

Leadership Style

Notable Quotes

“Leadership style flows from the personal values, and the personal values come from my culture.” (Latino-American male leader)

“If you can believe that you’re imperfect and come to accept that and that you have to improve yourself then I think you can become a better leader.” (Asian-American male leader)

“I can remember [being told] that ‘you wear these flowery dresses and you’re so sweet to the point that nobody anticipates that you’re going to say something harsh. So it comes as a bigger surprise; that’s why you’re having this problem posing as authority. Your voice . . . you sound like a little girl. You don’t sound like an authority figure.’” (Told to a White female leader)

Vignette: Invisible Leadership—“Pushing From Behind”

“What I’ve learned about leadership from my culture is that your role as a leader isn’t so much to be out in front and visible as much as to be the person behind pushing people to be the best that they can. My tribe is matriarchal so it’s natural for women to take a leadership role from the perspective of my tribe. Women are the ones who have always made decisions and have been the leaders. Although the women make the decisions, they also decide which man to put in a leadership role and would advise that man.” (Native American Indian woman leader)

Leadership Styles

Leadership style is a focus on “what leaders do” compared with leader identity, which is a focus on “who leaders are.” As leadership theories shifted from an examination of leader traits or leadership in situations to an emphasis on leadership style, research emphasized the behaviors of leaders and expanded the study of leadership to include how leaders behave toward subordinates in various contexts. The emphasis on leadership style was responsive to the rapidly changing environment of the 20th century and the need for leaders to be fluid and dynamic in response to these changes. It was an attempt to identify not a fixed set of leader traits or situations in which leadership occurs but rather to examine styles of behaving or processes of interaction in which leaders engage with their subordinates.

During the 20th century, interest in democratic versus autocratic versus laissez-faire styles of leadership grew post-World War II in response to the military dictatorships of Hitler in Germany and Mussolini in Italy compared to democracy in the United States—and the fear of nuclear war. These were charismatic leaders irrespective of their destructive power. Military images of command-and-control types of leadership prevailed embodied in the election of General Dwight Eisenhower as president of the United States. In the 1980s, leadership researchers became interested in charismatic and transformational leadership as many U.S. companies began to acknowledge the need to make changes in their leadership in order to survive amidst increasing economic competition from non-U.S. companies. Other leadership styles also emerged, often in response to the contexts and social zeitgeist of the times. Coined by Matthew Arnold in the 19th century, social zeitgeist refers to the spirit of social change and uncertainty that marks the thought or feeling of a period or age; the zeitgeist is much more than the prevailing worldview at a given time in history. It’s a force that influences events. For example, an emphasis on dimensions, such as authenticity and integrity, emerged in response to the scandals of Enron and Penn State and the economic downturns in the real estate and banking industries at the end of the 20th century. A review of some leadership styles relevant to diversity leadership follows.

Value Dimensions in Leadership Styles

The emphasis on leadership styles often resulted in dichotomous dimensions such as transformational versus transactional leadership. Instead of posing these dimensions as alternatives, value judgments often emerged deeming one dimension as better. The focus on singular dimensions also implied the opposite as undesirable. Hence, the introduction of value judgments is

inherent in the evolution of transformational leadership, servant or shared leadership, humane or virtuous leadership, leader authenticity and integrity. In developing our understanding of diversity leadership, we need to recognize the influence of values that shape our formulation of leadership theories and to examine our premises to ensure that our theories remain inclusive of diverse viewpoints and representative of all voices. Instead of asking which style is best, we might begin to ask questions about which styles are best for which situations and in which contexts.

Are Differences in Leadership Style Related to Gender, Race, or Ethnicity?

Another question to be asking is whether differences in leadership style are related to gender, race, or ethnicity. Eagly and Johnson (1990) found that men and women leaders behave more alike than different when occupying the same positions. As women and men rise to meet the challenges of their leadership positions, they tend to behave more similarly with one another when in similar position, presumably in response to the situational demands of the position. In contrast, the emergence of leadership in laboratory experiments tend to evoke social perceptions, expectations, and stereotypes; consequently, men and women leaders who emerge in laboratory experiments tend to conform to more stereotypic gender roles.

Zweigenhaft and Domhoff (2006) found that racial/ethnic minority leaders tend to conform to behaviors of the power elite once they reach these ranks of leadership. Similarly, cross-cultural studies (Dorfman, Den Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004) suggest there are universal leadership dimensions together with cultural variation in the pattern of these dimensions.

Task Versus Relationship Leadership Styles

Much research was conducted post World War II on task versus relationship leadership styles. These styles have alternately been called agentic versus communal styles, task motivated versus relationship motivated leadership styles, task versus interpersonal, or task versus expressive styles of leadership. In general, gender differences have emerged with women leaders being more relationship oriented and men leaders being more task oriented. The strength of these differences correlate with social perception and stereotypic expectations of men and women to behave accordingly with a tendency to dichotomize task versus relationship styles of leadership as mutually exclusive. Women are more likely to be perceived as communal

and interpersonal, possessing traits of warmth and gentleness that appear more tailored for subordinate and service roles (Kite, Deaux, & Haines, 2008). Men are more likely to be perceived as task oriented and associated with traits of decisiveness that appear more tailored for leadership roles. While these perceptions may have a basis in actual behaviors, their stereotypic portrayal of men and women tends to be constraining while the association of communal traits with weakness is disadvantageous for women. It can result in men and women leaders having different types of social interactions with their men and women supervisors and subordinates and influence the outcomes experienced by each party (Ayman, 1993).

A meta-analysis of leader stereotypes (Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011) demonstrated that stereotypes of leaders are culturally masculine, with greater agency than communion traits although this masculine construal of leadership is decreasing over time. Several studies (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1994) found women to be more attentive than men to “the human side of enterprise” (McGregor, 1985), suggesting that female leaders tend to base judgments more on intuition and emotions than on rational calculation of the relationships between means and ends, more toward social stereotypes of being more interpersonal, selfless, and concerned with others. This can also be viewed as an advantage.

In a meta-analysis of gender and leadership style (Eagly & Johnson, 1990), gender differences did not emerge in organizational studies between interpersonal versus task-oriented style. However, stereotypic gender differences did emerge in laboratory experiments and assessment studies—that is, studies when participants were not selected for holding a leadership position. Social perceptions and expectations apparently influence the leadership styles of women being more relationship based when in situations of self-assessment or when appointed to leadership roles in laboratory studies. Men conformed toward the social stereotypes of being more task oriented, self-assertive, and motivated to master their environment while women conformed more toward social stereotypes of being more interpersonal, selfless, and concerned with others.

It is important to note that leadership measurement scales often force a dichotomy when these dimensions are measured as two ends of a continuum; they might be better measured as two separate dimensions where one may be high on both. This would make for a more dynamic process to understand the interaction between leader, follower, and context and measure it as a multidimensional and bidirectional dimension. It also makes clear the need to avoid stereotypic bias and value-driven assignments associated with the task versus relationship leadership styles.

Cross-cultural differences have emerged and are consistent with findings that the emphasis on relationships over the task is more central among

Asian, Arab, and non-Western leaders. This plays out negotiation and decision making by leaders whereby these leaders use the negotiation process to evaluate the quality of the relationship; they believe in the long-term gain and that an initial negotiation is one to confirm belongingness as opposed to confirming authority and dominance as might be in the case of negotiation among Westerners. Hence, when non-Westerners “give in,” this can be misconstrued by Westerners as “losing” while it is viewed by non-Western leaders as serving the long-term relationship.

Assertiveness

Assertiveness has been defined as another dimension often associated with effective leadership; it is often juxtaposed with passivity. It is often characterized by confidence and affirming one’s rights or point of view without threatening or submissively permitting another to ignore or deny one’s rights. It is a characteristic more associated with a task-oriented approach of getting things done and of men. While women are often said to benefit from assertiveness training, men are said to benefit from sensitivity training.

As discussed in Chapter 3, Asian American leaders defined assertiveness to include using indirect means of communication in order to maintain harmony in interpersonal relationships consistent with cultural orientation values. While Westerners may label this as passivity by Westerners, it demonstrates the difference in concept equivalence of assertiveness across cultural groups based on differences in worldviews. Inherent in the dichotomy between task versus relationship oriented leadership styles are the concepts of *Ren-Qing* and *Quanxi* discussed in Chapter 3, which are based on relationships, interpersonal and social obligation, and loyalty. They played a prominent role in business negotiations and leadership styles.

Transformational Leadership Style

Transformational leadership is when leaders and followers engage in a mutual process of “raising one another to higher levels of morality and motivation.” Transformational leaders raise the bar by appealing to higher ideals and values of followers. In doing so, they may model the values themselves and use charismatic methods to attract people to the values and to themselves as leaders (Burns, 1978). Kouzes and Posner (2002) developed their model of transformational leadership based on more than 1,300 interviews across private and public sector organizations to consist of five fundamental practices that enable leaders to get extraordinary things

accomplished. These include the following: (1) Model the way (2) inspire a shared vision, (3) challenge the process (4) enable others to act, and (5) encourage the heart.

Rost (1991, p. 102) defines leadership as “an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes.” To be called leadership, the relationship must be based on influence; this influence is multidirectional, and attempts must not be coercive. Therefore, the relationship is not based on authority but rather persuasion. Influence is often defined as an important component of transformational leadership.

Transformational Versus Transactional

Initially, research compared transactional with transformational styles of leadership where transactional leaders emphasized the operations, organization, and decision-making processes while transformational leaders emphasized vision, change, and innovation. This evolved to favor transformational styles of leadership starting in the 1980s as U.S. corporations began to experience rapid change with the growth of multinational corporations and international business. Vision, change, and innovation associated as core components of transformational leadership came to be viewed as necessary for leaders in the 21st century to be prepared for rapid changes following a shift from an industrial to a digital age and global society where technology has ushered in rapid and dramatic change.

Charisma

House (1977) proposed a theory for charismatic leadership. It involves attitudes and perceptions of followers about the leader and specifies those traits that increase the likelihood of being perceived as charismatic. These include the following traits: strong need for power, high self-confidence, and strong convictions; impression management and articulation of an appealing vision also increase the likelihood of appearing charismatic. Along with vision, change, and innovation, the charisma of a leader who can unite and inspire the group toward a mutual purpose has been cited as one dimension of transformational leadership (see Burns, 1978). Charismatic leadership has been defined as those leaders with a special magnetic charm or appeal arousing special popular loyalty or enthusiasm for a public figure (as a political leader). Gardner and Avolio (1998) suggest that charismatic leadership is an impression management process enacted theatrically in acts of *framing, scripting, staging, and performing*.

Examples of such charismatic leadership have generally involved dominant male figures, such as General Douglas MacArthur, Reverend Martin Luther King Jr., Mahatma Gandhi, Winston Churchill, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. The questions to ask are: Is there a difference between women and men on the dimension of charisma? Does charisma vary across cultures? While charismatic leaders generally convey a commanding presence consistent with masculinized images, this tends to be true of Western leaders. It is interesting to note that non-Western charismatic leaders typically communicate more humanistic and altruistic features of compassion, modesty, and benevolence. Witness the images of Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, and the Dalai Lama, who are noted for their compassion and endurance amidst adversity. Their quotes reflect their different styles of leadership. Mahatma Gandhi, preeminent leader of Indian nationalism, was known for his pacifist stance while in India: "Always aim at complete harmony of thought and word and deed. Always aim at purifying your thoughts and everything will be well" (Gandhi, n.d.). Nelson Mandela was imprisoned for 27 years for his antiapartheid political activity in South Africa and later the first African president from 1994 to 1999. "It is better to lead from behind and to put others in front, especially when you celebrate victory when nice things occur. You take the front line when there is danger. Then people will appreciate your leadership" (Mandela, n.d.). The Dalai Lama, in exile since 1959 in India following the failed Tibetan uprising, is known as leader of the Tibetans. "The topic of compassion is not at all religious business; it is important to know it is human business, it is a question of human survival" (Dalai Lama XIV, n.d.).

We have some qualitative evidence that charismatic women leaders do not present with a loud and commanding presence as men. Mother Teresa, known for her humility and servitude, has been a model to many worldwide. Rather, charismatic women might be more distinguished by their nurturing and smiles. The examples below illustrate this point. When Nancy Pelosi was elected as House Minority leader in 2002, she became the first woman ever to head a party in either chamber of the U.S. legislature. McGroory (2002) wrote, "He is called the Hammer. She's a velvet hammer. He is Tom DeLay, the newly elected House majority leader, who is all coercion and threat. She is Nancy Pelosi of California, who is all persuasion and smiles." This description reflects the gender bias and differential language used to describe women leaders in masculinized contexts. Though pointing to Nancy Pelosi's collaborative and interpersonal strengths, the description reflects the tendency to "feminize" women leaders to suggest weakness or incredulity when women behave as decisive and effective leaders. Anson Chan, former Secretary of State in Hong Kong, is someone about whom there is uniform consensus about her charisma. When asked about charisma

in men and women, she said: “I actually think it’s an advantage to be a woman. Not that I took advantage. I have a reputation of always being approachable. I always have this big smile on my face, which makes a lot of people very happy. People feel that I’m approachable, that I’m a good listener, and that I’m prepared to listen to what they say. But at the same time, lots of women look up to me because they think that I’m a very good role model” (Chin, 2013). What is emphasized as charisma in both of these women leaders is their persuasion and smiles.

Related images about strong women include Nancy Pelosi and Hillary Clinton’s leadership described as a “Velvet Glove with an Iron Fist.” The image reflects the mystique of women—for strong women, their guise of softness, and the ambivalence about strong women. Consider the mixed images about Hillary Clinton, former U.S. Secretary of State, who brought disdain because of her strong and commanding style; she was viewed as cold and unfeeling—that is, “unfeminine.” She was “redeemed” during her run for president after she cried, showing emotion “befitting of women.”

Again, the issue of concept equivalence plays a role in defining charisma. It may be defined differently across gender and cultural groups. Whether or not the definition of transformational leadership includes charisma conveys masculine versus feminine images of transformational leadership. Those definitions, which include charisma as a commanding presence, are more aligned with masculine definitions. Those definitions that stress vision and change suggest that transformational leadership is more of the exchange between leaders and followers and are more aligned with feminine definitions of relationships. In those empirical studies using the latter definition of transformational leadership, women emerge as being more transformational and having an advantage.

Charismatic leadership, as defined by some, is how leaders communicate that they truly care about the group’s welfare and are willing to go the extra mile. These examples of charismatic leadership are based on the relationship between leader and follower, not solely on the personality of the leader. William Clinton, former U.S. president, was noted for how he could communicate “I can feel your pain and I’m willing to do something about it.” Central to Mother Teresa and the Dalai Lama’s appeal was their appeal to members’ motives and aspirations; they motivated followers to go beyond self-interest; their dedication to the cause and willingness to engage in personal sacrifice and danger was lauded. This element of self-sacrifice, associated with religious and Eastern philosophies, tends to characterize their charisma in contrast with the commanding and influential presence of General George S. Patton who said, “No bastard ever won a war by dying for his country. He won it by making the other poor dumb

bastard die for his country (Patton, n.d.)” and of Winston Churchill who said, “We shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender” (Churchill, 1940).

Cultural Variation

A meta-analysis of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles among women (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003) found that female leaders were more transformational than male leaders and also engaged in more of the contingent reward behaviors that are a component of transactional leadership. Male leaders were generally more likely to manifest the other aspects of transactional leadership (active and passive management by exception) and laissez-faire leadership. The small but significant differences are consistent with feminist principles of inclusion, collaboration, and social advocacy. Despite stereotype-based suspicions that women might not be effective leaders, these differences displayed by women leaders are generally associated with good managerial practices in current-day organizations (e.g., Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Women leaders have been found to be more transformational compared with men leaders although the differences are small but significant. We might attribute this to the “feminine” features associated with images of competent men leaders as transactional or task oriented. Or we might attribute this to feminist leaders “challenging the status quo” of male privilege and their marginal status in the ranks of leadership aligned with equity goals. Hence, they are more likely to promote change and innovation.

The measurement equivalence of transformational leadership has been tested across cultures. In most cultures, three styles of laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational leadership have been found, but the behaviors defining them are not the same (e.g., Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). Bass (1990) provides an example that boasting about one’s competence is inspirational and builds confidence in subordinates in Indonesia, but doing so in Japan is considered to be unseemly. On the whole, many cross-cultural studies have demonstrated the validity of transformational leadership (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). However, Chin (2013) found that diverse leaders of color in the United States endorsed transformational leadership as a preferred leadership style on a quantitative survey; however, follow-up individual interviews and focus groups showed that they preferred collaborative leadership models but felt they needed to aspire to transformational leadership styles (because they are in vogue).

Collaborative Leadership Style

As the women's movement and civil rights movement of the 1960s raised our consciousness about gender and racial/ethnic inequities and oppression, collaborative leadership styles emerged. Central to this style are values of collaboration and empowerment with concepts of "shared power" and "servant leader" emerging as models of leadership. This was a shift from power to empowerment in response to experiences of oppression in the United States and the emergence of social responsibility gaining prominence as a concern of leadership.

Hank Rubin (2009) described "a collaboration [as] a purposeful relationship in which all parties strategically choose to cooperate in order to accomplish a shared outcome." He says: "You are a collaborative leader once you have accepted responsibility for building, or helping ensure the success of, a heterogeneous team to accomplish a shared purpose. Your tools are (1) the purposeful exercise of your behavior, communication, and organizational resources in order to affect the perspective, beliefs, and behaviors of another person (generally a collaborative partner) to influence that person's relationship with you and your collaborative enterprise and (2) the structure and climate of an environment that supports the collaborative relationship" (p. 17).

Collaborative leadership styles have become increasingly popular with growing recognition of the diverse and global environment in which we live. This leadership style is viewed as enabling leaders to be at the forefront of change, and for leaders to be able to work across groups together in a global environment. It has led to growing recognition of the importance of flexibility and adaptability for effective leadership in the 21st century.

Today's most pressing challenges in society include issues such as managing resource constraints, controlling health care costs, training the 21st century workforce, developing and implementing new technologies, and stabilizing financial systems to foster sustainable economic growth. The future of collaborative leadership depends on the ability of leaders to engage and collaborate with the business, government, and social sectors. Nick Lovegrove and Matthew Thomas (cofounders of The InterSector Project) writing for the *Harvard Business Review* (2013), interviewed over 100 leaders who have demonstrated their ability to engage and collaborate across these three sectors and found six distinguishing characteristics:

- Balanced motivations. A desire to create public value no matter where they work, combining their motivations to wield influence (often in government), have social impact (often in nonprofits), and generate wealth (often in business)
- Transferable skills. A set of distinctive skills valued across sectors, such as quantitative analytics, strategic planning, and stakeholder management

- Contextual intelligence. A deep empathy of the differences within and between sectors, especially those of language, culture, and key performance indicators
- Integrated networks. A set of relationships across sectors to draw on when advancing their careers, building top teams, or convening decision makers on a particular issue
- Prepared mind. A willingness to pursue an unconventional career that zigzags across sectors and the financial readiness to take potential pay cuts from time to time
- Intellectual thread. Holistic subject matter expertise on a particular intersector issue by understanding it from the perspective of each sector

For collaboration to be effective there must be mutual respect of the cultures and identities that each member brings. This has not been common in more traditional organizations and institutions where an emphasis on hierarchy occurs. Managers are typically expected to manage a team of people with a set of resources; success, power, and influence are defined by having more people and more resources to control. In contrast, effective collaboration is contingent on managing people and resources outside one's control. Collaborative leadership also reflects cultural value orientations and the negotiation that occurs across diverse social and task-oriented groups.

Women and Collaboration

Research has demonstrated that women have a somewhat more democratic and participative style than men (Trinidad & Normore, 2005), perhaps because people resist women who take charge in a particularly assertive manner. In meta-analyses of studies on leadership styles of women and men, female leaders are somewhat more transformational than male leaders, especially in mentoring and developing workplace colleagues. They tend to adopt a positive managerial approach that trades on rewards rather than a negative approach that trades on reprimands (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003; Eagly & Johnson, 1990). This evidence supports the tendency for women to adopt a more collaborative, cooperative, or democratic leadership style and for men to adopt a more directive, competitive, or autocratic style, which has emerged in all types of studies. What is striking is that women seem to be intentionally different and more collaborative based on differences in personality and social interpersonal skills.

Collectivism

Collective leadership, simply stated, is leading together as partners according to Petra Künkel, who defines it as “the capacity of a group of

leaders to deliver a contribution in service of the common good through assuming joint and flexible leadership, according to what is perceived and required.” Each coleader feels no need to personally stand out or impose his or her views but cultivates the ability to know or sense what needs doing. In many non-Western cultures, leadership is considered a collective rather than an individual capacity; leadership is defined then as a relationship or a process, not a person, which contrasts with Western cultures that often emphasize who the leader is.

Unlike individual heroic leadership, coleadership embraces the diversity of people and perspectives and frees up self-initiative and collective intelligence. When practiced across sectors, it creates the conditions for societal learning and innovation through an increased sense of interdependence and a deeper trust in self-organization.

The distinguishing feature of a collaborative leadership style is working with members, using a team approach, and acknowledging their input, while a transformational leadership style is distinguished by the influence a leader has on the members. Collectivistic dimensions underlie this style and are consistent with many Eastern cultures and racial/ethnic minority groups in the United States. In fact, a collaborative style of leadership was preferred over a transformational style of leadership among racial/ethnic minority group leaders studied by Chin (2013). In endorsing a collaborative leadership style, these diverse leaders of color saw it as more central to a consensus-building process, ensuring that all voices are heard and engaging members and the community in the process of leadership. This style better reflected their collectivistic view over an individualistic view of society and their cultural orientation values.

In recognition of the difference between collectivist and individualist societies, Gauthier (2011) proposes the following model of collective leadership that integrates three new areas of leadership theory:

- Shared/distributed/rotating/collective leadership (lateral or peer influence, concertive action)
- Complexity leadership (entanglement between top-down, bottom-up, circular)
- Leadership as a relational process (interpersonal influence, dialogue, mutuality)

There is mutual adjustment among and between members and leaders—a shared sense making and collective learning. DAC leadership outcomes include the following: (1) Direction: understanding and assenting to the value of the collective’s goals; (2) Alignment: organizing and coordinating knowledge and work; and (3) Commitment: members subsuming their own efforts and benefits within the collective effort and benefit.

Team Leadership

Related to collaborative leadership is team leadership that focuses on groups working together to achieve a specified outcome. Groups that bring together diverse individuals have been shown to outperform more homogeneous groups because they ordinarily include members with differing ways of representing and solving problems; however, this can depend on the individual consideration given by leaders to its members (Homan & Greer, 2013). While diversity in teams can initiate subgroup categorizations of creating “us-them” distinctions and reduce interpersonal liking, low trust, and high levels of conflict that impedes team outcomes of performance and satisfaction, diversity can also initiate the exchange and processing of different perspectives and ideas, which can enhance team performance and satisfaction. Diversity in composition of group members brings advantages because the best solutions to complex problems generally result from teams that apply differing tools and skills.

The challenge for organizations is to leverage this potential by promoting diversity in groups and its leaders while working to lessen the conflict, communication barriers, and lack of mutual respect that can develop between in-group and out-group members (e.g., Polzer, Milton, & Swann, 2002; see review by van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). Considerate leaders “show concern and respect for followers, look out for their welfare, and express appreciation and support” (Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004, p. 36). Leaders who are themselves from groups traditionally excluded from leadership may be more likely to have the consideration attending to relationships and individual need and the multicultural competence to manage the challenges of a diverse workgroup and to reap its advantages.

Servant Leadership

Also related to collaborative leadership is servant leadership, which reflects attempts to transform leader-member relationships to be more egalitarian by redefining the relationship to be one of servant leaders responding to the needs of followers. Servant leadership was first developed by Robert K. Greenleaf (1977) and became one of the popular leadership models in reaction to concerns about the abuse of power among leaders. Servant leaders achieve results for their organizations by giving priority attention to the needs of members and those they serve. They are humble stewards of their organization’s resources (human, financial, and physical). Servant leadership was made popular with the late Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and has been described as one of the ways in which President Obama is representative of the modern ethnic minority leader, demonstrated by his

early career as a community organizer. He used the community and a sense of purpose beyond himself as he orchestrated one of the most inclusive and expansive presidential campaigns in the history of the United States of America; his message was about the people and the goals he was trying to reach and solve for the collective good.

In most contexts today, top-down, command-and-control leaders no longer provide the most effective or admired type of leadership (Eagly & Carli, 2007). In response to these changes, scholars of leadership have increasingly emphasized that effective leadership emerges from inspiring, motivating, and mentoring followers. Such leadership is embedded in interpersonal exchanges and dialogues in organizations in which leadership is distributed throughout the organization as both followers and leaders take responsibility for adapting to challenges (e.g., Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Spillane, 2006)—often described as shared leadership. Collaborative leadership styles are essentially a focus on the issues of power in the exercise of leadership; who holds the power and how it is distributed.

Ethical Leadership

Recent research has tried to understand moral behavior in the workplace mainly from an intrapersonal perspective, blaming ethical failures on the person's moral character, moral development or moral identity, or on isolated aspects of the situation. In doing so, little attention has been paid to the interplay between the person and the interpersonal context in which this behavior takes place. An emphasis on ethical leadership addresses the question studied by Zimbardo (2007) on how good people do bad things. In describing the dark side of leadership and power, he uses it to mobilize change in the concept that everyone can be a hero by making one small change.

Scandals involving leaders at the beginning of the 21st century such as Enron and Penn State (see Chapter 2) seem to have resulted in an increased emphasis on virtue and ethics as a goal for redefining leadership. Is there a need for leaders to act with virtue?

Virtuous Leadership

According to Kilburg (2012), five virtues espoused by Plato and Confucius have endured the test of time. These virtues frame the three essential components of effective leadership: strategy, character, and influence. Strategy involves setting the direction for where to go while influence is the ability to create meaningful relationships with others through which

work of the organization is accomplished. Character is the continuous exercise of virtuous behavior.

According to Kilburg, leaders must be virtuous human beings. Using a philosophical model to understand the “what and how” of effective leadership, he frames this as an exercise in answering two important questions: What are we to do? What are executives to do to lead their organizations? How do leaders determine identity (character) of an organization and strategic direction it will pursue and influence how it will go about achieving its organizational goals?

To be virtuous means having the five Socratic virtues or character strengths: wisdom, courage, temperance, justice, and reverence, which are essential to leadership competence. Good leadership occurs when the process of discerning, decision making and action involving these virtues is followed. Kilburg distinguishes corrupt leadership and derailment of leadership when leaders deviate from these virtues. He conceptualizes where leadership goes awry in terms of psychodynamic conflict and identifies the seven deadly leadership errors tied to failures to follow these virtues. These virtues mirror some of the traits currently emphasized in the leadership literature: Wisdom is cognitive strength in acquiring and using knowledge, courage is emotional strength and the will to accomplish goals in the midst of opposition, temperance is the exercise of moderation, justice is ethical behavior and doing what is right, and reverence is an adherence to order and hierarchy. Using a competency approach, Kilburg delineates the virtues into skills that can be learned, ties them to behavioral principles, and uses case examples to support the success of his model.

Kilburg integrates a global context with the organizational context of leadership, of comparing and contrasting historical 20th century leadership with 21st century leadership. The context for global leadership is placed amidst a comparison of the change in society 2010 from a century ago in 1910. None of the developments today were foreseen by leaders of nations and businesses a century ago. There has been a radical transformation in the geopolitical and economic systems of the world with a movement from imperialism to an unraveling of the empires of the 19th century toward the growth of democracies as a predominant form of government. Population growth has climbed dramatically. Science and technology today, influencing our speed of communication, information exchange, and global output of goods and services, outruns the imagination of those from a century ago.

Li (2012) draws on philosophy to compare differences between Asian versus Western learners and draws implications for virtuous leadership as well. The Asian learner is internal with a worldview emphasis on “to be” but is external in his or her learning outcomes to be altruistic. This contrasts with the Western learner who is external with a worldview emphasis on “to do” but is internal in his or her learning outcome to gain knowledge.

Failure of Leadership

Penn State University's firing of its President, Graham B. Spanier, and head football Coach, Joe Paterno, was a historic moment in 2011. It was a sanction against the failure of leaders to act and to uphold their ethical responsibility to protect those in their charge. What was being challenged was that leaders cannot allow the politics of athletics and the power of money to win over their judgment and ethical responsibility to act. In this public and profound action, college athletics and higher education will never be the same. The message was that cultures of silence that enable sexual abuse in the interest of the sport and the high money stakes will not be tolerated. Expectations of leadership will be held to a higher standard.

Former assistant coach of Penn State University, Jerry Sandusky, was charged with sexually assaulting eight boys before and after his retirement in 1999. Even after reports alleging sexual abuse, Sandusky was allowed continued access to young boys. University officials from the coach to the president were held responsible by its board of trustees, a first given that President Spanier and Coach Paterno were not the perpetrators. In holding leadership to a higher standard, the burden of responsibility did not stop with Coach Paterno reporting the alleged sexual abuse; he needed to ensure that action was taken. It elevates the ethical responsibility of our leaders to act and holds them to a higher standard of reporting.

From this incident, we must question how the values of a masculinized context of athletics and college football could have allowed this sexual abuse to go on for 20 years. No longer is it a man's world and privilege to engage in such behavior while other men looked the other way and blamed the victim. The Penn State scandal signals and symbolizes a sea change in our society in which leaders have the burden of responsibility to act, protect, and stop it.

Fairness: Procedurally Fair

De Cremer and van Knippenberg (2002) bring in the dimension of procedurally fair leaders who do not need to be charismatic to engender cooperation and vice versa. Instead of leadership based on the personality of the leader to influence and motivate followers as in transformational leadership styles, humane and ethical leadership is based on principles of fairness, integrity, and ethics. This concept of fairness and distributive justice has been found to weigh in judgments of effective leadership. More importantly, these judgments of fairness are influenced by the social identities of the leaders.

Humane Leadership

Humane leadership is growing in importance within the leadership literature. Described as one of the leadership dimensions in the GLOBE studies, endorsement of humane leadership was also found to be important among diverse leaders of color (Chin, 2013). Similarly, it has characterized the leadership styles of many Eastern leaders, including the Dalai Lama and Mahatma Gandhi as described in Chapter 4. Ayman (2004) similarly described it as a dimension of benevolent paternalism as described in Chapter 2. An important underlying principle is that of compassion found in many Eastern cultures. It leads to a social justice orientation or sense of social responsibility as a goal and outcome of leadership.

Confucian Leadership

Lao Tzu, a Chinese philosopher, in his “Moral Principles” quoted in Tsui, Wang, Xin, Zhang, and Fu (2004, p. 18) says: “As for the leader at the very top, it is best if people barely know he exists. Because he says very little, his words have more value. And when the work is done, the people are pleased because they think they did it all by themselves.” This opening quotation from the writings of the Chinese philosopher Lao Tzu speaks to a unique cultural specific leadership style steeped in Chinese traditions and values. Although there are a variety of leadership styles in present-day China, many of the leadership styles are grounded in Confucian and Daoist principles and teachings, Communist tenets, and selected influences from the Western world of business management and organization styles (Liu, 2013; Tsui et al., 2004). Humanistic orientations are at the core of Confucianism beliefs, where an emphasis is placed on a family’s welfare, the belief that all people are teachable, and that the improvement of one’s life can be attained through a group orientation; the achievement and maintenance of social harmony through relationships is the utmost goal of Confucianism. In effect, a leader first devotes time and thought to self-reflection in an effort to achieve communal balance in relationships with others and at the same time minimize influences on the actions of others.

Therefore, according to Jeong-Kyu Lee (2001) “Confucian leadership is based on two main themes: personal order and sociopolitical order. Both themes emphasize reciprocal interpersonal relationships between superiors and subordinates—that is, hierarchically authoritative leadership, as well as reciprocal humanitarian leadership” (p. 9). In some ways, the person who follows these principles and guidelines might be referred to as an “invisible leader,” who accordingly shares such characteristics as modesty, respect, generosity, avoidance of the limelight, and acknowledgement of

the value and work of others (Tsui et al., 2004). In many ways, the profile of the invisible leader is one who closely follows Confucianism beliefs and thus could be described as a one who advocates benevolent paternalism in their approach to leadership. It differs from the prophetic-caliphal leader described in Chapter 3 although there is shared emphasis on hierarchy.

Li (2013) draws on the concept of virtue ethics by Chinese philosopher Zhang Zai as one of great importance to leadership as the essence of inner character. It involves the vital energy behind emotions, which can become creative; the goal is self-completion (*chengxing* 成性) through development and cultivation (*gongfu* 功夫). Zhang Zai advocates the change of the quality of the vital energy as a way (*dao* 道) toward becoming a scholar (*xuezhe* 学者), the nobleman (*daren* 大人), or a sage (*shengren* 圣人). These three levels of development are based on the fundamental Confucian conception of the “Inner Sageliness and Outer Kingliness” (*neishengwaiwang* 内圣外王), the ancient model of leadership. It is central to the applications of leadership benevolent paternalism and differs from the more pejorative connotations of paternalism as developed in the West.

Benevolent Paternalism

A benevolent paternalistic leadership style has its origins in the way early tribes and civilizations organized themselves and how order, direction, function, and structure were maintained and delegated among community and tribal members. Basically such styles could be arranged according to paternalistic and maternalistic lines of authority; there are and were societies that were egalitarian, where leadership responsibilities were shared among the tribal and community members. Basically a paternalistic form of leadership is one where a father or a male elder governs the community or organization often without given them many responsibilities, duties, and civil or individual rights; it often has negative implications in as much as the father-leader treats the community or organizational members as his children. Maternalistic leadership is one where the woman orders and guides the direction of the community and organization with an emphasis on benevolence expressed through nurturance with a moral emphasis on the care and welfare of children and women.

A paternalistic leadership style is one that is usually employed by dominant males where their style and power are used to control and protect staff; in turn, employees or organizational members are expected to be compliant, devoted, and obedient. In some ways, the dominance of the male discourages creative thinking and innovative ideas. Based on the observations and conclusions of Farh and Cheng (2000), certain components of paternalism stem from a Confucian ideology that forms the cultural expectations that

leaders should act as parents with strong authority and display fatherly benevolence and morality to their followers in order to maintain control over employees and company wealth. According to Westwood and Chan (1992) paternalism is a father-like leadership style in which strong authority is combined with concern and with a great care not to cause or create inconveniences. Moreover, Westwood (1997) suggests that paternalistic leadership is effective in many Chinese business contexts in part because the style follows the principles of compliance and harmony. Pellegrini and Scandura (2008), through a careful and thoughtful review of the literature on paternalistic leadership, conclude that, “The growing interest in paternalistic leadership research has led to a recent proliferation of diverse definitions and perspectives, as well as a limited number of empirical studies. [In this nascent stage], the diversity of perspectives has resulted in conceptual ambiguities, as well as contradictory empirical findings” (p. 566).

Pellegrini and Scandura (2008) are correct in their conclusions and observations; definitions of the leadership style vary accordingly to include culturally different variations influenced by a country’s specific lifeways and thoughtways. For example, in a comprehensive 10-country study on paternalistic leadership preferences, Aycan et al. (2000) found that samples of American employees reported higher paternalistic values compared with employees from Canada, Germany, and Israel and maintenance of positive relationships consisting of benevolence/morality associated with positive relationships. Similarly, in a recent empirical study, Pellegrini, Scandura, and Jayaraman (2007) found that paternalistic leadership approaches significantly and positively influenced employees’ organizational commitment in a North American context. In another cultural comparative study on paternal leadership style preferences, Pellegrini, Scandura, and Jayaraman (2010) compared employee attitudes toward paternalistic leadership and its correlates. They found that paternalism had a significant positive effect on job satisfaction in India; the relationship was not significant among employee samples in the United States. Additionally, the researchers found that paternalistic leadership was positively related to leader-member exchange and organizational commitment. The authors conclude that, “The current results suggest that, for too long, negative perceptions of paternalism may have limited theory and research, which may have limited the potential that paternalistic leadership may hold to better understand the full spectrum of leadership” (p. 414).

In an effort to clearly illustrate and describe distinct leadership styles Aycan (2006) constructed a matrix describing four distinct styles from the perspective of their specific behaviors and basic fundamentals. The styles she identified included benevolent paternalism, exploitative paternalism, authoritarian approach, and an authoritative approach. In essence, benevolent

paternalism is a leadership style where the emphasis is placed on kindness, compassion, empathy, and openhandedness. As suggested by Farh and Cheng (2000), forms of paternalism have their origins in Confucian ideology, which emphasizes positive social relations; what can emerge is “benevolent leader with loyal minister” and “kind father with filial son.” These principles form the cultural expectations that a leader should be benevolent to his or her followers. Combined with definitions of paternalism, the leader blends elements of benevolence so that employees or organizational members are expected to be compliant and devoted and yet are treated with respect, kindness, gratitude, and generosity. In classic form of paternalistic leadership styles, power and influence are individual-centric and not necessarily oriented to collective well-being and tangibles of the group. In effect, authority flows downward. In collectivistic oriented societies, benevolent paternal styles can be more effective and accommodating of their lifeways and thoughtways. Relationships do matter under such circumstances. Control-centrism, for example, runs counter to group centeredness of collectivist organizations. In those settings, the benevolent leader’s goal is consensus achieved through a process-oriented mode of communication and decision making. Achievement of the laudable goal tends to generate employee or member loyalty. Constituents learn that their benevolent leaders are not interested in competing with them for resources and resource allocations. They note that their leader does not promote a personal agenda stemming from intrinsically motivated values and status mobility.

Constituents, employees, and group members also observe and recognize that benevolent paternalistic leaders respect humility, lack vanity, and often defer to the group’s welfare. Most important, they do not perceive the characteristics and expression of benevolent style as weaknesses or lack of influence in generating positive outcomes; and in this context, such leaders are viewed as strong and quietly persuasive. They are not perceived as megalomaniacs consumed with a high need for achievement, power and influence, and domination of others. In addition to their respect and expression of humility, they tend to be modest, unassuming, selfless, feign engaging in self-pride, and avoid passions for greatness, control, and power and micropolitics. Moreover, they tend to show their careful thought by being accommodating, patient, and helpful. Most important, they operate on principles of “do no harm” and do not inconvenience others; socio-psychological toxic environments are unacceptable for them and thus are avoided at great costs.

In a comprehensive study of different paternalistic leadership styles utilized by Chinese leaders and managers in small and medium-sized enterprises, Liu (2013) explored four types of organizational culture identified by a competing values framework. The research was based on 12 formulated

hypotheses concerning the impact of group, developmental, hierarchical, and rational culture on benevolent, moral, and authoritarian leadership. Liu collected data from 515 cases in 23 Chinese enterprises. Specifically, Liu conducted the study to explore the relationships between hierarchical culture, benevolent leadership, moral leadership, and authoritarian leadership. Also relationships were explored with group culture, developmental culture, and rational culture. Findings show that four culture types are positively associated with benevolent leadership. In addition, hierarchical culture positively impacted moral leadership, but it was not significantly related to authoritarian leadership. The impact of group, developmental, and rational culture on moral and authoritarian leadership is not statistically significant in Chinese managers of the sampled enterprises.

The prominent cross-cultural psychologist Michael Bond recently stated that, “We need multicultural studies testing models linking constructs to any outcome of interest, like well-being. How well that model performs should be tested on a culture-by-culture basis, the power of its constructs assessed and its power to predict an individual’s well-being calculated. That culture-specific formula constitutes the indigenous signature endorsing the culture general model” (Bond, 2013, p. 161). The literature on the paternalistic and benevolent paternalistic leadership is extensive; however, there are few empirical studies attesting to its influence on institutional and organizations structures, and thus, more cultural sensitive research should be conducted on the construct to better understand its effectiveness. On this note, Pellegrini et al. (2010) conclude that, “When paternalistic leadership is studied jointly with other leadership constructs, it may provide a more complete picture of leadership dynamics both in the domestic U.S. context as well as in other cultures” (p. 414).

Authentic Leadership

A great deal of theoretical discussion exists in the literature regarding authenticity in leadership. Authentic leaders are individuals in positions of responsibility who are trustworthy, genuine, believable, and reliable. These leaders “conform to fact” or are speakers of the truth. Contemporary theories of leadership have begun to consider leader identity by endorsing the importance of authenticity in today’s leaders—“in knowing who they are, what they believe and value” (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004, p. 803). Avolio (2007) defined authentic leadership development as considering the dynamic interplay between leaders and followers, taking into account the prior, current, and emerging contexts in explaining what actually improves or develops leadership. Avolio et al. (2004) defined

authentic leaders as “those individuals who are deeply aware of how they think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own and others’ values/moral perspective, knowledge, and strengths, aware of the context in which they operate, and who are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and high on moral character” (p. 4). An example of authentic leadership is leaders demonstrating passion for the vocation of an organization by describing the vocation and encouraging employees to mutually live the vocation. Employees can then understand the passion and purpose and consequently model the behaviors encouraged by the leader. By engaging employees psychologically, authentic leaders can create a healthy work environment. This is because engaged employees bring positive attitudes, emotions, and behaviors to the workplace, thereby creating a sustainable healthy workplace characterized by positive financial, people, and quality outcomes (Shirey, 2006).

Authentic leadership theory suggests attributions of self-awareness and understanding, empathy for others, building trust, and an affinity for building affiliation and supporting the community all lead to authenticity in leadership. Authentic leaders possess commitment to self-core enhancement by being in tune with and true to self (Bhindi & Duignan, 1997; Starratt, 2007). However, authenticity concerns more than self-reflection and self-focus (Cohen, Taylor, Zonta, & Vestal, 2007; Ferrara, 1998). Therefore, developing authentic capacity in others is also an attribution of authentic leaders (Goffee & Jones, 2000; Helland & Winston, 2005; Jensen & Luthans, 2006; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008) by removing privilege barriers (Goffee & Jones, 2000) and demonstrating interest in the talents of followers (Starratt, 2007; Woods, 2007). Authentic leaders reach beyond self and followers by recognizing community and culture customs, histories, and traditions; thus, authentic leaders tend to create responsive social structures leading to self, follower, community, and organizational success (Boerner, Eisenbeiss, & Griesser, 2007; Goffee & Jones, 2000; Helland & Winston, 2005; Spreier, Fontaine, & Malloy, 2006).

Authenticity and Bicultural Leaders

With emerging calls for new leadership models, authentic leadership is growing in importance with an emphasis on leaders to be transparent, to be real in who they are, and to act with integrity. In examining the cross-cultural application of this theory to Chinese leadership, Whitehead and Brown (2011) identified its complexity and the need to expand its Western-based definition. We might similarly examine its applicability to diverse racial and ethnic groups within the United States. While it appears reasonable to have leaders be trustworthy and authentic, the model fails

to consider the realities of diverse leaders whose multiple and intersecting dimensions of identity include race and ethnicities that are not part of the dominant social groups.

Within such bicultural environments, the salience of different racial and ethnic identities will depend on the contexts in which leaders find themselves. The tendency to code switch has been noted among bicultural individuals as they navigate between family, ethnic communities, and the mainstream environments. Might then a leader be deemed lacking in authenticity as these identities shift as he or she navigates across different social contexts—for example, a Latina leader speaking to a largely Latino/a audience versus a primarily White audience? A further challenge is for leaders of color whose social identities are less privileged than that of their leadership positions. This is a double-edged sword (Thomas & Ravlin, 1995; Thomas, 2008); while leaders can be more effective in conforming to the culture of their followers, they might also be questioned as to their authenticity (e.g., forgetting where they came from, trying to be White).

Feminist Leadership

Female leaders might well face this same challenge about their authenticity as they negotiate different gender compositions in the audiences that they face. We see this in the frequent dilemma faced by female leaders to be feminine as defined by their gender or leaderful as defined by their position; hence, we need to realize that achieving authenticity can be a more difficult matter for female than male leaders. According to Hayes (2012), “traditionally, men have been seen as better leaders because they have more authority, focus, and drive, and because they more readily take tough but necessary decisions such as downsizing, or firing people.” Alice Eagly suggests that this stereotype is now outdated (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Modern transformational leadership takes a different approach; leaders today are required to be more teacher-like or coach-like: motivating rather than threatening; inspiring embodiments of the corporate values rather than autocratic enforcers. These are qualities that match women’s leadership style very well. As women tend to be collaborative and take colleagues’ opinions into consideration, they tend to seek what’s best in the broader context rather than competing for the “top dog” position. They tend to be more democratic, more universalistic. . . . “This is not to say that men don’t have these qualities too, [according to Professor Eagly]. . . . And from a broader perspective, women advocate more supportive societal contributions to make it possible for them to enjoy fulfilling careers—more

childcare facilities, more parental leave for fathers and mothers, fewer hours—without having to miss out on opportunities for higher executive roles” (Hayes, 2012).

Global and Multiethnic Focus

In expanding perspectives of leadership with a global, multiethnic, and multinational focus, we need to recognize that it is quite a different experience for Black leaders in the United States than in a country in Africa or in a multiracial corporation. Moreover, the leadership styles of diverse racial and ethnic groups in the United States may differ depending on the context in which they are exercised. The invisible leadership, discussed earlier among Asian Americans, can also be found among today’s Native American Indian leaders in their origins from that of traditional American Indians. An example follows.

Authenticity and Chinese Leadership

While cultural differences exist between Eastern and Western notions of leadership, Whitehead and Brown (2011) finds evidence supporting the theory of authentic leadership as a part of the Chinese view of leadership. Chinese leadership patterns align with a collectivist culture (Wong, 2001), which respects cooperation, affiliation, and subordination (Ping Ping, Hausiu Chow, & Yuli, 2001). In fact, Chinese people rank high in willingness to subordinate personal objectives to a group purpose (Rawwas, 2003). The importance of understanding a Chinese-authenticity connection can enhance cross-cultural communication and avoid the premature return of expatriate managers from U.S. firms because of their inability to discern the subtleties of foreign business environments (Katz & Seifer, 1996; Rawwas, 2003).

Chinese leadership is paradoxical, from a Western vantage point, in that both authoritarian and benevolent attributes are observable in the same leader. This may be cause for misunderstanding and oversimplified labeling when Westerners only focus on the condition of subordinating to the collective greater good and believe that Chinese leaders are only autocratic. Ping Ping et al. (2001) provided strong evidence for a people-oriented leadership style correlating with high worker satisfaction. The best Chinese leaders seem to be high in both people and task orientation; authoritarian and participatory methods coexist, representing the complexity of the collectivist environment. The Chinese collectivist model represents an interesting balance in both authoritarian rule and participatory leadership, thus satisfying

the needs of both people and organizations and resulting in both paradox and harmony.

Wenquan, Chia, and Liluo (2000) developed and validated a leadership indicator scale specifically for Chinese that was compared against Western measures; the study found certain elements of Chinese leadership and American leadership to enjoy common ground. Both cultures seek leaders who are responsive, receptive, embracing, and participatory but who also know how to take charge and accomplish difficult group-oriented tasks. Chinese value faithfulness, morality, loyalty, and service, while paying strong attention to effort and education (Wong, 2001). Such traits align with authentic theories, which consider the social order to be at least as important as the individual (Cohen et al., 2007). On the other hand, American authenticity may be demonstrated by the degree to which individual voice and true-to-self constructs are manifest. While both capture the essence of authenticity, if the definition of authenticity has a scope that includes both a social orientation as well as a true-to-self orientation.

The Chinese are able to embrace multiple philosophies without a sense of conflict, which is an uncomfortable paradox for Westerners. Wong (2001) stated Chinese may be completely comfortable with Catholicism, Protestantism, Buddhism, and so forth, all at the same time. They see all truth pointing toward the inward growth of the individual. Seeming conflicts are reconcilable because Confucian and Buddhist influences in the Chinese culture teach truth is often irrational, paradoxical, and illogical.

Leadership Styles of Traditional Native American Indians

The typical leadership styles of traditional American Indians provide a good illustration of the differences that existed between conventional forms of leadership style that prevailed in the Western world. Although we may never know how traditional Indian leadership practices and styles existed pre-European contact, there is enough information available that enables us to list the essential and important elements (American Indian Research and Policy Institute, 2005; Warner & Grint, 2006). Linda Sue Warner and Keith Grint (2006) point out that, “indigenous leadership styles encompassed a continuum of styles that defy any simple reduction” (p. 232).

The core value for the leadership style is a strong belief in connectedness; that is, everything is connected to everything else. A firm and unquestioned commitment to spirituality, the sacredness of all life, and respect for all that exists and existed sets in and around the leader. American Indians did not view spirit and spirituality as objects to be set apart from life; they believed that spirituality and the sacred are inclusive of all that is and can

be. Those who demonstrated strong leadership skills and talents usually were thought to have a stronger sense and respect for the spirit and the sacred than others.

The selection or appointment of an Indian leader was determined by the needs of the tribe and community. Selection was not necessarily based on popularity but rather on the characteristics and traits of the individual and the perception that, whatever the problems or needs were, the person could assist in bringing about a solution. In essence, the ability to respond to a need or crisis determined the choice; hence, the decision was situation or context based. If the crisis or need was resolved, then another leader was chosen to meet yet another circumstance of importance. One's term was not marked by a definitive period of time but rather on the degree to which a need was met or an obligation fulfilled.

With a few exceptions, Indian leaders of the past did not seek the distinction or appointment; they did not campaign or pursue community support. In some instances, leaders emerged because of their hereditary lineage; however, the leader may have been reluctant to assume full and complete responsibility. Leaders typically embraced strong positive values such as generosity, respectfulness, kindness, integrity, and trustworthiness. When some leadership responsibility and direction was requested of them, they acknowledged their responsibility; they tacitly knew that they had to set a strong positive example for others to observe and follow. Firmly developed positive values were essential in honoring the connectedness and relationships in the community or village.

Traditional leaders made it a point to engage the community and village in all the discussions, especially the ones that needed serious attention. Many leaders would spend their time visiting with families and elders often spending a great deal of time with them. In effect, they saw their appointment as "a sphere of influence that must be contextualized" (Warner & Grint, 2006, p. 231); most did not believe their role was a formal, coveted, delegated position. Moreover, they tended to see their role primarily as a facilitator and promoter of community values, traditions, beliefs, and interests (Badwound & Tierney, 1988).

Gathering information from community and village members was a key element in reaching decisions and resolving conflicts and issues, especially those that needed serious attention. Reaching those decisions, though, was not always guided by fixed time constraints. Traditional leaders generally considered everyone's opinions that often were gathered in collective settings. Information gathering tended to be group centered rather than individual centered. Decisions were not reached until all the opinions and voices were heard. Traditional leaders placed a high premium on respect and that carried over in the discussion and deliberation process. The leader's

goal was to achieve consensus; achieving that laudable goal was tedious and time consuming. The process represented the leader's deep respect for connectedness. In honoring the connectedness of all things, the leader recognized that a decision could never be ordered or imposed on the community and village. Most often, the decision and outcome was respected by the elders and community and village members in large part because all voices were thought to be heard, valued, and considered.

There are some data to substantiate the various points and observations described in the previous paragraphs. In an interview survey with 21 tribal members from the Winnebago Reservation in Nebraska, Jeff Hart (2006) found the following to be the key words for describing a tribal leader with effective leadership characteristics: education, role, vision, respect, teach, spiritual, protect, caring, serving, battle, follower, choose, true leadership, responsibility, traditional, trust, listen, earned, and veteran. The respondents also told him that "wise councils, spiritual leaders, and elders were essential to the organization of a tribe," that "clanship and families were found to be high on the list as descriptors for traditional leadership," and "being a role model and having vision ranked high" (p. 5). On this point, Linda Sue Warner and Keith Grint (2006) maintain that "role models rely on actions more than the spoken word or the written word, though both the latter are used in support of and to perpetuate behavior" (p. 238.) The respondents also indicated that the following characteristics and attributes were significant: knowledge and the process of knowing; willingness to share; patience; willingness to spend time with the community to share information; hopefulness; and a strong appreciation and respect for "shared leadership."

In a careful and thoughtful review of literature on the leadership characteristics and practices, Tracy Becker (1997) compared the typical Native American Indian leaders with the typical leadership style in U.S. governance (see Table 1, p. 8). She concluded that, for Native American Indians in general, leaders were chosen for their knowledge, experience, and contributions and remained in the position for as long as the tribe needed them; they had no power over others, respected the strong value of tribal customs and traditions, and thus strived to uphold and maintain them. Consensus guided decision-making processes; the maintenance of relationships was essential in conflict resolution matters. Spirituality was at the center of all activities and matters of importance and significance to the tribe. She contrasted these descriptors with the typical form of leadership styles in the U.S. government. Following the order of points made previously, the list includes the following: "leadership is a position; leaders seek leadership positions either through elections or employment; they can create laws and have them enforced. The rights of the individual are salient in most

relationships; the majority of the group, community, or populace decides an outcome; judicial matters are governed by restitutions; and reason not 'spirituality' influences most decisions and deliberations" (Becker, 1997, p. 8).

Challenges and Dilemmas

Leading Change

As Pollyanna Pixton, President of Evolutionary Systems, Partner at Accelinnova (n.d.) claims, "It's no longer enough to respond to change—organizations must lead change or be left behind. How responsive is your organization to the new ideas that will improve operations as well as develop breakthrough product lines and services? And how do you foster innovation and creativity in your company to increase productivity and profits"?

The answers your organization needs in order to succeed are very likely to be found within the people who work with you. Those on the front lines know best how to lead change with subtle product improvements, bold new directions, and improved services that strengthen your position in the marketplace."

Value Judgments

The unfortunate emphasis is how these leadership styles quickly devolve into judgments of good versus bad, strong versus weak, and male versus female, resulting in images of weak and ineffectual feminized leadership. From a multicultural and diversity perspective, this has great implications for marginalizing leadership styles that differ from the dominant prototypic leaders. Eagly and Chin (2010) notes, for example, that collaborative leadership styles may be more syntonic with women but may not be accepted in masculinized contexts.

Summary

Leadership style is a focus on "what leaders do" compared with leader identity, which is a focus on "who leaders are." Different leadership styles have become more salient and favored in response to changing environmental trends and social forces, such as WWII and the rise of the digital age. These styles often are laden with value judgments and unresponsive to differences because of dimensions of diversity. In examining leadership styles, we need

to recognize the influences of gender on task versus relationship leadership styles, the influences of cultural values and orientation on collaborative leadership styles, or of the favoring of transformational leadership styles during times of change. Ethical and humane leadership styles arise both in response to cultural and philosophical orientations and worldviews favoring fairness and trust. Ethical models of leadership style also resulted from the rising concern over failures of leadership and leader integrity in such events as the Enron scandal during the 20th century. Finally, an emphasis on authentic leadership styles makes way for a attention to difference rather than narrow definitions of leadership style. Expanding perspectives of leadership within a global and diverse society also paves the way for new paradigms of leadership style responsive to dimensions of diversity. Confucian leadership styles and benevolent paternalism in leadership draw on cultural values and orientations of Eastern cultures, which favor harmony and respect for authority in relationships. Feminist leadership styles draw on principles of inclusion and collaboration central to feminist theory. Invisible leadership draws on the strong belief in interconnectedness apparent in Asian and American Indian cultures. Attending to these value dimensions of leadership can help leaders lead change and avoid value judgment, which marginalizes leadership styles that differ from the dominant leader prototype. It is a dynamic process between leader, member, and context; its measurement can be multidimensional and bidirectional, challenging us to broaden our perspective of effective leadership styles.

Discussion Questions: Multidimensional Leadership Styles Amidst Diverse and Global Contexts

1. Pick one of the leadership dilemmas from Table 3.2. Identify additional issues posed by the dilemma. Describe some challenges a leader might face in attempting to address them.
2. What do diverse leaders bring? Discuss the benefits and costs of lived experiences associated with sexism and racism faced by women and racial/ethnic minority leaders. How might this influence their exercise of leadership?
3. Is there a feminine advantage? Do women leaders have innate abilities to connect that give them an advantage in transformational and collaborative leadership styles?
4. Are diverse leaders, who have had to adjust to a bicultural environment and/or racism, more likely to develop greater cognitive flexibility, giving them an advantage in exercising innovative leadership?
5. Pick one of the leadership styles discussed in the chapter. How might one or more dimensions of worldviews influence how a leader might exercise his or her leadership using that style?

6. What are the similarities and differences between a benevolent paternalistic leader and a benevolent maternalistic leader? Might this change if benevolence was replaced with a tightfistedness style of leadership?
7. Discuss if and how charismatic leadership might be different across different cultures and gender. Give some examples as to how this might be manifested.
8. Discuss ethical leadership and the context of leadership. Would any of the scandals or failures of leadership have been different in a different context and social zeitgeist? Is ethical leadership related to social context or to one's core philosophy of ethical behavior?

Do not copy, post, or distribute