executives scheduled time to share information with both their colleagues and their subordinates.

The gender differences found between the two studies can be attributed partly to the 20-year time difference. However, Helgesen’s suggestions about a female leadership style, which she calls “the web” is supported by a number of other research and anecdotal studies. Helgesen’s web is defined as a circle with the manager in the center and interconnected to all other parts of the department or organization. This view differs sharply with the traditional pyramid structure common in many organizations (Tropila and Kleiner 1994).

Leaders such as Francis Hesselbein, chief executive of the Girl Scouts, Nancy Bador, executive director of Ford Motor Company, and Barbara Grogan, founder and president of Western Industrial Contractors, use the web as their management style. They shun the hierarchical structures for flat webs in which they are at the center rather than at the top. This structure, and their position within it, allows them to be both accessible and informed. Whereas top-down and bottom-up information in a traditional hierarchy is filtered and altered as it travels, leaders at the center of the web have direct access to all others in the organization, and their employees have access to them. As a result, the web structure prevents the managers from feeling isolated and out of touch with the needs of their subordinates and their organization. Gerry Laybourne, chairman and CEO of Oxygen Media, is the executive who built the top-rated children’s television network Nickelodeon while she was at Viacom. She considers competition to be “nonfemale.” When she found out that Fortune magazine was ranking women in business, she declared, “That’s a nonfemale thing to do. Ranking is the opposite of what women are all about” (Sellers 1998, 80).

Many other successful female business leaders, however, do not see their leadership styles as drastically different from that of their male counterparts. Darla Moore, president of Rainwater, Inc., an investment company, and the first woman to have a business school named after her, argues that women’s worse sin is to think, “ ‘You should be a nice girl. You ought to fit in. You should find a female mentor.’ What a colossal waste of time” (Sellers 1998, 92).

FUNCTIONS OF THE LEADER: CREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF AN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

One of the major functions of leaders is the creation and development of a culture and climate for their group or organization (Nahavandi and Malekzadeh 1993a; Schein 1985). Leaders, particularly founders, leave an almost-indelible mark on the assumptions that are passed down from one generation to the next. In fact, organizations often come to mirror their founders’ personalities. Consider for example how Vermont’s gourmet ice-cream maker Ben and Jerry’s reflects its cofounders’, Ben Cohen and Jerry Greenfield, strong beliefs in social responsibility (Welles 1998). The company practices egalitarian management by keeping the difference between managers’ and employee’s salaries low, encourages participation, and supports a lengthy social agenda such as saving the Amazon rain forest. Similarly, Roger Abramson’s furniture company discussed previously is a reflection of his frenetic pace and obsession with speed and quick results.
If the founder is control oriented and autocratic, the organization is likely to be centralized and managed in a top-down fashion. If the founder is participative and team oriented, the organization will be decentralized and open. The leaders make most if not all of the decisions regarding the various factors that will shape the culture (see Figure 1.2).

Leaders are role models for other organizational members. They establish and grant the status symbols that are the main artifacts of organizational culture. Followers take their cues from the leaders on what behaviors are and are not acceptable. If the leader of the organization is uncaring and brash with lower-level staff members, other managers may follow suit and show disregard for their staff. On the other hand, if the top executive goes out of his or her way to take notice of the lower-level employees and emphasizes their importance to the organization, other managers are also likely to do so. For example, a few years ago, Chuck Hickey, president of Surfsoft, a software consulting company, started implementing many total quality management (TQM) concepts after having read a book by Edward Demming. Hickey flattened his organization, removed sales quotas, and created teams (Mochari 1998). His focus on cooperation and improved morale trickled down and revived a company that was once in trouble.

One of the key behaviors that leaders need to role model is the acceptance of responsibility for one’s actions. With the power and status afforded to leaders comes the obligation of accepting responsibility for one’s own decisions and the organization’s impact on others. The willingness to accept such responsibility often seems to be lacking in many U.S. corporations where finger pointing takes up more energy than correcting mistakes. The leader’s demeanor in this category can set the tone for others in the organization to either accept or shirk responsibility for their actions and decisions.

Other means through which the leader shapes culture is by decisions regarding the reward system (Kerr and Slocum 1987) and by controlling decision standards. In one organization, rewards (both financial and nonfinancial) only go to the highest contributors to the bottom line. In another, accomplishments such as contribution to cultural diversity or the degree of social responsibility are also valued and rewarded. Addition-
ally, leaders are in charge of selecting other leaders and managers for the organization. Those selected are likely to fit the existing leader’s ideal model and therefore fit the culture. Selecting other influential members of the organization provides leaders with yet another opportunity to shape the culture. Many firms, for example, have a nominating committee of the board of directors. In such committees, top managers nominate and select their successors. They can, therefore, not only control the current culture but also have a strong influence on the future of their organization.

The power of the leader to make decisions for the organization regarding structure and strategy is another effective means of shaping culture. By determining the hierarchy, span of control, reporting relationship, and degree of formalization and specialization, the leader molds culture. A highly decentralized and organic structure is likely be the result of an open and participative culture, whereas a highly centralized structure will go hand in hand with a mechanistic/bureaucratic culture. The structure of an organization limits or encourages interaction and by doing so affects, as well as is affected by, the assumptions shared by members of the organization. Similarly, the strategy selected by the leader or the top-management team will be determined by, as well as help shape, the culture of the organization. Thus, a leader who adopts a proactive growth strategy that requires innovation and risk taking will have to create a very different culture than a leader who selects a strategy of retrenchment.

Does Leadership Make a Difference?

Open any newspaper or business periodical and you will probably find the profile of a political, community, or business leader or a lengthy article about how an organization is likely to be greatly affected by its new leadership. Company stocks fluctuate as a result of changes in leadership. For example, while the board of directors of American Express was debating the fate of CEO Robinson (he was replaced), the company’s stock price plummeted a steep 13 percent in four days. Similarly, a new leader may affect a firm’s credit rating by affecting the confidence the financial community has in him or her. A city or nation may feel a sense of revival and optimism when a new leader is elected. In 1998, Venezuelans elected a populist leader of a failed coup as president. Despite serious concerns from the business and financial communities, Hugo Chavez energized millions of voters with a party that won 35 percent of congress a year prior to the presidential elections. By and large, we tend to believe that the leadership is an important matter.
Although you may take this assertion for granted, there is considerable debate among leadership scholars concerning whether leadership really does impact organizations. The following are the key questions:

- To what extent, if at all, does the leadership of an organization affect various organizational elements and organizational performance?
- Are there certain situations in which leadership has more impact than others?

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP

Much of the research about the lack of impact of leadership has roots in the field of sociology. Such an approach asserts that organizations are driven by powerful factors other than their management (Brown 1982; Cyert and March 1963; Hannan and Freeman 1977; Meindl and Ehrlick 1987; Salancik and Pfeffer 1977). Environmental, social, industrial, and economic conditions, just to name a few factors, are assumed to determine organizational direction and performance to a much higher degree than does leadership. Similarly, the same external factors along with organizational elements such as structure and strategy are also assumed to limit the leader’s decision-making options, further reducing the leader’s discretion. The support for this approach comes primarily from two areas:

- First, a group of researchers has studied the impact of change of leadership succession in organizations. Results from studies in the private and public sectors have supported the notion that the change of leadership does not affect organizational performance strongly. For example, Salancik and Pfeffer (1977), in a study of the performance of mayors found that leadership accounted for only 7 percent to 15 percent of changes in city budgets. Similarly, Lieberson and O’Connor (1972) found that, whereas leadership has minimal effects on the performance of large corporations (accounting only for 7 percent to 14 percent of the performance), company size and economic factors have considerable links to firm performance.
- Second, support for the “lack-of-importance” hypothesis is found in an area of research that focuses on the extent of managerial discretion (Finkelstein and Hambrick 1990, 1996; Hambrick and Finkelstein 1987). Although the goal of the research is not to show the insignificance of leadership, some of the results show that CEOs have very limited discretion in their choices and activities. The lack of managerial discretion in decision making further reinforces the notion that external environmental elements and internal macro-organizational elements have more impact than does leadership.

Overall, the early evidence from the leadership succession research together with some of the managerial discretion findings can be used to support several suggestions. First, leaders have little impact on organizations. Second, even when leaders do make decisions that may affect organizations, their decisions are determined by environmental and organizational factors and are therefore not a reflection of the leader’s preferences or style. Additionally, some researchers have labeled leadership as a simple symbol or myth rather than an objective factor in organizations (Meindl and Ehrlick 1987). Research findings in support of such a view indicate that, when asked who is responsible for a group or an organization’s success and performance, people are more likely to attribute the success to the leader. This occurs even when there are data that indicate that such attribution to the leader alone is not warranted. Researchers therefore conclude that the effect of leaders, although interesting, is not objective and actual but
rather reflects a romantic notion of the role and impact of leaders. Table 1.3 summarizes the arguments regarding the impact of leadership.

ARGUMENTS FOR THE IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP

More recent reconsideration of the older data and reinterpretation of some of the findings point to the serious flaws in the research concerning the lack of impact of leadership, reasserting the importance of leadership in organizational performance (see Table 1.3 for a summary). For example, reevaluating Lieberson and O’Connor’s 1972 study, Weiner and Mahoney (1981) found that a change in leadership accounted for 44 percent of the profitability of the firms studied. Other researchers (Day and Lord 1988; Thomas 1988) also indicated that the early results were not as strong as originally believed. Other studies in schools showed that the principal is the most important factor in the climate of a school and the success of students (Allen 1981). Still other studies found that the leadership is critical to orchestrating and organizing all the complex elements necessary to change an organization (Burke, Richley, and DeAngelis 1985).

RECONCILING THE DIFFERENCES

The debates about the impact of leadership make valuable contributions to our understanding of leadership. First, it is important to recognize that leadership is one of many factors that influence the performance of a group or an organization. Second, the leader’s contribution, although not always tangible, is often significant in providing a vision and direction for followers and in integrating their activities. Third, the key is to identify situations in which the leader does have limited power and discretion over the group and the organization. (These situations are discussed at length in chapter 6, concerning substitutes for leadership, and in chapter 9, concerning the role of upper-echelon leaders.) Finally, the potential lack of impact of leaders in some situations further emphasizes the importance of followers in the success of leadership and the need to understand organizations as broad systems. Overall, after years of debate, the popular view that leaders impact organizations has received research support, and the focus has shifted from whether a leader has impact to understanding a leader’s impact and its consequences.

Summary and Conclusion

A leader is any person who influences individuals and groups within an organization, helps them in the establishment of goals, and guides them toward achievement of those goals, thereby allowing them to be effective. In order to be effective, leaders must help
maintain internal health and external adaptability. Despite the apparent simplicity of the definitions of both leadership and effectiveness, both are difficult concepts to implement. First, culture can affect who we consider to be an effective leader. Second, organizations rarely provide their leaders with the opportunity to experiment and to improve.

Many have proposed separate definitions for leadership and management. However, the activities performed by leaders are similar to those typically considered to be the domain of effective managers. Although some have seen the roles of leaders and managers as being different, effective and competent managers are often also leaders within their groups and organizations. In addition to performing the traditional managerial roles and duties, leaders also have a special role in the creation of a culture for their organizations. They can affect culture through making direct decisions regarding reward systems and hiring of other managers and employees and also by being role models for others in the organization. Notwithstanding the many roles that leaders play in an organization, there are some situations where they have only limited impact on group and organizational performance. It is therefore essential to consider leadership in its proper context and to take into account the numerous factors that may impact group and organizational performance.

**Review and Discussion Questions**

1. What are the essential components of the definition of leadership?
2. What are the essential components of the definitions of leadership effectiveness?
3. Provide one example each of an effective leader and a successful leader. Consider how they differ and what you can learn from each.
4. What are the three models of culture, and how do they impact leadership?
5. What are the obstacles to effective leadership? How have the nature and occurrence of such obstacles changed in recent years? Why?
6. Based on your knowledge of the field of management and your personal definition of leadership, how are management and leadership similar or different? How can the differences be reconciled? How do these differences add to our understanding of leadership?
7. What are the ways in which leaders influence the creation of culture in their organizations? Are there additional methods used by top managers? Provide examples.
8. What are the basic assumptions guiding the “insignificant leadership” concept? What is your position on this issue? Document your arguments.
EXERCISE 1.1

WHAT IS LEADERSHIP?

This exercise is designed to help you develop a personal definition of leadership and clarify your assumptions and expectations about leadership and effectiveness.

1. **Describe Your Ideal Leader**
   Individually list five desirable and five undesirable characteristics of your ideal leader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIRABLE</th>
<th>UNDESIRABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Develop Group Definition**
   In groups of four to five, discuss your list and your reasons and draw up a common definition.
   Common Definition:

3. **Present and Defend Definition**
   Each group will make a five-minute presentation of its definition.

4. **Common Themes**
   Discuss various definitions:
   A. What are the common themes?

   B. Which views of leadership are presented?

   C. What are the assumptions about the role of the leader?
One way to clarify your assumptions about leadership is to use images to describe your ideal leader. Through the use of such images, you can understand your views of the role of leaders in organizations and your expectations and image of leadership. These images are your personal theories of leadership. For example, viewing leaders as facilitators presents a very different image from viewing them as parents.

1. **Select Your Image**
   Select the image of your ideal leader. List the characteristics of that image.

2. **Share and Clarify**
   In groups of three or four, share your leadership image and discuss its implications for your own leadership style.

3. **Class Discussion**
   Groups will share two of their individual members’ images of leadership.

   Discuss implications of various images for:

   A. A person’s leadership style.

   B. Impact on organizational culture and structure.

   C. Compatibility with current or past leaders.

   D. Potential shortcomings of each image.
The following exercise is a cross-cultural role-play designed to allow you to experience the challenges and opportunities of interacting with people from different cultures. The setting is the fictional country of Nari. You will be asked to play the role of either an American or a Narian. Read the exercise carefully; your instructor will provide you with further information.

**Background**

Nari is a Middle Eastern country with an old history and a rich cultural heritage. Through judicious excavation of a number of minerals, the country has obtained considerable wealth, and the stable political and social climate has attracted many foreign investors. As a result, Nari has launched a careful and well-planned development campaign in the past 20 years that has allowed the country’s economy to become the strongest in the region. The per capita income is the highest in the region, and the literacy rate is over 80 percent for the population under 30 (which comprises 53 percent of the population).

The political system is an authoritarian monarchy. Although there is an elected parliament, its powers are limited to being a consultative body for the king. This political system has been in place for over 1,000 years. Compared to many of its unstable neighbors, Nari has enjoyed a very calm political climate. The current dynasty has been in place for over 400 years. However, the Western press has been highly critical of the lack of democracy and the authoritarian nature of the government. The king has unceremoniously dismissed the charges as cultural colonialism and has emphasized the need to preserve the Narian culture while welcoming the West’s and the East’s help in economic development.

The culture is warm and generally welcoming of outsiders, although criticism of the culture is poorly accepted and not open for discussion. The extended family remains the core of society, with the father being the unquestioned head. Many younger Narians seek higher education in other parts of the world; however, almost all return eagerly to their country. Although there are some rumblings about opening up the political systems and allowing for more democratic participation, the authority of the family, of the community, and of the monarch are rarely, if ever, questioned.

Narian leaders are assigned total and absolute power. Although not viewed as derived from divine rights, leaders are assumed to be infallible. Narian leaders are confident in their complete knowledge of all that they come to face. They do not ask questions and do not seek advice, even from equals; such potential indication of lack of knowledge or expertise would be seen as incompetence. The Narian leader is expected to take care of loyal followers under any circumstances. As followers owe unquestioning obedience, leaders owe them total devotion. They are fully responsible for all that happens to their followers, in all aspects of their life. They are expected to help and guide them and come to their rescue when needed. Their primary duty is to take care of their followers.

In return, Narian followers are expected to be loyal, obedient, dutiful, and subservient. They accept their leaders’ orders willingly and wholeheartedly, as all Narians are taught from the youngest age that leaders are infallible and that the proper functioning of the social order hinges on obedience, loyalty to leaders and elders, and fulfilling their responsibility as followers. Dissent and conflict are rarely in the open. If ever a mistake is made, regardless of where the fault lies, all individuals work on correcting it without assigning blame. If the leader has made a mistake, an event that
rarely, if ever is brought out in the open, one follower openly accepts the blame to protect the leader’s face and the social harmony. The person accepting that responsibility is eventually rewarded for his or her loyalty.

The role of women in Narian society has been very puzzling to Western observers. For over 30 years, women have had practically equal rights with men. They can vote, conduct any kind of business transactions, take advantage of educational opportunities, file for divorce, obtain custody of their children, and work in any organization. The literacy rate for women is equal to that of men, and although fewer of them have pursued higher education, it appears that most women who are interested in working outside the home have found easy employment in the booming Narian economy. However, the society remains highly patriarchal in its traditions.

**Role-Play Situation**

A U.S. engineering and construction company has won its first major governmental contract for the construction of two bridges in Nari. The general terms have been agreed to. The company is working closely with several U.S.-educated Narian engineers who work for the Narian Ministry of Urban Development (UD) to draft precise plans and timetables. The minister of UD, Mr. Dafti, is a well-respected civil engineer, educated in Austria in the 1950s. In addition to Narian, he speaks fluent German, English, and French. He has been instrumental in the development of his country. Although a consummate politician and negotiator and an expert on his country’s resources and economic situation, he has not practiced his engineering skills for many years.

Mr. Dafti has decided on the general location and structure of the two bridges to be built. One of the locations and designs has serious flaws. His more junior Narian associates appear to be aware of the potential problems but have not clearly voiced their concerns to the U.S. contractors, who find the design requirements unworkable.

The role-play is a meeting with Mr. Dafti, his Narian associates, and representatives of the U.S. engineering firm. The U.S. head engineer requested the meeting, and the request was granted quickly. The U.S. team is eager to start the project. The Narians also are ready to engage in the new business venture.

Please wait for further instructions.
Leadership in Action
The New Dutch Leader Shakes Up Procter & Gamble

Procter & Gamble (P&G), the Cincinnati-based maker of household products such as Tide and Pamper, has been recently rated as one of the best companies for which to work in the United States (Fisher 1998). It ranks 64th in the Global 500 as is ranked 12 in Fortune’s “Most Admired” list (http://cgi.pathfinder.com/cgi-bin/fortune/fortune500). The company recognizes that the key to success is innovation. John Pepper, CEO from 1995 to 1999, was a personable consensus builder and 33-year company veteran who focused the company’s vision on innovation (http://www.pathfinder.com.fortune/1996). With a long string of successful products, P&G is eager to launch the next “Tide.”

With all its success, the company also has a reputation for being both traditional and highly conservative. The company’s culture tends to—as some observers describe it—“procterize” its employee (Parker-Pope 1998). P&G even has a set of guidelines called “Current Best Approaches” that informs employees on how to do most of their routine activities, from running test markets to approaching retailers (Brooker 1999). Although it seeks diverse outside talent, the company has a well-established practice of internal promotion that has led people who have worked their way up the P&G ladder to fill 31 out of the 32 top positions in the company (Fisher 1998). Even though such a practice leads to a high level of satisfaction for employees such as Carol Tuttle, the company’s 22-year veteran and vice president of human resources, it can also have its downside. New ideas and disagreement are not part of a culture that borders on a cult in its lack of tolerance for innovation and dissent. Employees who try to break away from the mold are often called troublemakers and are quickly reminded to fall back in line (Brooker 1999).

But P&G is gearing up for a culture shock because of its new CEO, Durk Jager. Jager is a 55-year-old Dutchman and protégé of P&G’s famous 1990s CEO, Ed Artzt. Jager has a reputation for shaking things up, asking tough questions, demanding answers, and encouraging innovation and unconventional solutions. His motto is “If it ain’t broken, break it” (Brooker 1999). Although he is almost a 30-year veteran of the company, he has spent much of his time away from the Cincinnati headquarters. One of his biggest accomplishments was as a manager in Japan where he used his language—he quickly learned Japanese, adding to the other seven languages he already spoke—and cultural skills to open markets for P&G products and streamline operations.

Jager believes, “Great ideas generally come from conflict—a dissatisfaction with the status quo. I’d like to have an organization where there are rebels.” (Parker-Pope 1998, B4). He wants people to stick their necks out and throw away the P&G rule book. He is creating an environment where employees can take their ideas directly to the top of the organization. The company now has a “My Idea” site on its Intranet where employees can post their ideas (Brooker 1999). Jager is further restructuring the company into independent global businesses with

more autonomy. All his efforts are to encourage the 110,000 P&G employees to come up with the new ideas and products that can continue the success of the company and follow up on its world-famous products. Jager states, “There are people that have the ability and the want and the desire to be little rebels” (Brooker 1999). He wants them to come forward.

- Do you consider the potential changes at P&G positive or negative? Justify your answer.

- What can be done to both benefit from the change and maintain the company’s strong culture? What role can the leader play?
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