

**NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
FISCHLER GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Doctor of Education
in
Organizational Leadership**

**LDR 8510
Leadership to Shape the Future**

RESOURCE GUIDE

Graduate Leadership Studies

Revised 7/2003

**© 2003 Nova Southeastern University
All rights reserved**

The one thing that is becoming clearer and clearer is that the institutions of the past may be obsolete and that new forms of governance and leadership will have to be learned. Furthermore, as the rate of change itself increases, learning ability will not consist of the one time learning of a new system; perpetual learning and change will be the only constant.

--E. H. Schein

Leadership to Shape the Future initiates your course of doctoral study.

Leadership is the thematic thread that unites all of the learning experiences that you will encounter in your NSU Organizational Leadership doctoral program of study.

Leadership is a prerequisite required of all who wish to make a contribution in the workplace today. It will become even more essential as workplace organizations transform themselves to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

LDR 8510 is the beginning. As a course of study it is not designed to **answer questions**. Rather, it is structured to inspire you to **question answers**.

Leadership is an evolving concept. Many organizational theorists have attempted to define effective leadership. Definition by its nature renders a concept immutable. Perhaps this is one reason why leadership “fads” emerge with enthusiasm in business management only to eventually fade away. Description, in contrast, is adaptable to immediate reality. In an ever-changing context, what behaviors, characteristics, and qualities describe effective leadership?

MODULE 1: Theoretical Frames of Leadership and Organizations

In this section of the study guide, several critical dimensions of organizational leadership, including descriptions of leadership behavior, will be discussed. The attributes of effective leaders also will be explored.

On Describing Leadership

Truly effective leaders in the years ahead . . . will be visionary, they will believe strongly that they can and should be shaping the future, and they will act on those beliefs through their personal behavior.

--R. Beckhard

The Leader as Visionary

“Leadership is vision,” says Drucker (1989). Or, as expressed in Proverbs 29:18, “Where there is no vision, the people perish.”

In *Secrets of Effective Leadership*, Manske (1987) observed that Martin Luther King who led the great crusade for civil rights from 1955 to 1968, epitomized a leader with great vision and tenacity to move ahead at all costs. Despite being jailed several

times, stabbed and stoned, King persisted in his efforts to fulfill his dream of a world of racial equality and improved living conditions for the poor.

No one who was at the Lincoln Monument on the afternoon of August 28, 1963, will ever forget the conclusion of King's speech before a crowd estimated to be over 250,000. Lerone Bennet, Jr. captured the electricity and emotion of the moment:

Digging deep within himself, picking up bits and pieces of speeches dating back to 1956, he began to improvise, rolling out long legato phrases that brought cheers like thunderous waves . . . over and over again King repeated, "I have dream" and the throng, electrified, rose en masse, screaming, cheering and crying, pushing him to ascending heights of revelations and discovery.

While Dr. King is most famous for his "dream," his leadership practice actually centered around "**dramatizing the present situation**" so that people could see the current reality of racism. He seemed to deeply intuit and certainly embodied the principle of creative tension or the energy generated from holding the tension between a vision for the future and current reality. In his famous "letter from the Birmingham jail," King eloquently expressed the idea: "Just as Socrates felt that it was necessary to create a tension in the mind, so that individuals could rise from the bondage of myths and half-truths . . . so must we . . . create the kind of tension in society that will help men [sic] rise from the dark depths of prejudice and racism" (Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, Roth & Smith, 1999).

Vision, together with the capacity to generate and sustain the creative tension between a vision for the future and current reality, is **the first critical dimension of effective leadership**. Without vision there is little, if any, sense of purpose in an organization. Efforts drift aimlessly as people struggle to find meaning. The lack or loss of meaning leads to disharmony among work units and divisive infighting among executives in an organization.

Vision and Values: More Important than Ever!

Here are a few reasons why vision and values may be more important now than at any other time in human history:

- Faster rate of change
- More competition for the customer
- Slimmer profit margins
- Flatter organizations
- Greater cultural diversity within organizations
- Faster turnaround times
- Interactive education
- Electronic communication
- Increasing interest in finding meaning in work

All of the above variables contribute complexity to an organization making it more difficult to manage. Communicating vision and values provides employees at all levels with direction; it is the best way to ensure that decisions, actions, and tasks are aligned with the mission and goals of the organization.

Articulating a Vision

Leadership requires a critical analysis of process and strategy. Leaders are designers (Senge, 1990). They engage in complex mental tasks. They are alert to contextual evolving patterns. Leaders are able to integrate thinking and doing (Senge, 1990). They must be introspective, imaginative, and self-reflective—an orientation that enables leaders to recognize opportunity and then develop strategies to capitalize on that opportunity (Jaco, 1995). Bennis (1985) described this as the leader's transcending ability to articulate his or her vision for the future.

Although the terrain is constrained by social patterns and legal regulations, successful leaders are able to navigate amidst obstacles by assessing their surroundings and putting their abilities to work. Whether general or specific, it is the leader's mental image of a better condition than what currently exists coupled with passion that provides direction and momentum. Leaders can communicate their vision and recruit the people who complement their strengths in order to initiate and sustain change within an organization.

The uniqueness, then, of leaders is not only that they dream, but also that they have the capacity to manage the achievement of their dreams.

Articulating a vision is a matter of planning backwards, beginning with a goal. Sizer calls it "backward mapping;" Covey calls it "beginning with the end in mind." From the onset, effective and honest communication is imperative and cannot be overstated. Effective and honest communication serves to bond diverse and independent individuals into a single enterprise (Geneen & Moscow, 1984).

Communication must be more than simply clear. It must be accompanied by a genuine openness and an approachable attitude. An effective leader must have "conquered his [sic] own ego problems (Geneen & Moscow, 1984, p. 144) and be able to listen to criticism. "Unfortunately, much more common are leaders who have a sense of purpose and genuine vision, but little ability to foster systemic understanding" (Senge, 1990, p. 335). Systemic understanding is the essence of the "learning organization" and "leadership communities." Thus, the mastery of communication is inseparable from effective leadership (Bennis, 1985). Leaders must be able to speak, listen, and write in order to foster understanding, cooperation, and support. **As an important aside, this requisite of effective leadership should resonate with each doctoral candidate to produce high quality written work.**

Empowering Others

Without a clear vision for the future, options and their potential consequences cannot be delineated. Vision and intellectual strategies by themselves, however, are not enough to energize people in the workplace. Goals can be achieved only if members of an organization “buy into” a vision; they must come to accept the vision as their own, before they can assume any responsibility for bringing it about. Herein resides a **second critical dimension of leadership—the capacity to inspire and energize others to perform at their highest level individually and collectively**. Naisbitt and Aburdene (1985), among others, call the process of energizing people to strive for a single vision “alignment.”

Taking risks is an essential component of gaining mastery over one’s personal and professional life. Perhaps the biggest risk for leaders is empowerment. Leaders, being furthest from the action according to Rosenback and Taylor (1993), must “allocate the resources and decision-making authority” to their followers and give them the freedom to fail without fear of retribution. For most leaders, it is extremely difficult to entrust important decisions to others. However, trusting others is the only way for a leader’s vision to ultimately become the followers’ vision. Bennis described empowerment as the power reciprocal requiring transformative leadership in the individual as well as the organization. This requires a keen sense of judgment and the wise and judicious exercise of power by the leader.

The various ways in which leaders energize and empower others will be discussed during the online chat sessions. In general, however, leaders create a positive attitude or force in their organizations through the strength of their commitment to a vision, by their personal vigor, and by the creation of a common belief that good things are happening. Once the positive force is initiated, others in the organization are stimulated to join in and before long, hopefully, what Senge et al (1999) calls a “leadership community” is created. At the same time, people begin to believe that their own goals can be achieved through the goals of the organization.

Truth and honesty are at the heart of judgment. Leaders also must know what is right and what is necessary. Of course, the ability to make effective and equitable decisions is partially dependent upon the quality of the innate character and personality of the leader.

Values and actions will be aligned to the extent that a leader is integral and capable of empowering others.

Leadership in Transition

Through the years there has been a gradual transition from the older type of foreman who was known as the “boss” to the modern type of foreman who is considered a “leader.” They can be compared in the following ways:

The Boss

Drives people
 Relies upon authority
 Says “I”
 Instills fear
 Says “Go”
 Makes work a drudgery

The Leader

Guides people
 Relies upon cooperation
 Says “We”
 Inspires enthusiasm
 Says “Let’s go”
 Makes work interesting

The concept as well as the reality of the hard-headed, two-fisted foreman is quickly being replaced by new approaches to leadership that require a leader to inspire enthusiasm, create the desire for accomplishment, foster confidence, and develop morale among his or her colleagues.

Attributes of Effective Leaders

“Leadership is purely subjective, difficult to define, virtually impossible to measure objectively, and cannot be taught in school . . . yet it is the single most important ingredient for success” (Geneen & Moscow, 1984, p. 127). Although many have attempted to do so, the concept of leadership seems to defy definition. Nonetheless, one approach to defining leadership is to identify leadership characteristics and traits. In his numerous publications, Bennis (1988, 1989a, 1989b, 1993, 1994, 1995) identifies 300 different characteristics of an effective leader.

A second approach to defining leadership considers the relationship between the environment and the leader. It’s likely that we have all heard of individuals who thrived in one setting only to strike out when transferred to another one. Lou Gerstner established a poor-to-middling record at Nabisco. Yet, people consider him to have been singularly successful in transforming IBM into a lean and mean organization that is again profitable after many years of losses. Examples such as this have led to the definition of leadership as “situational.”

Despite the difficulties with attempts at definition, there are common attributes that characterize successful leaders. A few of the attributes are discussed briefly below. In *Organizational Leadership I*, you will have an opportunity to examine leadership attributes in detail.

There is consensus among theorists that successful leaders exhibit a trait that can be called *comfort*. Some refine that trait further as *inner comfort*. Some add *reflective* as a key component. Leaders are generally involved in *self-evaluation* (Rosenback & Taylor, 1993). They possess self-regard (Bennis, 1985). They grapple with decision making. “Everyone struggles to make choices. It is the struggle that is most important” (Walker & Mehr, 1992, p. 174). Leaders accept and constructively use criticism and take risks.

Leaders, according to theorists, must recognize, own, and be comfortable with their unique leadership style, viewing it as an asset. Such recognition emerges and is nurtured by ongoing self-reflection. Leaders generally are involved in such self-evaluation (Rosenbach & Taylor, 1993). Personal knowledge of strengths and the capacity to compensate for weaknesses are first steps in achieving positive self-regard (Bennis, 1985). Self-reflection facilitates the accomplishment of tasks necessary for moving from one stage to the next in the human development process.

Being able to accept and constructively use criticism through self-reflection sounds simple, but is not always easy. Self-reflection can be accompanied by feelings of discomfort and restlessness. Often self-reflection involves choice—choosing risk over security and activity over withdrawal. Leaders, according to Senge (1990), must strive to gain more and more personal knowledge leading to “personal mastery.”

Saskin described the female leader as one who reaches a level of personal mastery wherein she has the capacity to be adaptive to whatever needs attention at the moment (Smith, 1994). Such flexibility facilitates the process of personal mastery among individuals. This, in turn, enables an organization to become a learning organization. Flexibility, therefore is another component of effective leadership.

Personal knowledge is only one kind of knowledge needed to produce effective leadership. Regardless of the professional field one chooses to enter, knowledge establishes credibility. **Credibility**, too, is a **critical component of effective leadership**. A knowledge base is not something to acquire and keep; it must be periodically renewed. One’s knowledge base must remain current; one way to remain current is to review the relevant literature on a periodic basis. As one businessman described it, remaining current is “a goal without a finish line.”

Leaders must be well-read and well-traveled, so that they can synthesize opposing views and thus move from analytical to integrative thinking (Rosenbach & Taylor, 1993). Leaders also must possess technical knowledge that includes such things as fault tree diagrams, affinity diagrams, and factor analysis—regardless of the field of endeavor. As more and more companies subscribe to a total management approach, the knowledge base required of leaders will be broader and encompass a wider perspective than any one specialized field.

Leaders, furthermore, are “persons who have a global perspective and understand that once tidy lines between domestic and international, and public and private, are irretrievably blurred” (Rosenbach & Taylor, 1993, p. 23). A global perspective enables leaders to critically analyze and solve problems with others that may be in different specialized fields.

Perhaps it goes without saying that each individual leader is unique. Because of differences in individual characteristics, situational variables, and organizational contexts, the work of particular leaders differs greatly. Nonetheless, there are qualities that distinguish outstanding leaders from the average.

Qualities of Leadership

The outstanding leader:

- ◆ Shoulders his or her own responsibility – doesn't "pass the buck"
- ◆ Understands colleagues – is friendly
- ◆ Progresses – plans for self-improvement
- ◆ Enforces all regulations – sets a good example
- ◆ Respects people – builds confidence and good will
- ◆ Anticipates problems – takes preventive action
- ◆ Inspires enthusiasm – develops high morale
- ◆ Sells him or herself and his or her ideas – gets cooperation
- ◆ Instructs clearly – demonstrates patience and empathy
- ◆ Originates – takes initiative
- ◆ Notices good performance – gives credit where due
- ◆ Shows concern for the safety and security of the people for whom he or she is responsible

The foregoing discussion has touched upon some of the issues that will guide your study in **LEADERSHIP to SHAPE the FUTURE**. The challenges facing organizations today cannot be met without strong teamwork. And, teamwork and collaboration are not possible without effective leadership. Bennis and Nanus (1985) noted a chronic crisis in leadership in America's institutions consisting of the pervasive inability of organizations to cope with the expectations of their constituents. Today the crisis is worldwide. Bennis and Nanus conclude, "If there was ever a moment in history when a comprehensive strategic view of leadership was needed, not just by a few leaders in high places, but by large numbers of leaders in every job . . . this is certainly it."

Based on five years of research with over 90 of the most effective and successful business and government leaders in the US, Bennis articulated *The Four Competencies of Leadership*. The competencies are paraphrased below:

The Four Competencies of Leadership

- ◆ *Management of Attention*. Effective leaders have a compelling **vision**, dream, and set of intentions that attracts people to them.
- ◆ *Management of Meaning*. Effective leaders are skilled at **communicating** their **vision** and **values**. Through powerful anecdotes, stories, and actions, they are able to communicate through many organizational layers and across great distances.
- ◆ *Management of Trust*. Effective leaders are **reliable** and consistent. People would rather follow someone they can count on than someone who shifts positions frequently.

- ◆ *Management of Self*. Effective leaders are highly **self-aware**. They know their own skills and can deploy them effectively.

Module I: Required Reading Assignment

Bennis, W., & Goldsmith, J. (1997). *Learning to lead: A workbook on becoming a leader*. Cambridge: Perseus Books.

Bennis, W., Sprietzer, G., & Cummings, T. (Eds.). (2001). *The future of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. Chapters 1-3.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. (3rd ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Chapters 1-3.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. (5th ed.). NJ: Prentice Hall. Chapters 1-5.

MODULE II: Personal Frames of Leadership

*Yes, you can learn to lead, but don't confuse leadership with position and place.
Don't confuse leadership with skills and systems or with tools and techniques.
They are not what earn you the respect and commitment of your constituents.
What earns you their respect in the end is whether you are you.
And whether what you are embodies what they want to become.
So just who are you anyway?*

-J. M. Kouzes

Personal Leadership Styles

All leadership is personal. It begins with your values and beliefs. It begins with who you are and who you are endeavoring to become. It begins with you.

In this thematic area of study, we will focus in greater detail on the attributes and characteristics of highly effective leadership. As you will find from reading Bennis, Cummings, and Springer (2002), there is continuing controversy about the precise components and combination of components necessary for effective leadership in the 21st century organization. Controversy exists too with regard to the extent to which leadership is situational and how the interactions between the leader and the workplace context predetermine direction and outcome. Nevertheless, as a student of leadership it is important to gain an understanding of the personality and character issues and to weigh this new knowledge against what is occurring in **your** personal and professional experience.

As you now know, an important component of effective leadership is self-awareness. Personal knowledge of your strengths and preferences as well as the kinds of situations in which you are able to function with ease and those that strain your capacities

is especially important. As one means of facilitating such self-awareness, the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory (MBTI) provides insight for understanding oneself. Many of you may have taken this inventory previously and participated in staff development sessions related to the outcomes of the MBTI. For students who have not taken the MBTI, the websites www.personalitypage.com and www.keirsey.com provide you an opportunity to learn MBTI principles and concepts.

Have you ever surprised a friend or colleague who was secretly checking out his or her astrological forecast in the daily newspaper? Notice the reaction to getting caught as the person folds the newspaper away and defends what he or she was doing. Ever notice how many of the popular monthly magazines at the newsstand contain a regular astrological section? Despite a reluctance to admit it, everyone seems to want to know more about his or her personality.

Wanting to know more about yourself, who you are and how you interact with others, is a significant aspect of the search for meaning and purpose. Throughout recorded history in the writings of the world's greatest thinkers, one can find the ageless dictum: Know thyself. But, how can the average person, or in our case, a student of leadership, satisfy this curiosity?

Astrology offers one means of gaining knowledge about your personality. As a system of understanding it is based on deterministic philosophy. In part, the study of personality based on astrology assumes that who you are was determined, in large measure, by the date, place, time, and celestial influences at the time of your birth. But, there is no way to prove or disprove the idea that subtle gravitational fields such as those exerted by the sun, moon, and distant planets exert a degree of influence over the structure and development of the human personality.

As a scientific discipline, modern psychology has avoided "other-worldly" concepts of causation which can neither be proved, nor disproved. Psychometrics is a specialization within the field of psychology concerned with the measurement of a host of human characteristics such as intelligence, achievement, cognitive abilities, interests, and personality. The MBTI is based on psychometrics. Functioning styles of personality are classified into one type or another based on a pattern of response alternatives. The MBTI was chosen for use in Organizational Leadership I for solid professional reasons. There are many publications that use the MBTI as a basis for exploring leadership and management issues. The Association for Psychological Type (APT) is a national professional and training organization based on the MBTI. Members include clergy, psychologists, educators, and organizational specialists. The MBTI was also selected for the same reasons people enjoy reading astrological forecasts: the descriptions of personality types or functioning styles provided by the inventory are positive and interesting.

The MBTI was developed with the underlying assumption that none of the personality types are "good" or "bad" and none is better or worse than any other. Each type is simply different from all of the others. Understood, accepted, and well defined,

whatever type you happen to be is okay. Each type has a combination of strengths and weaknesses. Each type has important and useful roles to play in organizational life. In other words, personality is not judged, but rather described by the MBTI. As an example, consider for a moment whether having blue eyes is better than having brown eyes. Similarly, is having brown hair better than having black hair?

Personality types are remarkably stable for most people. Essentially, our type or functioning style as measured by the MBTI is the product of our genetic inheritance and our early experiences in life. Nevertheless, Carl Jung, the great Swiss-born psychiatrist on whose theorizing the MBTI is based, believed that we “live by aims as well as causes.” To be sure, if personality could not be shaped by understanding and effort, there would be little sense in undergoing psychotherapy or engaging in any self development or improvement activity.

As you gain knowledge about your approach to and suitability for various leadership roles, you may, in fact, decide to work on an aspect of your personality. You might decide, for example, to change a part of your personality that tends to crop up and seems to cause you trouble. You might decide to pursue a self-improvement project as a result of taking the MBTI and reading the profile. Whatever you choose, as a first step it is important that you accept yourself as you are.

Everyone has strengths and weaknesses. For example, you may have a part of your personality that makes you well adapted in getting along with people in certain situations. At the same time, you may have a part of your personality that builds walls between you and others. Both parts make sense; they’re usually interrelated in a sensible way. The more you learn about the various aspects of your personality and their interrelationships, the better you’ll become at observing yourself and taking control of your own behavior. In other words, the more knowledge that you gain about self, the more you can take charge of the direction of your life, increasing your personal satisfaction and professional effectiveness.

The Sixteen Personality Types

The MBTI divides personality into sixteen types or functional styles. The 16 types are based on four pairs of interactive factors that are briefly described below.

All of us, all of the time, are information processors. We live our lives by taking in information, determining what needs to be done, and taking action. The input process of becoming aware is called perception. The output process of decision making and reacting is called judging. People vary enormously in terms of how much they enjoy the perceptive process and how they prefer to perceive reality. Likewise, people can be classified by how much they like making judgments and how much they prefer to do so. The MBTI first distinguishes perceptive types from judging types.

Perception vs. Judgment. Perceptive types deal with their environment most comfortably when they are observing, thinking, or otherwise taking notice of the world

around them. Judging types deal with reality most easily when they are forming judgments or conclusions about what they perceive.

The perceptive type is patient with gathering data about people, ideas, and day-to-day occurrences. The judging type begins to organize what is observed almost immediately: summarizing, classifying, simplifying, or otherwise “pigeon-holing” reality into boxes built by previous experience.

In the extreme of the type, perceptive people may have a difficult time “getting to the bottom line” in making even routine decisions, while judging people may “jump the gun”

and make up their minds about issues before enough information has been gathered to take an informed stand. Perceptive types can be wishy-washy, if their judgment is not developed. Judging types can be stubborn and reactive, if their perception is not developed. It is a matter of balance between the two functions.

It should be apparent by now that no one could really be all perceptive or all judging, because perception must precede judgment and judgment eventually does follow perception. With most people, however, one process does tend to predominate. In other words, we have natural preferences. The tendency to have one clear preference over the other is both natural and adaptive.

It defines one important aspect of personality type. The ideally balanced person has an adaptive mixture of perception and judgment: perception to give awareness and judgment to form opinions, develop attitudes, and take action at the appropriate time.

Sensory vs. Intuitive Information. All of us perceive reality in two stages. First we use our sensing ability and then we process the sensory data using our intuition. People may be divided into two groups based on which of these perceptive processes they prefer to use. Thus, sensing types are distinguished from intuitive types by their preferred perceptive process.

People who rely on sensory information to guide their awareness of the world are often described as realists. They are keen observers and proud of it. They live in the here and now. They use their sight, hearing, sense of smell, taste, and touch to tell them about life. If they can sense it, they trust it; if they can’t sense it, then they don’t trust it.

Sensory types tend to rely on familiar, time-tested strategies and past experience to guide their perceptions of new situations. While the sensing type perceives what is seen, the intuitive type forms perceptions by combining what is seen with ideas and associations from imagination and memory.

Intuitive types see life more in terms of imaginative possibility than practical reality. They look to the future. They search for meaning. They exult in images, ideas, theory, and speculation. They love experimentation. They try out new ways of interpreting things. They prefer indirect and seemingly circuitous routes of perception.

At their personality extremes, sensing types may seem rather lack luster and unimaginative, while intuitive types may seem to have no sense of reality. The former may seem to have feet planted too firmly on the ground, while the latter may seem to fly through the air and never touch down. Sensing types make keen observers, but poor poets. Intuitive types may well be mathematical geniuses. They may be great storytellers and inspiring orators, but you probably wouldn't pick one to be your accountant.

Again, all of us need to use both sensing and intuiting processing to form perceptions. But, most of us favor one process more than the other. And, that process is an important part of your personality type.

Thinking vs. Feeling. After the perceptions of any life situation have been formed by sensing and intuition, we tabulate the results, draw conclusions, and take action. That's what is meant by judging.

To form judgments, all people apply two processes in series. We think and we use feeling. But we don't rely on those processes in equal measure. At least most of us don't. There's good reason to believe that it is healthy, normal, and adaptive to have a clear-cut preference for the function you use. The tendency to choose one process over another identifies your preferred judging process.

Those who are most comfortable using their thinking process trust rational analysis and impersonal logic to guide their decision making. Those who prefer to use their feelings turn to their inner system of values to direct their actions. The thinking type, in the extreme case, may seem hard-hearted and mechanical in day-to-day affairs. Compassion may seem lacking. It may seem as if ice flows in their veins. The feeling type may appear to be irrational, while ignoring the facts of a situation to decide "with heart" regardless of the outcome.

Extravert vs. Introvert. Each of us has an inner self—quiet, contemplative, and introverted. Our extraverted self is the one that the world sees. Our introvert is silent; the extravert is vocal. Those who prefer their extraverted self see people and things as the real stuff of life, while the introvert deals with ideas as the preferred reality.

The extravert yearns for contact with a variety of people, while the introvert yearns for peace and privacy or for association with a small intimate circle of friends. When dealing with people on a wholesale basis, the extravert is involved, while the introvert is detached and reserved. The extravert talks speedily and sometimes nonstop, while the introvert contemplates. More often than not, the introvert may think without talking, while the extravert may talk without thinking.

More so than the introvert, the extravert relies on encouragement, support, and acceptance from others. In comparison, the introvert is self-motivated, self-reinforcing. The extravert learns by doing, using experiences as a laboratory in life. Outgoing, fearless, and almost childlike in naivete, the extravert tends to try the unknown first and

ask questions afterwards. The introvert is far more shy, cautious, and deliberate. In the extreme case, it appears that some introverts must understand life before living it.

The extravert's emotions are accessible, frequently vented, obvious to all around. The introvert tends to bottle emotion, cork it tightly into little flasks, deny it, or hide it until crossing some threshold unannounced to the world, and the cork blows, unleashing pent-up emotion in what may become an explosive eruption.

The extravert's personality is directed outwards. The face the world sees is an accurate reflection of the extravert's "real self." If the extravert is a judging type, then the preferred judging process—either thinking or feeling—will be a primary feature of the outward personality. Likewise, if the extravert is a perceptive type and, thus, relies on sensing or intuition as the preferred perceptive process, every aspect of the extravert's behavior will reflect those personality tendencies.

But, with the introvert, what you see is not what you get. If the introvert is a judging type, the thinking/feeling process will characterize the outward personality, but the inner preferred perceptive process will be the key to understanding the individual's personality and it will be out of sight. Remember, to the introvert, the world "out there" is not where their best reality lies. It lies within.

By the same token, the introverted perceptive type will organize his or her outer personality using the sensory or intuitive process, for they must have some extraversion in order to survive in the physical world of people and things—to function in society. Nonetheless, it is their preferred judging process, either thinking or feeling, which is the real key to their personality, their dominant process, and it's underground.

Confusing? You bet it is. But, then, so are introverts. Whether you are an introvert or love an introvert or work with an introvert, it is well worth the time you invest to understand their complexity. After all, they make up one quarter of the population. And, that presents us with another point. Introverts are territorial. It's as if they build a fence around themselves. Now, you can understand why. They make up a minority of the population. They need to defend themselves from the intrusiveness of the extraverts.

Balance. As you learn more about the information provided by the MBTI and as you review your own profile, it is important to remember that a goal is to achieve balance. Balance is part of the maturing process. The extravert needs to learn introspection, as much as the introvert needs to develop sociability. The intuitive type must develop the capacity to attend to life's data, just as the sensing type needs to exercise imagination. Thinking and feeling types need a bit of each other's forte. The perceptive type must be able to decide, while the judging type needs to practice patience in perceiving.

From time to time, it's worthwhile to take stock of ourselves, give some attention to our identity, look at our relationships with family, friends, and colleagues, and ask

ourselves if our lifestyle and work are really meeting our needs and goals. Certainly, beginning a doctoral program is such a time to pause, take stock, and organize ourselves for growth.

This point in your adult life, the beginning of your doctoral studies, can be a cognitively and emotionally creative moment as you undergo a rediscovery or reinvention of yourself. You can take stock of unmet needs and embark on the next phase of your life with renewed strength and stability. In recent years, developmental psychology has been expanded to acknowledge, examine, and more deeply understand the significance of such adult watershed periods or “passages” as they are referred to by Gail Sheehy.

We hope that an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of your personality type will be simply the beginning of your exploration of the issues surrounding your leadership style, the roles that you play in small and large group activity, and the strengths that you bring to an organizational setting. The Kroeger text, *Type talk at work*: artfully and poignantly expands your understanding of typology and offers you opportunity to “see type” at work!

As you now know, an important component of effective leadership is self-awareness. Personal knowledge of your strengths and preferences as well as the kinds of situations in which you are able to function with ease and those that strain your capacities is especially important.

Learning to Lead, by Warren Bennis & Joan Goldsmith (1997) is being introduced into the LDR 8510 course area in the belief that honest, capable, ethical leadership is possible. The observations and exercises of the workbook are written to focus on both large and small problems and at the same time to enable students to enjoy transforming themselves into more effective leaders (p.xii).

Wanting to know more about yourself, who you are and how you interact with others, is a significant aspect of the search for meaning and purpose. More importantly, the process of discovering one’s leadership capacity holds the promise of great accomplishments and achievements in one’s personal and professional life.

Clearly, in leadership, character counts. One’s convictions about character-based leadership comes from years of studies, teaching, observations, and interviews with leaders, and with people near them—their direct reports and board members. It is maintained that leadership *is* character. It is therefore, not merely a question of leadership style, but has to do with who one is as human being and with the forces that have molded and shaped him/her.

The process of becoming an effective leader is much like the process of becoming a whole-integrated human being...a highly personal process. Opportunities to examine and explore one’s life offer questions, challenges and new directions for personal integration.

Leadership Readiness

To the educated eye, the signs of a leadership crisis are alarming and persuasive. The numerous changes in leadership and direction have occurred in many of the major corporations as well as smaller enterprises. In politics, the leadership landscape is similar. The mood of the nation reflects the unrest and instability of these changing times.

Diverse challenges confront leaders today especially the remarkable changes in technology and globalization. However, nothing known to modern day leadership theorists could have prepared the nation/leaders for the trauma that rocked the world in September, 2001.

The horrific events of September 11, 2001 clearly dictate that effective leadership and integrated leaders are in high demand world-wide! The mayor of New York City, Rudy Giuliani is a prime example. His stature as an effective, integrated leader rose from the ashes of the World Trade Center. His leadership ability was stretched beyond him beyond his own abilities...to spaces and places within and unknown to himself. The leadership that he exercised in the minutes, hours, days and weeks post 9/11/01 stands as a beacon, shining brightly in the dark and turbulent times—a harbinger, perhaps, of the leadership capacity residing within each person. Indeed his willingness to walk the walk, and talk the talk, to embody the qualities and characteristics he demanded of others, to rally a city and its people serve as the foundation of his legacy to not only to New York City but to the country as well.

Mayor Rudy Giuliani was honored as the 2001 Time Magazine “Person of the Year,” a distinction he clearly earned!

If nothing else, the tragic events of September 2001, serve as proverbial “wake-up call” to all students of leadership. You must ask yourself a litany of questions ranging from your readiness to assume a similar leader role to your capacity to engage in such leader behavior. It is as much about personal responsibility as one’s ability to respond in a time of crisis.

Bennis and Goldsmith (1997) identify four demands that people want from their leaders:

- 1) Purpose, Direction and Meaning
- 2) Trust
- 3) Optimism
- 4) Action and Results

Did not Rudy Giuliani respond to these exact demands? The question is whether or not you could have responded.

1. Purpose, Direction and Meaning

One cannot exaggerate the significance of a strong, fierce determination to achieve a goal, together with the conviction, passion, and unique point of view that establish energy and direction of the leader. Max DePree, a corporate leader, stated, “The first task of a leader is to help define reality.” This is another way of speaking about purpose. Without a sense of alignment behind that purpose, drifting occurs. The purpose cannot be an old, worn out purpose but rather needs to be one that galvanizes, energizes and entralls people. It must have meaning and resonance and it must belong to each and every member of the organization. The leader not only must have direction, but also must communicate that direction in such a manner and with such verve that ownership to the direction takes place on all levels of the organization.

2. Trust

One of the more challenging tasks of a leader is to create and sustain trust. The trust factor is the “social glue” that binds commitment and promotes action needed to yield the desired results. Without it, the leader is doomed to failure. To trust other people, to have confidence in them, the leader needs to see evidence of others competence on a consistent basis. The importance of openness cannot be minimized even if dissent flows from it. The leader needs to trust in order to be trusted, it is a simple and complex as that!

3. Optimism

In a nutshell, all leaders need to be purveyors of hope. Mayor Guliani’s optimism after the tragic events of 9/11/01, is a contagion that assuages the soul and psyche of the populace. It fascinates and it bemuses because it is so pervasive and powerful. It does not stand on grand delusions or phony ground but rather sounds a clarion call for others to embrace a spirit of hope. Such optimism stems from a profound focus of the present reality as well as a profound promise of the future. Effective leaders embody this sense of optimism and their very beings exude optimistic energy and determination.

4. Action and Results

The last demand common to effective leaders is a “bias toward action.” Leaders have the capacity to convert purpose and vision into action. It is insufficient to have a great vision that can inspire others, this vision must become reality, and it must be manifest in real and concrete ways and yield results. Most contemporary leaders are pragmatic dreamers and practical idealists. Would you rather be guilty of “sins of omission or commission?” Nothing ventured, nothing gained, or learned for that matter!

Your exploration of the tenets of leadership in this course will provide you the opportunity to examine your various leadership abilities and potential. The diverse self-

reflective activities, in which you will engage, will offer learning and opportunity to you. Your willingness to grow into your leadership is a critical component of the process.

Organizational and Systems Requirements

As mentioned, effective leadership does not happen in a vacuum. The new breed of leader faces challenges of creating organizations, communities, institutions, systems and structures in which each and every member can realize his or her full human potential. The new work environment must support such personal growth and professional attainment. There are three elements that are foundational to such organizations, viz., alignment with a common vision; empowerment of all involved; and a learning, inquiry-based, and reflective culture. It is mandatory that leaders understand these organizational elements so that they can help create and foster them within the members of their organizations.

1. Alignment with a common vision

Alignment with a common vision means having a sense of shared objectives and goals to which people can be dedicated. It has much to do with spirit and team mentality. It is the organization's "vision thing," the "motto" and "mantra" that defines the organization's *raison d'être*. Work becomes an integral ingredient pursuing a greater purpose embodied in the organization's people, products, and services.

2. Human Capital Empowerment

Empowerment that creates and sustains the belief that "I" make a difference is at the heart of effective organizations. People sense that they are at the "heart of the matter" and that the organizations' success hinges on their contributions. Meaning and purpose are core values of an "intentional organization." "Empowered organizations generate and sustain trust, flatten their structures, develop system-wide communication, and do a lot of it." (xviii)

3. A Learning/Inquiring Culture

A learning, inquiry-based, and reflective culture is essential element in an effective learning organization. People's ideas and information flow freely and risk taking, innovation and change are actively pursued. Work is about problem finding- not just problem solving in a learning organization where testing ideas and learning from mistakes are promoted and celebrated.

Active participation in the learning activities in *Learning to Lead* (1997) will serve as a template for your leadership development and growth plan in the Organizational Leadership doctoral program.

Leadership in the Workplace: Understanding the New Organization

Five hundred years ago, Renaissance Man discovered that the world was round. Three hundred fifty years later, Organization Man developed the practice of management. But as this practice evolved, he forgot that his world was round, and he built a management world of squares and boxes and pyramids. . . then a period of massive historic change began, a period of global competition and blurred boundaries, of old answers that did not fit the new realities. . .

F. Hesselbein

What worked yesterday won't work today. Why? Margaret Waitley (1995) explains why:

- ◆ Yesterday, natural resources defined power. Today, knowledge is power.
- ◆ Yesterday, hierarchy was the model. Today, synergy is the mandate.
- ◆ Yesterday, leaders commanded and controlled. Today, leaders empower and coach.
- ◆ Yesterday, leaders were warriors. Today, leaders are facilitators.
- ◆ Yesterday, leaders demanded respect. Today, leaders encourage self-respect.
- ◆ Yesterday, shareholders came first. Today, customers come first.
- ◆ Yesterday, managers directed. Today, managers delegate.
- ◆ Yesterday, supervisors flourished. Today, supervisors vanish.
- ◆ Yesterday, employees took orders. Today, teams make decisions.
- ◆ Yesterday, seniority signified status. Today, creativity drives process.
- ◆ Yesterday, production determined availability. Today, quality determines demand.
- ◆ Yesterday, value was extra. Today, value is everything.
- ◆ Yesterday, everyone was a competitor. Today, everyone is a customer.
- ◆ Yesterday, profits were earned through expediency. Today, profits are earned with integrity. (pp.3-4)

The nature of work in small and in large organizations is changing rapidly. However difficult it is for executives and top level managers to remake strategy and structure, they themselves will, in all likelihood, retain their identity, status, and sense of control. For those below them, people with titles such as supervisor, case manager, director, resource person, or perhaps even teacher, structural change is often much more difficult to bear.

Leaders traditionally were trained to do things by the rules, but in the new organization the rules are gone. In the new organization, staff members must learn to operate without the crutch or hierarchy and have only themselves to rely on (Hanna, 1988). Success now depends on figuring out whose collaboration is needed to act on good ideas. In short, the organization implies very different ways of obtaining and using power and influence.

Not only is the new organization smaller and flatter, but also it has many more channels for action. Cross-departmental projects, joint ventures with other agencies, collaboration with unions and professional associations, and activities outside the mainstream reporting lines contravene the traditional organizational chart and ignore the chain of command (Tewel & Holzman, 1991).

The existence of new channels of action has several important implications. For one, the new channels of action create more potential centers of power. Simply put, the power for greater flexibility undermines hierarchy. As more and more action takes place in the new channels, the tasks that take place within conventional departments decline in significance (Lawler, 1987).

Traditionally, the heads of offices surveyed the terrain for new ideas and resources. In a restructured or re-engineered organization, environmental scanning is an important part of everyone's job at every level of the organization. And, the environment to be scanned includes many potential outside partners, including the private sector. At the same time, all staff members are encouraged to think about what they know that might have value elsewhere. In schools handling their own budgets and hiring their own personnel, for example, it is not unusual to find finance personnel working with school leadership teams to develop accounting and ordering procedures.

Every staff member must think cross-functionally, because everyone plays a role in dealing with system wide as well as departmental or agency problems. In fact, in the new organization, the ability of top and middle level managers and leaders to get tasks accomplished depends more on the number of team networks in which they are involved than on their position in the hierarchy.

The new strategic and cross-functional collaborative function is particularly important as people assume the roles of integrators and facilitators, no longer the roles of watchdogs and interventionists. Organizations and the people who lead them need to demonstrate the value of their services to the clients that they serve, and in some cases, will compete with outside service providers.

As executives and managers—the leadership cadre—spend more time working across boundaries with peers and other staff members over whom they have no direct control, their interpersonal and negotiating skills become essential assets. Power evolves from personal strengths, not from organizational structure. At the same time, more staff members at more levels are active in the kind of external relationships that only the CEO or chief operating officer were formerly authorized to conduct (Kanter, 1989).

Because cross departmental teams and task groups often bring together people from different professional communities, good-deal making depends on the capacity to step into other people's shoes and appreciate their goals. As one child care specialist stated about being a member of a cross departmental agency team:

I'm gaining experience anticipating the reactions of other people on my team. While we occasionally disagree about important issues, we no longer have the destructive conflict that erupted during the first few meetings. Before I present the child care point of view, I ask myself what others will say. Sometimes I alter my proposal before I present it.

An increase in the number of channels for contact means greater opportunities for people with ideas to stimulate action. Innovative suggestions for resolving system wide problems come from staff members who traditionally carried out the ideas of others. As top level executives spend more time on cross-departmental tasks, they are forced to delegate more responsibility to lower-level staff members who, over time, feel greater authority to chart their own direction.

The change process clearly places new burdens on the organization's leader during the transition period. The new organization exists on a chart in name only and is not really functional. While the old organization no longer exists on paper, however, it continues to haunt the minds, habits and performance of staff presenting leadership ongoing challenges.

MODULE II – Required Readings

- Bennis, W., & Goldsmith, J. (1997). *Learning to lead: A workbook on becoming a leader*. Cambridge: Perseus Books.
- Bennis, W., Sprietzer, G., & Cummings, T. (Eds.). (2001). *The future of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. Chapters 1-8.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey Bass. Chapters 4-7.
- Kroeger, O., & Thuesen, J. (1992). *Type talk at work: How the 16 personality types determine your success on the job*. NY: Dell.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. (5th ed.). NJ: Prentice Hall. Chapters 6-10.

MODULE III – Futuristic Frames of Organizational Leadership

Futuristic Frames of Organizational Leadership

Producing change is about 80 percent leadership—establishing direction, aligning, motivating, and inspiring people—and about 20 percent management—planning, budgeting, organizing, and problem solving. Unfortunately, in most of the change efforts I have studied in the past twenty years, these percentages are reversed. Our business schools and work organizations continue to produce great managers; we need to do as well at developing great leaders.

--J. P. Kotter

The Future Focuses on Leading the Organization's Change Agenda

Clearly, the future of leadership in any organization centers on the ability of leaders to effectively lead the change agenda. Leadership is about creating the direction, aligning resources, cultivating human capital, and strategically planning for future growth and productivity. Peter Senge (1990), in his text *The Fifth Discipline*, suggests that leaders are about establishing learning organizations.

He described the role of leadership in learning organizations in a most cogent way:

Leaders are designers, stewards, and teachers. They are responsible for building organizations where people continually expand their capabilities to understand complexity, clarify vision, and improve shared mental modes . . . they are responsible for learning (at all levels).

As he embellished upon a metaphor about teaching an elephant to dance Belasco (1990) indicated that the undertaking of change is a difficult one. Organizations tend to be tied to the past by tradition or success. Like powerful elephants, they are bound by the memory of earlier constraints that may no longer exist. Myth displaces the accurate perception of current reality. To effectively learn and teach the process of change, leaders must begin thinking systemically. They must see themselves and each member of the organization as an integral part of a whole, larger entity. They must learn and teach to think in terms of interdependence and interaction, rather than in terms of simple cause and effect relationships. In and of itself, this is no small task.

Senge et al (1999) describe their current thinking about leadership as an “ecological perspective.” In any organization there are many leaders, because there are many people at many levels of the hierarchy who play critical roles in generating and sustaining change. Thus, Senge et al focus on “leadership communities” rather than “hero-leaders” at the top who “drive change.” This represents a radical shift in thinking about and ultimately engaging in leadership.

You drive a car. It is a machine that you control, with the aim of getting to where you want to go. The car takes you there. You do not “drive” a plant to grow. Nor do you “drive” your teenager. Nor, we would argue, do leaders “drive” their organization. The organization is a human community. It is a living system, like the plant or the teenager. There is no one driving it. But there are many tending the garden. (Senge, et al, 1999, p. 21).

No organization today—large or small, local or global—is immune to change. To cope with the new technological, competitive, and demographic forces, leaders in every sector have endeavored to change fundamentally the way that their organizations do business. The change efforts have paraded under many banners—total quality management, reengineering, restructuring, mergers and acquisitions, turnarounds.

According to most assessments, however, the goals of these efforts are rarely accomplished. Kotter (1996) and Drucker (1999) succinctly presented the three essential ingredients of the process of innovation: focus on the mission, define the desired results, and rigorously assess what is being done and how it is being done. If innovation appears straightforward and simple, why is it so difficult for organizations to initiate and sustain the change process?

There are many rationalizations for avoiding innovation. How many of the following convenient excuses have you heard, or even uttered, before?

- ◆ We tried that before.
- ◆ Our organization is different.
- ◆ It costs too much
- ◆ We're all too busy to do that.
- ◆ That's not my job.
- ◆ We don't have the time.
- ◆ The clients will never buy it.
- ◆ We've never done it before.
- ◆ It's against policy.
- ◆ We don't have the authority.
- ◆ That's not our problem.
- ◆ Why? It's still working today.
- ◆ You're right, but . . .
- ◆ It isn't in the budget.
- ◆ Let's give it more thought.
- ◆ Put it in writing.
- ◆ Not *that* again.
- ◆ We did all right without it.
- ◆ Let's form a committee.
- ◆ It won't work.
- ◆ Let's sleep on it.
- ◆ I know someone who tried it.
- ◆ It's too much trouble to chance.
- ◆ We've always done it this way.

These are some of the typical responses people offer in both professional and personal situations to avoid confronting the necessity for change. Yet, the exercise of leadership is about change: leading people to think and behave in new ways.

According to Senge (1999), there are two possible explanations, representing dramatically different worldviews, for why it is so difficult for organizations to innovate. The opposing outlooks were first articulated nearly 40 years ago by McGregor in his *Human Side of Enterprise*: Theory X (employees as unreliable and uncommitted, chasing a paycheck) versus Theory Y (employees as responsible adults wanting to contribute).

From the perspective of Theory X, organizations fail to innovate because most people really don't care about innovation. Despite the fact that few individuals in positions of authority would admit to this worldview, Theory X remains the prevailing philosophy in many large organizations, especially in the American corporate world. Actions, however, always belie espoused values. Look closely and honestly at how organizations manage people. Most appear to function with the belief that employees cannot work without careful supervision. People are viewed as "human resources" waiting to be used, i.e., employed or unemployed, to meet the needs of the organization. "We don't have the right people" is another frequent excuse for the failure to innovate. The worldview inherent to Theory X obscures the leader's fundamental task of helping people accomplish more together than they possibly could accomplish as individuals.

In contrast, from the perspective of Theory Y, most people come to work (or at least did at one time) truly desiring to make a difference, to make a genuine contribution, and to help give shape to the future. Embracing the worldview of Theory Y requires that leaders try to understand how good people, desiring to learn and innovate, fall short of or fail to accomplish what they intend.

Drucker maintains that innovation is a "discipline," a word having its root in Latin *disciplina*, one of the oldest words for "to learn." Many have talent, but real learning requires discipline: the process through which leaders draw out their potential and the potential of others through commitment, practice, passion, patience, and perseverance.

The Process of Change

John Kotter, in his best selling book, *Leading Change*, (1996) presents eight steps required to accomplish and sustain change in organizations:

1. *Establish a sense of urgency.* Examine the circumstances, including the market and competitive realities. Identify and discuss crises, potential problems, and major opportunities.
2. *Form a powerful guiding coalition.* Assemble a group with enough power to lead the change effort. Encourage the leadership group to work together as a team.
3. *Create a vision.* Create a vision to help direct the change effort. Develop strategies for achieving the vision.
4. *Communicate the vision.* Use every vehicle possible to communicate the new vision and strategies. Teach new behaviors by example; have the leadership group model behaviors expected of others in the organization.
5. *Empower others to act on the vision.* Get rid of obstacles to change. Change systems or structures that seriously undermine the vision. Encourage risk taking and nontraditional ideas, activities, and actions.

6. *Plan for and create short-term wins.* Plan for visible performance improvements. Recognize and reward employees involved in the improvements.

7. *Consolidate improvements and produce still more change.* Use increased credibility to change systems, structures, and policies that don't fit the vision. Hire, promote and develop employees who can implement the vision. Reinvigorate the process with new projects, themes, and change agents.

8. *Institutionalize new approaches.* Articulate the connections between the new behaviors and organizational success. Develop the means to ensure leadership development and succession.

The first four steps help to unfreeze a hardened status quo. Steps five through seven introduce new practices. Step eight grounds and helps to sustain changes in the organization. Leaders often attempt only steps five, six, and seven. Neglecting any of the unfreezing activities, however, precludes direction, purpose, and motivation—the solid foundation of the change process. Without step eight, change is unlikely to be sustained.

Kotter (1996) also identified four mistakes that are the source of most failed change efforts. Each mistake is briefly discussed below.

1. *Writing a memo instead of lighting a fire.* Too often leaders launch their change efforts by writing a memo or circulating a report, then expect people to rally to the cause. They rarely do. The effort involved in creating a sense of urgency is usually several times what leaders expect.

2. *Talking too much and saying too little.* Most leaders substantially under communicate their change vision and in the least convincing of forms—speeches and memos. Leaders must lead by example.

3. *Declaring victory before the war is over.* Celebrating incremental improvements is a great way to mark progress and sustain commitment, but the work that remains should not be forgotten. Meaningful change often takes years.

4. *Looking for villains in all the wrong places.* The biggest obstacles to change are not middle managers but, more often, those who work just a level or two below the CEO—vice presidents, directors, general managers, and others who have not yet made it to the top and have the most to lose in change.

If you expect others to change their behavior, you have to change yours. It is as simple and as difficult as that (Smith, 1999). One of the most profound and inspiring experiences people can have in an organization is observing their leaders grow. Leadership is truly a catalytic role.

In the final analysis, however, according to Senge (1999), when the discipline of innovation is practiced effectively, it's done in communities, among diverse individuals

who share a common purpose. For example, energized communities characterize most periods of innovation in the arts, such as the birth of impressionism, or modern dance, or jazz. Similarly, science at its best is a collaborative effort, even when the collaborators are individuals competing with one another within the larger scientific community. Mastering the art of innovation is likely to require that organizations, competitive or not, work together and learn from one another's efforts. In the process of change, people often experience profound discomfort. Acknowledging the threat and confronting the uncertainty that the process of change evokes is best done with others, not in isolation.

MODULE III: Required Reading Assignment

- Bennis, W., & Goldsmith, J. (1997). *Learning to lead: A workbook on becoming a leader*. Cambridge: Perseus Books.
- Bennis, W., Sprietzer, G., & Cummings, T. (Eds.). (2001). *The future of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. Chapters 6-8.
- Kouzes, J., Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey Bass. Chapters 8-12.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. (5th ed.). NJ: Prentice Hall. Chapters 11-15.