



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://waikato.researchgateway.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

**PUTTING LEADERSHIP IN ITS PLACE:
TRANSFERABILITY OF LEADERSHIP ABILITY
ACROSS CONTEXTS**

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Social Science in Psychology

at the

University of Waikato

By

JONATHAN WILLIAM DICK

University of Waikato

2009

Abstract

The aim of this study was to contribute to the growing body of research involving the subject of leadership, while looking at a facet of this phenomenon on which there appears to be very little data available. In the fast moving environment of the twenty first century, there is more and more pressure on leaders from every area of industry, commerce, community and public service to be capable of not only performing their basic tasks in the immediate scope of their area of responsibility, but also a growing expectation that they must be capable of exporting this ability into any environment or context that the organisation rapidly finds itself. There is little time to recruit, train and deploy new leaders when a novel situation presents itself. This research employs a qualitative approach utilising an interpretive multiple case study method to investigate what followers look for and expect in their leaders in the form of traits, values or characteristics. The investigation then looks to see what style of leader employs these values to best effect, suggesting that this type of style, based on this set of values, are the most likely to be durable across any context. The study is conducted looking at the wider culture of the individual participant in terms of age and era, gender, education, and the added dynamic of punishment as a leadership tool. While initial findings suggest that females may have this ability to transfer their leadership style at face value, the study acknowledges the variables involved and recommends the way forward for future research in this area.

Acknowledgements

This research would not have been possible without the assistance and support of the following people:

Natalie Franke, Helen Knap (Te Arawa, Ngati Pukenga), Bruce Chave, Major Malcolm Helyar, E.D., RNZIR, Ensign Berend ter Brake, RNZN, Carol Devoy-Heena, Gail McKenzie, Major John O'Reilly, ONZM, NZIC, Major Allan Patterson, Sue Sumich, Lieutenant Colonel (rtd) James (Steve) Warner, USMC, Samantha Jaschke, Wallace Duarte, Warrant Officer Class One (rtd) John Furey LSGC, Ngaraima Taingahue (Tauwhao, Ngaiterangi), Hugh Bomford, Fusun Duarte, Captain (rtd) John Isdale, Kevin Fitzpatrick, Dr Annelies Kamp, Michael Kolomyjec, and two participants who chose not to be named.

I would also like to acknowledge my supervisors; Professor Jane Ritchie and Doctor Cate Curtis from the Department of Psychology, University of Waikato, New Zealand.

My thanks to friends and family who encouraged and pushed me to complete this thesis including my brother Geoffrey, as well my mother Patricia, and late father Eddie.

A special thanks to my partner Samantha, and Reece and Teagan, who encouraged me throughout the process and without whose incentive I probably wouldn't have got this document published.

A special thanks to the ‘followers’ over the years, without whose support the pleasure of leadership would have been vastly different. I apologise for not having the benefit of this learning while leading this important group of people.

Finally I would like to thank and acknowledge all those leaders throughout my life who guided, encouraged, pushed, and above all showed me by their example what leadership should be; those still with us, Tom Hemepo, Neil Webb, Neil Marshall, David Mills and John O’Reilly; and those no longer with us; Rick Keno, Ray Delves, and Uncle Arthur.

Kua mutu aku paipa mo tene wa; no reira, kia tau te rangimarie kia koutou. Peace be with you all.

Table of contents

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	7
Historical overview	8
Age	15
Gender	20
Followship	27
Values / Traits	34
Styles	51
Transferability	58
RESEARCH QUESTION	63
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY – AIM, APPROACH AND METHODS	64
Research aim and purpose	64
Research approach	65
Participants	67
Participant profiles	68

Materials	76
Data collection procedures.....	77
Ethical considerations.....	80
Data analysis methodology	82
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA COLLECTION RESULTS	85
Participant history	85
Education level	87
Gender	89
Punishment	90
Age	91
Styles	94
Values	96
Motivation	97
Scenarios	99
Additional comments	101
Table 1. Matrix of raw data	103
CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION.....	104
Participant history.....	104
Preferred style	105
Preferred traits and values.....	107
Scenario one and two	110
Motivation	111

Education and training versus experience	112
Age	113
Gender	114
Transferability	116
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION	119
REFERENCES	123
APPENDICES	134
Appendix one: Information sheet.....	134
Appendix two:	136
Appendix three: Interview sheet	138

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

“If your actions inspire others to dream more, learn more, do more and become more; you are a leader”

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS

In 1948, American General Omar Bradley recorded his thoughts on leadership in a United States military training pamphlet and said,

“Leadership is the art of influencing human behaviour through ability to directly influence people and direct them toward a specific goal”(p.iii).

(Bradley, 1948.)

In 1993, forty five years later, one of his successors as Chief of Staff, United States Army, General Gordon R. Sullivan, penned his own interpretation and said,

“Leadership is the process of influencing others to accomplish the mission by providing purpose, direction and motivation”(p.iii).

(Sullivan, 1993)

In those intervening 45 years, no less than fourteen interim United States Army Chief’s of Staff had written their own version of the definition of what constituted leadership, General Sullivan twice, in two successive years, as did General J. Lawton Collins in the early nineteen fifties (Collins, 1953).

In 1983 General John A. Wickham formalised his ideas on the subject,

*“The process by which a soldier influences others
to accomplish the mission,” (p.ii).*

(Wickham, 1983)

and he rewrote it in 1986 in the “AR 600-100” (Wickham, 1986), and then again in 1987, only in that particular year he amended it no less than three times, once in May for the “AR 600-100” (Wickham, 1987), and then twice in June for two different publications, the “DM Pam 600-80” (Wickham, 1987), and then again that same month for the “FM 22-103”, which read,

*“ Leadership is the art of direct and indirect influence
and the skill of creating the conditions for sustained
organisational success to achieve the desired result.
But, above all, it is the art of taking a vision of what
must be done, communicating it in a way that the
intent is clearly understood, and then being tough enough
to ensure its execution”.*(p.iii).

(Wickham, 1987)

General Omar Bradley was one of the most distinguished leaders in the 20th century and during World War Two gained the reputation for being ‘The soldiers General’ and ending the war as ‘America’s foremost battle leader’. He was known to be; distinguished, fair, honest, effective, calm, knowing his subordinates and the needs of his soldiers, and having care and compassion for those same people. Members of the

German Army who met him in their captivity spoke of his “lack of pretentiousness” and that they found this trait being not normal for a senior ranking officer of his level (Bradley, 1951).

If the evidence above suggests anything, it is that General Bradley and his successors obviously had difficulty in defining just what leadership was, and *is*; despite the fact that they were clearly considered, by their rank and reputation, to be leaders of exemplarity. It has been said that there are as many definitions of leadership as there are people who have tried to define it (Rost, 1991). It would be difficult enough to work with a subject that in itself cannot be accurately defined, without the knowledge that leadership is a continually evolving concept that has been around as long as the human race, in fact it even existed in primates such as chimpanzees, which evolutionary theory suggests are the predecessors of our species (de Waal, 2006).

In today’s environment, the demands on leadership performance are more critical than ever before. In the military, business, and the public sector, leaders are not only expected to be able to perform in their primary role and environment, but in any situation in which they find themselves. Today’s military leader in particular must have flexibility as one of their most essential characteristics. (Claburn, 2004). Kao, Sinha and Wilpert (1999) support this when they say that the assumption that managers can automatically transfer their skills and styles from one situation to another is wrong and presents the greatest challenge to international managers today (Kao, Sinha & Wilpert, 1999).

Gabarro (1987), goes on to say that there has been little research carried out on transferability of leadership skills, at the executive level across different industries, but suggests that the ability is limited in this area (Gabarro, 1987). Gordon (2000) supports this assertion about the lack of research on transferability saying that results have been 'meagre' and 'obscure', but says that some leadership examples have been shown to persist from early school into situations in later life, both in employment and the community (Gordon, 2000).

Zenger and Folkman (2002) suggest that leadership is not effectively transferable between contexts and say that "effective leadership practices are specific to an organization" (p.21), in their book, 'The Extraordinary leader'. In this book, issued to Commanding Officers of the New Zealand Army, they cite stories of countless leaders who are successful in one organization, transferring to another and immediately failing. They state that this is compelling evidence that leaders must fit the organization. They say that their research showed that each organization had different values on leadership competencies and that leadership "always occurs in a context" (p.33) (Zenger & Folkman, 2002).

If leadership is really about followership, as Barker (1992) suggests, then the transferability is not so much about the leader and the environment, but more about what characteristics the follower will follow. Huber (2005) says that followers want certain values and traits in their leaders, such as honesty, credibility and supportiveness. Klenke (1996) suggests that gender plays no part in this equation, but values and traits are the overriding issues. This theory goes equally for age according to Deal (2006) who says that while older leaders sometimes were better due

to experience, age generally was not significant in terms of leadership ability. There has been much research carried out on the differing dynamics of leadership, and it is said that one of the most important contributions that the field of psychology has contributed to the area of business development, has been the identification of leadership traits, styles, and values of leaders who have already been acknowledged for their skill in this area (Thornton, 1992).

While there are many traits, styles and values that make up an individual's leadership dynamic (Posner, 2006), each person claiming that *their own* works best for them in their area of community, commerce, industry or the military; the question, and indeed the debate that arises, is whether or not that *same leader* can move easily from their usual context of leading, across to a less familiar environment with the same success. Anecdotal evidence claims, for example, that a military leader would not be successful if they tried managing a production line environment or vice versa. Could a scout leader move easily into some form of business leadership? Some research findings say that this is not possible (Zenger & Folkman, 2002), while others say that it depends on the initial selection and / or training of the leader involved (Kouzes & Posner, 2005).

This thesis analyses responses from a variety of leaders from diverse occupations and backgrounds, qualifications and experience. It is based on the premise that most people have some form of leadership role in their lives, whether it is a formal relationship in business or other management position, in their local community, or even within the family in a parenting situation. Some of these people, not necessarily my participants, are highly successful in one context of their leadership but fail

abysmally in another, while others may be good at both for a limited time or even perpetually (Zenger & Folkman, 2002). Whether this is based on the characteristics of the individual or some form of leadership qualification and /or experience, is one of the questions I will be attempting to answer. Overall I will be endeavouring to reveal whether or not the styles, traits and values that leaders have in one context are readily transferred in part or in whole into a second environment.

While there is a large amount of research available on leadership generally, there appears to be little on the subject investigated in my thesis (Gabarro, 1987). Given the importance of leadership in all sectors of our environment today (Claburn, 2004), this may add to the area of leadership development. Leaders today must be more flexible than ever to meet the changing dynamics of the financial market place as well as the rapidly moving pace of modern industry (Claburn, 2004). Organisations must not only select the right people to lead their workforce in the first place, but also expect from those selected the ability to move quickly and effortlessly between the different and varied sectors that make up their area of operations (Kao, Sinha & Wilpert, 1999). This research and others like it will hopefully show the gaps in selection and /or training and development of those chosen to lead into the first half of the 21st century and beyond.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

“The key to successful leadership today is influence, not authority”.

KENNETH BLANCHARD

According to Keesing and Strathern (1998), “tribesmen seldom unite *for* anything, they unite *against*” (p.149). Often a leader emerges to unite tribesmen, using religious symbols, or mystical dreams and visions, to bring together fragmented groups to fight a collective war for liberation or conquest. The Assiniboin Indians of the eastern plains of native America, and the Iban of Borneo, both of whose leaders had visions of such conquest, temporarily united their disjointed groups under a common cause of victory that was revealed in dreams (Keesing & Strathern, 1998).

Leadership appears to be an essential and perpetual part of the evolution of the human race. Boehm (1999) and Brown (1991) identified the phenomenon of leadership as a constant universal in the human species. From the discovery of human male sperm that include suicide elements that explode when confronting a rival sperm, to the research showing that serotonin levels increase when people are promoted in employment suggesting genetic hard wiring of humans to be status conscious, they both say that leadership in some form has been evident since the emergence of the homo sapiens and before (Boehm, 1999; Brown, 1991).

Dunbar (2004) reinforces this by saying that the behaviour of both leaders and followers has been present throughout evolutionary history as the product of cognitive adaptations which assisted humans to solve adaptive problems. Wilson (1975)

suggests that this behaviour originated in our primate forbears and even in behaviour of other organisms such as the waggle dance of the honey bee that incites members of the hive to collect food. He also cites aerial formations of birds and swimming patterns of schools of fish as examples of leader- follower patterns.

Historical Overview

The first appearance of the word leader from the root *leden* which meant to *travel* or to *show the way*, did not appear in the English language until the 1300's. It was to be some five centuries later that leadership as a word, finally came into use, and the formal study of this as a science, did not begin until the turn of the twentieth century (Rost, 1991).

Beck, Black, Kreiger, Naylor and Shabaka (1999) offer a perspective into the era's of leadership, breaking them down into: tribal, pre-classical, classical, progressive and post progressive. They support Novick, et al., when they say that tribal leadership was based on size, strength and agility, but add that leadership at this level was based largely on fear and was very directive and task orientated. Pre-classical leadership was still marked by brutality and oppression, however these leaders were generally a combination of kings and church in collusion, claiming spirituality or magic as a basis for their power (Beck, Black, Krieger, Naylor & Shabaka, 1999).

While leaders in the classical era no longer used brutal force and the threat of death to maintain obedience and production, Beck, et al. say that they still led by command and manipulation, demanding production at minimal costs and resulting in inefficient workers. The progressive leadership era saw the introduction of Total Quality

Management (TMQ). Stability now meant nothing and *empowerment* was the technique used to maximise the potential of everyone, and the worker being involved with organisational change (Beck, et al., 1999).

Finally, in the post-progressive leadership period, leaders get involved in risk models, taking chances on their followers to do the right thing under a new democratic agenda, coping with a society immersed in constant change and rapidly developing technology. This new leadership had to manage information exchange at a rate that predecessors could never imagine and stakeholder relationships anywhere in the world on a twenty four hour, seven day basis. Finally, leaders and followers meet on an equal basis (Beck, et al., 1999).

While leadership obviously existed in prehistory, the study into this didn't commence until around the turn of the twentieth century. Rost (1991) lists theories that developed from these early studies that went back to the 1900's, and the *great man* theory that stated that people were *born* to lead, and that an innate quality was required. In the 1930's the group theory emerged explaining how leadership develops and emerges in small groups.

In the 1940's and 1950's the trait theory was prominent and research was centred on precisely which universal traits were common to all leaders. This theory still has favour in research today. In the 1950's and 1960's behaviour theory was popular looking into the key behavioural patterns that resulted in the best leadership models, followed by the contingency / situational theory in the 1970's looking to establish which leadership behaviours succeeded in specific situations (Rost, 1991).

In the 1980's, according to Rost, researchers could not determine which patterns of behaviour resulted in effective leadership and so they tried to find out which interaction of traits, behaviours, key situations and group facilitation best allowed people to lead organisations to excellence. This led to the alternative theories of the late 1980's, which differed from earlier models, essentially, in the discipline of the researcher. Up until this time most studies were carried out using a psychological managerial focus. In the late 1980's, however, anthropologists, historians, political scientists and authors took an active interest in the subject. The important aspect of this period is the focus moving from solely on the leader to also acknowledging and concentrating on the follower as an essential dynamic in the leadership process, where leaders and followers develop mutual purposes (Rost, 1991).

Looking at leadership itself in history, we see that once families, social groups, then tribes and communities are formed, leading on to the formation of nation states, united states and eventually to the united nations, the one constant of all this, is effective leadership, and in support of this theory, Allman (1996) says that having a head of state is a naturally occurring phenomena and stems back to our primate beginnings. He states that serotonin levels in the brain give us the ability to relax when appropriate while allowing us to react quickly and decisively when a threat presents itself. The leaders among us have the added ability to know the difference in those situations and react in a positive way for the protection of the group. Additional research, says Allman, shows that in monkeys, those having higher levels of serotonin will usually indicate that they are the alpha male. This has also been shown to be true in college fraternities in the case of high ranking officers and swim team leaders. (Allman, 1996).

Studies at the University of Leicester showed that when animals are formed into groups, deciding which of their number to follow, and then deciding if and when to follow them, becomes fundamental to their existence and survival (Ward, Sumpter, Couzin, Hart, & Krause, 2008). Doctor Ashley Ward, who led the study, said that *social conformity* exerted powerful behaviour on all animal and human groups and this extended to non human varieties such as fish and other species, who he stated have an inbuilt desire to follow a leader, even if it is at a high cost to itself (Ward, et al., 2008).

Kummer (1968) observed that nomadic Hamadryas baboons had a method of leadership / followership more unusual than most in its alternating pattern of leadership selection. When the group decided to rest up for the night, one individual would wander off in a direction to choose a spot. The remaining band would then decide whether it was safe to follow, and if not they would move off as a group, thus making the loner follow them until another individual went off independently to find a suitable night area. This process of selection was repeated until a suitable spot was chosen (Kummer, 1968).

The Bonobo monkey, according to de Waal (1997), is so closely related to humans that their genus name should be changed from *Pan* to the same as ours, that is, the genus *Homo*. With this in mind de Waal discusses leadership in the Bonobo tribes, and traits and values such as altruism, compassion, empathy, kindness, patience and sensitivity, and says that these are not uncommon among individuals who are selected to lead groups of these *Pan Paniscus* (de Waal, 1997). de Waal noted that while rank does not play a large part in Bonobo society, the status of a male is determined by the

status of his mother, due to the matriarchal culture driven by strong female bonding. The traits, mentioned above, in their leaders meant that among all the primates, the Bonobo have very little conflict and it is usually resolved in a non aggressive manner by their female leaders (de Waal, 1997).

In the case of *Homo sapiens*; as the human race went from bands of families, to tribes, to chiefdoms, and finally to nation states, the need from leadership to co-ordinate and make decisions grew. Many small bands were egalitarian societies, that is to say, leaderless, and leadership only emerged in times of danger or hardship. This hardship usually meant alliance with other bands and the need for combined leadership (Wilson, 2000). Wilson goes on to say that with the advance of agriculture, knowledge and technology, tribes combined into chiefdoms and finally states, with individuals vying for control, and with it, it's associated privileges and status (Wilson, 2000).

The selection of leader at this level was often based on the *great person* theory. According to Novick, Morrow and Mays (2007), this generally meant that only those who had superior mental, physical or cultural ability were chosen to be leaders, which suggested that leaders were born not made (Novick, Morrow & Mays, 2007). This 'nature versus nurture' debate has dominated the leadership question up until the 1940's and continues today in some areas of study, albeit somewhat broadened and more flexible in its argument (Nye, 2008).

Nye goes on to say that traits today have come to be seen as "consistent patterns of personality" (p.23) rather than characteristics that have simply been inherited. This

new theory of traits mixes the nature and nurture debate into one, and suggests that traits can be learned and changed over time. Nye says that we talk about leaders being more energetic, risk taking and optimistic along with their ability to persuade, and while we can attribute this to their genetic makeup, we can now say that their environment has also contributed to these traits being learned and developed over time (Nye, 2008).

MacDonald, Burke and Stewart (2006) say that when we discuss any human attribute the argument usually develops over whether it is an inherited or learned characteristic. The discussion must be looked at here however, because we have to be cautious about making statements about human attributes that are supposed to be *set* for life and not capable of alteration (MacDonald, Burke & Stewart 2006).

The purpose of raising the discussion in this thesis is not to reengage in the argument, but to simply acknowledge, as MacDonald et al. does, that leadership consists of some characteristics that are in our genetic makeup and some characteristics that are learned and developed by our environment. These include essentials such as our mental processing ability which is *inbuilt* and not subject to a maturational process. Technical skills, social process skills and general knowledge, however, are characteristics which can be taught, learned and developed over the life cycle (MacDonald, et al., 2006).

The Seneca Indians of Western Pennsylvania had a somewhat unique method of leadership. While their leaders were chosen for their wisdom and ability, they only remained in the position as long as they did as their people wanted them to do. The position of leader was open to both men or women and they had to work like

everyone else. They did not have servants and appeared to have had a system of selection that worked, as most were long term leaders. One of their most renowned leaders was Queen Alliquippa who was born in 1680 and remained in power all her life (Clark, 2005).

History has shown that without strong competent leadership, groups fragment and split into individual factions of temporarily like-minded people who will quickly fall apart when the next issue arises where there is disagreement, unless there is legal authority, and even then, only when that legal authority falls under an effective leader or enforced authority as in a dictatorship. The break-up of the United Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) and the domino effect of the de-fragmentation of nation states in the Baltic and surrounding areas on the European continent is a prime example of this (Matlock, 1995).

Matlock explains that the break-up of the Soviet Union actually began in 1985, and ended in 1991, a result of successive leadership decisions by Mikhail Gorbachev following the death of Konstantin Chernenko. While Gorbachev has been hailed as actually being a good leader, he was not the right one to hold the communist regime together (Matlock, 1995). The programmes of Gorbachev, consisting of *glasnost* (political openness), *uskoreniye* (speed-up of economic development), and *perestroika* (political and economic restructuring), while being admirable in a western culture, actually worked against him in a communist one. Glasnost actually resulted in the Soviet press, who had been effectively *gagged* for seventy years, having the freedom to report the truth and say what it thought, relishing in an environment of less control. Soviet social scientists had the freedom to research and report on subjects and issues

which had previously brought them into trouble with their communist masters and had been generally forbidden to conduct research on, such as public opinion polls (Remnick, 1994).

Thus, while Gorbachev had all the attributes and wisdom that we would normally associate with a great leader, it was the environment and his followers that were wrong for him at the time, and while the outcome was favourable for the Soviet people, as the leader of the communist regime charged with holding it together, he failed abysmally. Gorbachev was the youngest Soviet leader since Stalin and only held this office for a mere 21 months (Remnick, 1994).

Age

When it comes to the age of a leader, there is much debate over youth versus age. McDermott (2008) says that while it appears that older leaders generally prove to have more insight, experience, understanding and calmness in the work environment, they tend to suffer from the dynamics of aging, whether it is disease or mental degradation, and this is actually more apparent with powerful leaders. They may lack the energy and vitality of their younger counterparts. Deal (2006) suggests, however, that it is not so much the physical age of a person that affects their performance, rather the era, or culture, that they come from. She says that older generations come from a much authoritarian period of leadership while younger people are more used to the not so rigid style of today (Deal, 2006).

Ket de Vries (2003) has a differing opinion again and says that while there is much discussion about the older manager losing their edge as they age due to imposing

retirement and the social adjustment that this will require, that it is more about the lack of 'challenge and opportunities' as they progress through their careers that impact on performance. He goes on to say that there is evidence that vocabulary, knowledge and information ability does not decrease with age, and that the older manager is equally as competent and productive as their younger counterparts when it comes to performance. In terms of experience and maturity in judgement the older leader has the advantage, as well as a history of attendance, punctuality, reliability and safety, which the younger managers do not have as yet (Ket de Vries, 2003).

Phillips (1998) found that there are advantages at both ends of the age scale when it comes to leadership, particularly entrepreneurial leadership. She reports findings that suggest older people find it easier to delegate, while young managers, especially those just commencing in a new business, struggle because they feel uncomfortable assigning their workload to others. She says that those under thirty five were more successful in starting up an enterprise due to their ability to sell people on ideas, taking risks and acting quickly, but generally had difficulty in the end because they tried to do it too much on their own. The older business starter excelled more at team building, achieving consensus and being more open-minded. Younger leaders, however, were more charismatic, but had less trust in their people (Phillips, 1998).

Kingsmill (2009) disagrees with Phillips to a certain extent with the findings from her study of banking leadership, where she found that senior, older managers were unable or unwilling to exercise authority over their younger executives, contributing to the near collapse of some Scottish banks in the United Kingdom. She says that while energy, innovation and action were commendable attributes of the young leader, they

lack foresight, tend to over commit themselves and have a reluctance to own up to their own mistakes and faults, while the older managers are happy with mediocre results, do not accept suggestions easily, and get involved in too much consultation (Kingsmill, 2009). Oshagbemi (2004) found in his research with over 400 managers in the United Kingdom, that the research suggests that older and younger leaders had considerable differences in their styles in terms of consultation and participation, with older managers consulting and participating more than younger ones. It was found that generally both groups used different leadership styles overall. Of interest, and conflicting strongly with Phillips (1998), the study showed that both older and younger managers were approximately the same when it came to directive leadership and delegation (Oshagbeni, 2004).

Kakabadse (1999) argues in favour of the older leader saying that they make the most of people, and “foster continuous, effective performance” (p.16). He says that older managers are more interested in long term results while their younger colleagues are ambitious and concentrate on immediate outcomes. He contends that in the flat organisational structure of today, managers need to be resilient and wise and that these characteristics are more often found in the older leader (Kakabadse, 1999). This research involved over 6500 managers across several countries, and Kakabadse found that the older manager was more effective in developing positive relationships with subordinates than younger ones. He says in times of change older leaders appear to be better equipped to act positively and encourage rather than discourage enthusiasm as well as being able to nurture a “performance orientated culture” (Kakabadse, 1999).

Oshagbeni (2004) supports Kakabase when he says that it was found that younger leaders are more willing to take risks, prefer to operate in fast changing environments and look at new ways of operating, than older people. In contrast, experienced older managers use their in depth knowledge and past practice from experience when solving problems, cooperate and delegate more effectively, and are much more calm in their approach. They minimise risk and show much more empathy and concern than their younger colleagues, along with working to develop and promote others, unlike younger leaders who consistently make an effort to develop and promote themselves. Oshagbeni also says that younger leaders are found to be more intense and energetic and can pass this energy on to others, continually look for new opportunities and are very competitive when pushing for higher and higher levels of results (Oshagbeni, 2004).

Kakabadse (1999) supports these findings further when he reports from two studies involving, firstly, 750 top managers from the public service in Australia, and secondly research results from the United Kingdom which used more than 500 National Health Service Trust directors. It was found that the managers who out-performed were from the older age group and had been long term employees of the organisation and were focussed on external dynamics. They were shown to have maturity, were realistic with tolerance, and showed a commitment to discipline and discussing relevant issues. They were essentially team players who had been in their jobs for between five to ten years. (Kakabadse, 1999).

These people, according to Kakabase, looked well upon and spoke of highly of, their organisations, were very supportive of staff and liked them to express what they

thought. They were not backward in acknowledging the weaker points of their companies however. This group were generally slower to act as they were more concerned with persuading and ensuring others were there to support them before they implemented decisions, insisting on continual feedback. Kakabase found, conversely, that in younger managers there was much more criticism of their organisation, subordinates felt anxious when they were around them because of their nervous energy and often unrealistic demands. These people also were found to be impatient of those around them (Kakabase, 1999).

Gardner (2007) supports Deal's earlier assertion that the primary difference between the two groups of leaders has nothing to do with their age but the historical period in which they emerged as leaders. Older leaders grew up and developed during and post the Second World War and then the cold war. This period of history had different social norms in terms of responsibility and roles, as well as in terms of the work place, family and community. In contrast says Gardner, the younger leader emerged in an era of multi media, sexual revolution, globalisation and such world wide issues as AIDS and more recently, global terrorism (Gardner, 2007).

Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal and Brown (2007) carried out some of the latest research to emerge on the subject of age in leadership in their study of generational differences on work processes. The study was carried out across four generations of managers and the findings showed that the different age groups clearly value different attributes in their leaders, and that leaders from these different groups behave quite differently. While the press at the time over emphasised the differences in age groups, the evidenced suggests that organisations do need to pay attention to the these findings

when selecting, training and positioning their personnel involved in leadership roles (Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal & Brown, 2007).

Gender

While there appears to be no shortage of research showing that age or generational era may have a significant impact on styles, behaviours and values of leaders, much of that same and other research argues that there the gender of these people is largely irrelevant (Kakabadse, 1999). This particular research by Kakabadse asserts that there are no differences when it comes to team dynamics, clarity of vision, communication, as well as the overall quality of management. Kakabadse says that popular opinion goes against women in leadership roles, however he says that current findings show this as not significant when it comes to leadership styles, and in fact the “so-called ‘caring nineties’ provided the ideal context” (p.9) when it came to women being able to show their “softer skills’. It has subsequently been shown that these skills are ultimately more effective in the modern workplace (Kakabadse, 1999).

Oshagbemi (2004) supports Kakabadse and says that gender is non significant when it comes to the perspective and competence of any leadership role, whereas organisational tenure and age have considerable influence on these dynamics. Eagly and Johnson (1990) found a difference in laboratory studies as opposed to field studies. The laboratory studies showed that there was little difference between gender with both being interpersonally orientated and democratic, also showing men as both task orientated and autocratic. Field studies contradicted these findings however revealing men as more autocratic and directing subordinates performance, and women

as more democratic, encouraging their people to perform more effectively and efficiently.

Similar research by Eagly, Karau and Makhijani (1995) also found that women were more effective as leaders in areas which were largely dominated by female workers, or in contexts which were of a feminine orientation. This applied equally to men, where it was found that men did better in leadership performance when it was a male dominated arena or in areas of male orientation. These findings led the researchers to believe that working in an area that was aligned to the same gender as the leader, led to perceived success more times than when the rolls were reversed.

Further findings expanded on the previous research and suggested that women were marginally expected to have a more transformational style of leadership than their male counterparts, which meant that they were more like a teacher or coach in their style, encouraging their people to engage in creativity when it came to solving problems. This style, exhibited by more women than men, has been shown to be more effective in modern settings with women also rewarding better performing staff which is one of the better dynamics of transactional leadership. Men on the other hand were found to be very hands off in their approach and were often found to be overly critical of staff, and these styles were found to be less effective in the workplace than those used by women (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & van Engen, 2003).

The authors warn, however, that generalisations should not be made that neither men nor women have any form of innate leadership ability based purely on their gender. They suggest that some women may deliberately change or 'soften' their style for fear

of being labelled 'the bossy woman'. Further to this they say that both men and women have differing levels of feminine and masculine approaches within each gender, feminizing some men and maculating some women (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & van Engen, 2003).

Historically, women have always been written about in a dismissive or derogatory way which inevitably followed through into opinion on their ability in leadership. From Plato and Aristotle through to Kant, Rosseau and Nietzsche, history talks about women and their capacity for philosophical rationality, however most early writers found them 'inferior' (Kennedy & Mendus, 1897). Much has been written on the many differences between men and women and how they see and interact with the world in differing ways. Such written material covers the fact that women are supposedly more intuitive, empathetic, selfless, kind, but weak, and suggest that men are opposite to this, being judgemental, rational decision makers and debate more, all based on gender specific assumptions with little research to support the theories (Gilligan, 1982).

Helgesen (1990) observes that the major areas of research on gender and leadership at the time still seemed to be focussed on a comparison of sex, belief systems of each gender, stereotypes and social structure. There was very little research carried out on gender within different contexts and organisational processes. Some researchers did however hold the view that identity was actually related to an individuals 'social space' or the context in which they lived and worked, and that the broader contexts in which changes occur are more significant than gender differences in affecting leadership dynamics (Tajfel, 1982).

Valentine (2004) reports research findings that suggest that women preferred to use a transformational leadership style and men used more of their masculine traits when it came to management in the physiotherapy profession. In a study of 545 managers where fifty eight per cent were women, it was shown that where men preferred to use their position within the organisation and the fact that they had the power to punish poor performance and reward good performance, women chose instead to use charisma, their personal power, or contacts they had developed, along with their proven work record to motivate and lead those that they were responsible for. They motivated their staff by taking their individual or group self interests and transforming these into goals for the organisation (Valentine, 2004).

Kakabadse (1991) however, says that research suggests that leaders are inclined to use a transformational style usually when they are not happy in their work environment. He proposes that women in a lot of workplaces are dissatisfied with the gender imbalance in leadership or management roles, and this may lead to a desire to transform the workplace to provide greater satisfaction for its female workers (Kakabadse, 1991). In Kakabadse, Okazaki-Ward and Myers (1996), the discussion continues, and research suggests that women in organisations where there were less of them did not see that gender was a positive reason for identifying with other women, and neither did they see women in senior positions as role models or even to have legitimate authority. The research goes on to say that women in these firms are less likely to receive peer support and all other women who are equal in status are seen as fierce competition. It is further suggested that gender proportion has a significant influence on job satisfaction which in turn affects the leadership style of women in managerial positions (Kakabadse, et al., 1996).

Korac-Kakabadse and Korac-Kakabadse (2001) go on to say that the findings of their Cranfield study show that there are dynamics other than gender that influence not only behaviour and attitudes in organisations generally, but also the impact on leadership styles and approaches.

Male versus female dynamics aside however, the gender in leadership discussion also extends to the gay and lesbian elements within society, and Snyder (2006), in his book 'The G Quotient' says that ninety four per cent of gay executives report a belief that looking to the motivational pathways of employees is the key to successful leadership. He says that employees respect honesty and like to see what people say turn into what they do , which he asserts is a natural inclination in gay leaders. Rush (2006) in his military guide for non commissioned officers, however, is stoically against any form of gay leadership, particularly in the United States military, and says that homosexuality in "not compatible" with military forces as he believes it affects "morale, good order, discipline and unit cohesion" (p.35).

In the face of this military rebuke, Snyder (2006) goes on to say his research shows that gay executives display all the positive aspects of good leadership in any environment, and that ninety two per cent of them also believe in developing their workers potential as an essential element of good leadership and success in business, regardless of the setting. He says that he found that, overall, gay leaders appear to have a distinct advantage when it comes to clear and honest communication, and because of their belief in diversity as an organisational strength, this gives them an even greater ability to do business internationally (Snyder, 2006).

Snyder states that he believes gays make better leaders because of their sexual orientation, in many cases spending years of 'hiding the truth' for fear of societal retribution of some kind, and the fact that so much energy is spent 'keeping the closet door closed'. He says that many gay managers become aware of the external world in a much more focussed way once they acknowledge their sexual orientation, and this allows them to hear the subtleties and inherencies of truth so much more clearly. These attributes make them more readily acceptable by their employees (Ryder, 2006).

If success in leadership is anything to go by, there are plenty of examples in history of reportedly very successful gay leaders. From King and conqueror, Alexander the great to the American Labour leader Randi Weingarten, gay people have shown that they are more than capable of leading anything from small businesses and community groups to nations, in successful ventures (Aldrich and Wotherspoon, 2001). Even in areas which do not involve direct supervision and leadership in the sciences and in the arts, gay people have invariably 'led' the way. American Ann Bancroft was the first woman to reach the North pole, Leonard Bernstein the musical conductor and composer, musician David Bowie, and Lord Byron the renowned English poet, are but a few who have shown that being gay was certainly no barrier to being successful in their chosen fields (Aldrich and Wotherspoon, 2001).

In terms of what may be called direct leadership, there is still no shortage of names from the gay community, either in antiquity or modern times; Caligula, Roman Emperor, Edward the second King of England, Brian Epstein manager of the Beatles, Hadrian the Roman emperor and military commander, Alfred Redl, Austrian military

officer and spy who led Austria's counter intelligence effort prior to the first world war, Ernst Rohm German military officer, and J Edgar Hoover who led the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation (Aldrich and Wotherspoon, 2001). Although many of these leaders were not subject to the same levels social bigotry that gay leaders of recent times have had to endure, they would still have been gay leaders with all the traits, values and styles that go with that, and they were arguably successful (Miller, 1994).

More recently is the story of Harvey Bernard Milk, the first man to be elected to public office in California who was openly gay. Milk was assassinated when he was forty eight years old in 1978, but not before he had made his mark on San Francisco politics as a "hard working, inspirational visionary" according to New Mexico University professor Karen Foss. Foss (1994) goes on to say that Harvey Milk was known to be highly energetic, and importantly for his leadership skills was the fact that he was charismatic, and this gained him widespread respect and support from both the gay and heterosexual elements in society (Foss, 1994). Honesty was something else that aided Harvey Milk in his role as a leader, and D'Emilio (1989) says that what Milk always wanted to be remembered for most was the, "imperative to live one's life at all times with integrity" (p.51). United States of America President Barack Obama formally recognised the contributions of Harvey Milk in August 2009 with a posthumous award of the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

If followship is an important factor in leadership, then it is interesting to note a 2003 research project relating to confidence in gay leaders both from a military and a civilian perspective. Belkin and Bateman (2003) found that out of 704 military

personnel, 65.3% were more confident with a straight leader, 20.2% were equally confident with a straight or gay leader but that zero per cent were more confident with a gay leader in isolation, with 14.5% having no opinion. Conversely in the civilian population of 903 people, 34.6 % were confident with straight leaders, 49.9% were more confident with either a straight or gay leader and .3% were more confident with a gay leader, and 15.2% had no opinion (Belkin & Bateman, 2003).

Of interest, the military are now more confident with women in leadership roles than their civilian opposites with 67.8 % being equally confident with either a female or male leader over 58.7% in the civilian environment. This reversal in preference being quite significant compared to when women were introduced into mainstream military service in the 1970's and 1980's (Belkin & Bateman, 2003). One can only assume that once gay and lesbian leadership is more prevalent, open, and given the chance to prove itself on equal footing, that it too will improve in preference with the follower.

Followship

Ira Chaleff (2002) said that, "Leaders rarely use their power wisely or effectively over long periods unless they are supported by followers who have the stature to help them do so" (p.156), and that while the success of an organisation may rely heavily on how well their leaders lead, there is an equal importance placed on how well their followers follow. Huber (2005) says that followship is the flip side of leadership and that followers perform the vital task of accepting or rejecting their leader, and also in assisting to determine just how much personal power that leader has. Drucker (1996) says it a little more concisely when he states "The only definition of a leader is someone who has followers" (p.73).

Kellerman (2008) suggests if you do an Amazon.com book search on the internet that you are likely to come up with more than forty thousand books on the subject of leadership. She goes on to say that a similar search on followship will result in “exactly” thirty nine. Kellerman defines followship as “the response of those in subordinate positions to those in superior ones” (p.2) and says that followers have less power, authority and influence than their leaders do, and usually just fall into line. Chaleff (1995) supports Kellerman when he says that his projected guess was that there are about 300 texts on leadership to every one on the subject of followship.

What Kellerman and others in the field of leadership / followship found interesting is the changes that appear to be occurring everywhere they looked. They saw that both parties are becoming bolder and more strategic in their thinking. Followers in every sphere are taking on established leaders when they are confronted with something that they believe to be immoral or illegal, and they are referring to this phenomenon as a ‘global political awakening’. Kellerman states that this trend first started appearing in the 1960’s and 1970’s with the information revolution in the following decades taking it to a new level again, resulting in information and access to it the “new power symbol” (Kellerman, 2008).

Jones (2002) says that as long as there have been leaders in history there have been followers, however not until 1967 has there been any official mention of this dynamic of leadership and that both leadership and followship are equal in importance despite that fact that there has been little research in the relationship between the two.

According to Bovee and Thill (2005) the whole area of study involving followship is so new, that most researchers, academics and professionals are spending most of their

time just trying to justify its importance and relevance along with a rationale for continuing an interest into the area of research on the subject (Bovee & Thill, 2005).

Hock (1999) says that leader presumes follower, and that follower presumes choice of some kind. He asserts that someone who is 'coerced' to carry out the purposes and objectives of someone else is not a follower but someone who is subject to manipulation. A follower *chooses* to follow. In the true relationship between leader and follower, both have the freedom to choose another path. Hock says that if this freedom does not exist, then the relationship is simply one of superior / subordinate, master and servant, or owner and slave, and these relationships are all inherently different from the leader / follower one (Hock, 1999).

The relationship between those who lead and those who follow is very simple according to Chaleff (1995), and he says that you cannot have one without the other and they are co-dependant on each other. He says that when a company or organisation fails, the questions that are often asked are "what went wrong?" and, "how come nobody said anything"? The answers according to Chaleff are generally found among the followers that, because of their relationship with the leadership of the organisation, did not feel that they had the right, responsibility or courage to speak up at the time for fear of retribution. This, he says, is not a leader/ follower relationship (Chaleff, 1995).

Kelly (1992) found that all the research on followership centred on how the follower felt about the leader, implying that the follower had nothing interesting or pertinent to say about themselves. He says that successful leadership implies or assumes good

followship, however all the literature on the subject ignores this fact. Chaleff warns that change has not only already occurred, but will continue to happen at an alarming rate, saying that new models of leadership are emerging. Historically strong leadership was needed because of the tasks that had to be achieved, “building a pyramid or laying a railroad” (p.78) says Chaleff, but now with information age organisations the role of leader / follower is confused with people answering to people across a wide range of interconnected responsibilities and within a context of knowledge based power dynamics (Chaleff, 1995).

Kelly goes on to say that what we are seeing in organisations now, is a change from the idealist leader to one of team focus, collaboration, and where the employee is becoming the owner. With these changes in dynamics, the lines of communication, power, ownership and control, are becoming increasingly blurred, along with determining just who the leader is and who is the follower. If only one perspective is followed, the leader or the follower, then we end up with ‘single minded conformism’ again, not having a true leader / follower relationship (Kelly, 1992). Chaleff goes on to say that with the increased competitiveness on a global scale in many organisations, that this type of conformism holds the opinion that followers are simply ‘blindly obeying sheep’, and that this is doomed to certain failure and cannot function in a modern successful organisation (Chaleff, 1995).

In an earlier book, Chaleff (2002) talked about the power of the leader / follower paradigm. Traditionally, he said, the leader had *all* the power and while the follower worked for the pay, the perks, the bonuses, promotions and the best jobs, it was the leader who held all the power to give these things. This relationship had developed a

system where the follower had done everything in order not to risk losing out on these opportunities. The follower always wants the leader to see them in a positive light and continue creating a good impression. In this type of relationship, however, Chaleff says that the open flow of information is closed down and this negates the effectiveness of the leader. As Chaleff asks, “who will tell the Emperor he has no clothes” (p.34)? (Chaleff, 2002).

Kelly (1992) says that the time has come, or indeed the time has passed, when managers need to look at their own huge financial remuneration, no monetary benefits and massive redundancy payments, and start giving these to their followers. Barbara Kellerman (2008) stresses that managers need to understand that it is one thing to train the next generation of leaders, however, while not everyone *can* be a leader, everyone *will* be a follower at some time or other, and it is just as important to train and adequately reward that *next* generation of followers, and while doing so encourage them to speak up.

Kelly continues to say that his research shows that in any given organisation, followers do eighty per cent of the work and leaders only contribute twenty per cent. This Kelly says, is because even leaders have to report to someone and they spend most of their time doing so, in fact they spend more of their time as followers than as leaders (Kelly, 1992). Chaleff states that in a healthy organisation, the leader and follower are both striving to serve a common purpose and more importantly they both recognise and acknowledge this, and this in turn reflects equally the organisations success (Chaleff, 2002). Crockett (1981) stresses the importance of developing followship. He says that leadership is only one piece of a very complicated structure

that holds our organisations together in terms of human relationships, while Lundin (1990) claims that organisations that value followship as much as they do leadership will *enrich* themselves, saying that academic support for this claim only comes from leaders who have long experience and can validate this from personal observation.

Goethals and Sorenson (2006) go a step further in the debate on followship when they say that when followers refrain from exercising their power in certain ways, and this action makes for an indispensable dynamic to the performance of leadership. They say that followers have far more power than they themselves realise and employ, in fact, more power than leaders themselves. They say that followers accept their place in the relationship but only as long as they think that they are benefiting from the deal. Chaleff however, sees the relationship as slightly more equal and says that while both leader and follower have equal power, they have different roles that circle around support and fulfilment of the organisations reason for being (Chaleff, 2002). When they are both focussed on the same goals and common purpose, this relationship, according to Chaleff is more open and embodies respect, trust, open communication, as well as being respectful, supportive and above all, encompassing honesty.

Honesty is very important according to Kellerman (2008) if organisations want followers to feel free to provide feedback in order to maintain the effectiveness of the business. She says that if employees are not made to feel that they can provide honest feedback then they will feel that they should keep quiet for fear of being labelled a troublemaker or just being ignored. In this case there is not a leader / follower relationship, but merely a manager / subordinate with all the pitfalls that that entails. Kellerman says that most of us understand why we end up following leaders, and

even why we follow appalling models of leadership. The main reason as Kellerman points out is purely out of self interest. People fear the cost of resistance, or the consequences of non compliance. She adds that it is not only leaders that we follow, but the pressure to conform also comes from our own peers, or co-followers (Kellerman, 2008).

Maak and Pless (2005) talk about the leader / follower relationship as “close and enduring” and that authentic leaders establish “trusting relationships” with people throughout all levels of their organisations as well as their personal lives, and these relationships have both tangible and intangible, long lasting rewards. They say that genuine relationships are at the core of the leader /follower dynamic and that both players raise the other to higher levels of motivation.

Pounder (1998) also says that the relationship between leaders and followers has special significance and involves influence on both sides. Both parties in this relationship actively influence the other toward a mutual purpose and both intend real change that reflects these mutual purposes in an open and honest way. This says Rost (1991), is what is meant by ‘transformational leadership’, and that honesty is one of the most important aspects of this type of relationship. Pounder goes on to say that this collaboration between the leader and the follower is based on parity and reciprocity. Parity is based on equal access to power and resources, however reciprocity is based, like all relationships, on both parties believing that they are getting equality in the allocation of privileges and rewards based on the effort they have put in. Without this feeling of reciprocity, says Pounder the relationship begins to fall apart (Pounder, 1998).

Values / Traits

The common theme appearing in this relationship according to Barker (1992) is the phenomenon of dual motives and aspirations based on a matrix of shared values. It is a “marriage of binding, interlocking, meshing and involvement, a fully sharing relationship based on trust” (p.51). Burns (1978) agrees that shared values and needs are the central thread to which this relationship is based upon, including motives of both leader and follower. Burns says that values are:

“enduring beliefs that a specific mode of conduct (modal or instrumental values) or end states of existence (end or terminal values) are personally and socially preferable to alternative modes and ends. Modal values may be such things as honesty, courage, and fairplay. End values may be such things as equality, salvation and world peace” (p.29).

(Burns, 1978).

John Gardner (2001) says that a large part of the very fabric of followship is integrity. He says that integrity is “identifying values and being true to them” (p.27). Unfortunately says Gardner, many people treat their own integrity like they do a fire extinguisher, “ignoring them until there’s a crises, and then hoping they can remember how to work them” (p.27). This says Gardner is the reason many workplaces fail and both leader and follower must work to improve their skills in

identifying their own set of integrity linked values and then making them work in the organisation (Gardner, 2001).

If integrity, based on shared values, is integral to the leader / follower relationship working in any situation, what are these values? Deal (2006) has input into this from her research into the top ten leadership attributes by generation. The population samples were from the Silent generation, the early Baby Boomers, late Baby boomers, the early X generation, and finally the late X generation. Out of forty attributes selected more than fifty per cent of people chose: credible, trusted, listens well, farsighted, and encouraging; all of these being in their top five when listed.

Interestingly, credible, was the top attribute chosen by four out of five of the generation groups, the “X” generation rating it number seven in importance and, listens well, as their number one. Deal does not appear to explain the reason behind this result (Deal, 2006). Deal’s research also covered the least frequently chosen attributes and these were: global leadership, globally innovative, has a global view, internationally resilient, good fund raiser, physically fit, and wholesome. These attributes were chosen in the top ten less than ten per cent of the time. Deal says that the theme here is that people do not believe it important, or want their leaders to have, any global attributes or ability to deal with people and organisations outside of their own country, in the case, the United States of America (Deal, 2006).

Deal says that the, ability to fund raise, is perceived with even less importance and, being wholesome, with equal disinterest. She also says that while many in this population sample did not believe that being physically fit was very important at all, there is considerable evidence to suggest that being in good physical condition does

assist a leader to perform better than those who are not physically fit, even if those that they are leading or their peers and managers don't see this attribute as being very important in leading within an organisation (Deal, 2006).

The Concise Oxford Dictionary (1982) states that a value is:

“The ideals, customs, institutions, etc., of a society toward which the people of the group have an effective regard. These values may be positive, as cleanliness, freedom or education, or negative, as cruelty, crime, or blasphemy,” (p.1186)

and, “to regard or esteem highly” (p.1186). Santrock (2007) says that personal values may be resistant to change as they are developed from a very early age and may be quite entrenched in our character. Values may arise from one's culture or religious background, along with family, nation, and the generation from which we came from. Santrock goes on to say that these values developed over a lifetime contribute to the way we think, feel and act. Further to this, he says that research has shown that adolescents who are involved in group activities at school or in the community such as church groups or sports teams, show a much higher level of values aligned to social trust inclusion of everyone into society, and altruism, along with a general commitment to the common good of the community and society as a whole. This research also showed that the adolescents who did not get involved with group activities displayed much higher levels of self interest and valued material possessions higher than the intangibles of belonging to the community (Santrock, 2007).

Barrett (1998) talks at some length on value based leadership, and he says that when we have to deal with a situation in our lives, we have a choice on how to handle it. We can use our beliefs, our values, or our intuition to come to a conclusion on a course of action. Barrett says that if we use our beliefs then we are condemning ourselves to simply using out past experiences to solve the problem and our past history is context based. We therefore do not have a basis for making decisions that are not in the same context and experience that we had in the past, and we cannot confidently solve issues that are new, complex or novel.

Barrett says that if we use our values to solve new situations then our decisions become in sync with what we would like to see our ideal future looking like. He goes on to say that our values are above both our past experiences and the contexts that formed our beliefs and so can be used when we are involved in new situations that are more complex than those we have experienced before. Psychologically, Barrett says, when we use our values we are trying to create our own ideal of the future (Barrett, 1998).

True leaders, according to Hock (1999) are those who make the shared values and beliefs of the community to, become apparent, grow, and be passed on from one generation to the next. The leader's true behaviour is brought about in many small ways collectively by every follower who decides to follow that leader. In this way it could be deduced that the values that a leader displays are the ones that the follower will follow in any given situation, and if the leader displays these in any situation then the follower will be more likely to follow in any situation where that leader is in place and displaying those values.

Outcalt, Farris and McMahon (2001) disagree with Barrett when he says that we shouldn't use our experience in solving situations, and they say that we each have our own personal philosophy that *is* based on experience, but in tandem with our values *as well* as our beliefs. They do however agree with Barrett on other issues including the fact that leadership is a type of service and that leaders are always serving something higher than themselves and in the best interests of their society. They say that being in the service of others for the betterment of all is the true meaning of leadership. Ensuring the facilitation of positive change is the key to effective leadership according to Outcalt, et al, along with the fact that the leader is in a relationship with all stakeholders, including their followers and those in the community in which they serve.

In terms of what followers actually look for in their leaders, Morgan, Harkins and Goldsmith (2004) shed some light on their latest findings. They say that the overriding quality that people look for and admire in those they follow is personal credibility, and these are the ones they are most likely to follow in any given situation. Morgan, et al break down just what credibility means in practice, or the specific form of behaviours that this takes, and most frequently the response to the question of what credibility is, they say, is, "practice what you preach", or, "do what you say you will do" (p. 62). Morgan, et al say that when this sentiment is broken down into the 'say' and the 'do' parts, then when leaders verbalise or 'say' their beliefs then they must be very clear about them and just what they mean. Secondly, they must act on what they say and they must put what they have said into practice or act on their spoken belief. The most important aspect, claim Morgan et al, is the 'do' part (Morgan, et al., 2004). This is further explained when they say that while doing what you say you will do

maintains personal credibility, however doing what *we* say *we* will do demonstrates and maintains *leadership* credibility.

In narrowing down just what personal values people look for and will consistently follow when assessing their leader, we look at a very large piece of research that looks into this question. Participants in a study which began in the early 1980's, spanning two decades, numbering over seventy five thousand business and government executives, and covering six continents is one of the most comprehensive studies ever carried out on the subject (Posner, 2006). Respondents were asked to select their top seven qualities that they look for in a leader out of a list of two hundred and twenty five different values, traits and characteristics. The key issue of the questions asked of these participants was not what they would feel they *had* to follow but what qualities they "most look for and admire in a leader, someone whose direction they would willingly follow" (p.24).

Over the two decades of the research, four characteristics have again and again received over fifty per cent of the votes, consistently over time, and across all continents (Posner, 2006). There has been a constant pattern in what people look for and admire in their leaders and what they would mostly be likely to follow. These four values are from first to fourth: honesty, forward looking, competent, and inspiring, with honesty topping almost every survey conducted, leading the way as the single most important factor in any leader / follower relationship.

Posner (2006) says that it is patently obvious that if people are going to follow someone regardless of the situation, context or environment, they will only do so

willingly if they believe that person to be “truthful, ethical and principled’ (p.27) which combined makes up the value of honesty. Many people also use words such as integrity and character when they are talking about honesty as these are synonymous. Interestingly, in terms of transferability of leadership, Posner says that this desire for an honest leader is essential “no matter what the setting” (p.27). Posner says that it is a natural human condition that no one wants to be lied to or deceived, and despite our desire to succeed or win, we want to be told the truth as an overriding factor (Posner, 2006). Bennis (1993) also supports this when she says that character was important as a leadership trait and it consisted of, among other things, honesty and integrity.

Posner goes on to say that the honesty of our leader is a direct reflection of our own honesty if we choose to follow them, and the most personal attribute we look for in our leaders is honesty. He says that this is because it is the one thing that is likely to reflect our own character and that is why we prize it so highly in those we choose to follow. If our leader is dishonest it is likely that we will be viewed the same by those looking at our organisation, and if we choose to follow that person, we know has no integrity when it come to honesty in their leadership, then we not only come to lose our respect for them, but eventually, for ourselves (Posner, 2006).

Cohan (2003) says that while hiring honest people in an organisation has its obvious benefits and makes the organisation generally a nicer place to work in, there are also huge benefits to promoting honest people into positions of leadership. Cohan names James Parker of Southwest Airlines who was promoted into the position of CEO and was widely known for his “humility, honesty and effectiveness” (p.142), and in his maiden speech talked about honesty as a keystone to his management style, and went

on to gain an even greater reputation for combining “honesty, fairness and toughness” (p.142) along with his willingness to fight with all he had to protect the company and its employees. Southwest airlines became an even stronger company under the leadership of Parker. (Cohan, 2003).

Cohan also says that everyone who ever described Parker always used ‘honest’ in their description. Danny Bruce who was the aviation director at Dallas airport said of Parker, that he admired him as being “straightforward, *honest* and strong” (p.143). While others always said that one of Parkers strongest personality traits was his honesty, Parker himself always said that he found that this value always worked for him as it induced others to always trust him. The chairman of Southwest, Herb Kelleher, said that because Parker had such a strong reputation for being honest, it sent a very clear message through all levels of the organisation that being honest was worthy of reward if they wanted promotion within the airline (Cohan, 2003).

The key to honesty is not what leaders say they believe in and what they say they will do, and regardless of how much they claim to have integrity, followers only believe what they see in the behaviour of those they follow (Posner, 2006). This ties in very strongly what Morgan et al (2004) say in their research, that leaders must do what they say they will do, which shows that they believe in what they say the believe in.

Goldsmith, Greenberg, Robertson and Hu-Chan (2003) say that a leader, and more particularly a global leader must be able to demonstrate “honest, ethical behaviour” (p.217) and say that when collaborative leadership breaks down, it is due to “a lack of integrity, a lack of trust, and the presence of a political agenda” (p.219). Goldsmith, et

al. say that leaders need to build trust, and to do this they must integrate their own personal value system into the dealings with business colleagues and their followers. People expect leaders to 'walk the talk' and to model the behaviour that they expect from those below them in the organisation, as they will always trust a person who acts out the values that the leader espouses. Finally they say that integrity rests partly on courage and on honesty, but overall it rests on "integrating ones beliefs with ones actions" (p.220).

Being forward looking came in second with over seventy per cent of the participants saying that they looked for someone who was able to look ahead with a certain amount of confidence in the direction they were expecting others to follow (Posner, 2006). Basically Posner says that if leaders want others to follow them willingly, they must demonstrate, and have confidence in the belief, that they know where they are going (Posner, 2006). Posner found in other surveys that the most critical concern for top executives was strategic planning and forecasting. In that same survey when asked to rank what they considered to be the important characteristics of leadership, the same group as a whole, put forward "a leadership style of honesty and integrity"(p.29) first, and a "long-term vision and direction for the company" as second (p.29). Deal (2006) found in her research using a list of forty leadership attributes, and across the five generations she had as participants, that being farsighted was always listed in the top four, scoring fifty two per cent overall, which supports Posner's findings, as do Barker and Coy (2003) when they say that, vision, among other values and traits are essential to anyone seeking to enter the leadership arena as a career in business, politics or even community organisations.

Posner goes on to say that people don't expect anything magical about forward planning or vision, only that they can give a realistic picture of what the organisation will look like six months, one year, or five years down the track, and that it is delivered in such a descriptive way and with such clarity and confidence that those following will know what things will look like and how things will feel when they get to that chronological destination, as well as knowing exactly the route to take to get there (Posner, 2006).

Of significance, Posner says, is the fact that at senior levels within organisations, ninety five per cent of senior managers selected forward planning for their most desired characteristic of a leader, and only around sixty per cent chose this value when surveyed at middle to lower leadership levels. Posner interpreted this to mean that senior leaders see the need for long term planning and a secure future more than those at lower levels who deal with the day to day running of the organisation, however he says that as people move up in the hierarchy there needs to be some developmental needs around changing their perspective on the importance of this dynamic (Posner, 2006).

The third most popular choice in selection of leadership values according to Posner is competency. This is based on the idea that to follow someone willingly we must believe with all confidence that they are competent to lead us to success. Followers must see in their leader a capability beyond the norm and someone who is effective in what they are doing. If we doubt the competence of our leader then we are unlikely enlist in their cause. Posner (2006) says that leadership competence refers to "the leaders track record and ability to get things done, and doesn't refer to the leaders

abilities in the core technology of the operation” (p.29). Bennis (1989) in an earlier treatise on the values of leaders, says that cognitive ability and knowledge of the business are core attributes to successful leadership, and that without these, leaders would be sadly lacking in the area of competent leadership.

Posner suggests something along the lines of, perhaps that, you don't have to be a pilot to run an airline. Organisations today are far too complex with many multi disciplines and far too multifunctional for a leader to know even some of the basic intricacies of individual tasks. What followers want are leaders who know the underlying principles of their industry, the market place and the general area of the field they are involved in, as well as the fundamentals of leadership and management expertise. Posner (2006) says that probably the most important ability that a leader can offer his or her organisation is an innate ability to get along with other people and to be able to work well with those people that they have to themselves follow, their peer groups and those they in turn lead, along with external stakeholders, customers and the general public with whom they may have to interact with as part of their wider role of representing the organisation. Posner lists some of the skills more specifically and says that “modelling, inspiring, challenging, enabling and encouraging are skills leaders must master if they are going to be considered competent” (p.31).

The fourth attribute on the list from Posner (2006) is the value of being able to inspire. People are looking for meaning and purpose in their lives and inspiring leaders contribute to that says Posner. Followers take hope from leaders who are “upbeat, positive and optimistic about the future” (p.31), according to Posner's research. In normal day to day organisational functions it is important to have people

in management positions who are able to communicate their vision and the vision for the organisation with confidence and an ability to encourage, however in times of uncertainty it is even more essential to be showing positive emotions and being able to move people onward and upward.

When followers are concerned about their own future the last thing they need is someone above them who is negative and full of doom and gloom. They are frightened and discouraged in themselves, and the negative types of leader will only feed this fear and make things worse. They expect those who lead them to be enthusiastic as well as positive and show energy in a way that people will want to emulate them. Being positive about the future is the overriding attribute according to Posner (2006). Being able to dream of or see the future is a positive attribute in a leader says Posner, but this is not enough in itself, and the leader needs to be able to communicate this vision in a way that gives those who follow a great sense of purpose “in their everyday lives” (p. 31).

Posner says that while all this enthusiasm and energy cannot change the environment of the workplace or even the type of work people are doing, a positive attitude can change the way people feel and think about their day and their work, and this is the secret to being an inspiring manager. Leaders; good leaders; breathe life in the dreams of their followers and this in turn makes them want to follow their leader and achieve greater things (Posner, 2006). People don't just listen to the words of inspirational leaders, but also closely watch them in their demeanour and actions to ensure they do what they say they will do and believe *themselves*, what they say they believe. In times when the need is the greatest, leaders can only inspire maximum performance from

their people with positive emotions. Basically says Posner “If a leader displays no passion for the cause, why should anyone else?” (p. 32). Daft and Lengel (2000) say that in their research that respondents voted for inspiring as a value seventy eight per cent of the time, just behind honesty and visionary but well ahead of being independent and self controlled, each of which were only selected five per cent of the time.

Posner goes on to say in his research that the values and traits that he found have endured not only over two decades that his research was conducted, but during that time we saw expanding globalisation, the internet becoming increasingly more prolific and important, the advent of international terrorism, and rapidly changing political dynamics. Through all this these four characteristics have remained constant (Posner, 2006). He says that the four values identified are not only significant in themselves, but according to international communications experts, these four also make up a phenomenon called “source credibility” (p.32).

Posner says that research has shown that when believability of sources of communication was measured, it has been found that people are assessed on three criteria, these being, “perceived trustworthiness, their expertise, and their dynamism” (p.32), and when people were rated more highly on these three characteristics then they were considered to be a more reliable source when it came to information and believability. Posner goes on to say that these three values are strikingly similar to three out of the top four in his research; honesty, competency and inspiring, and he says that above all in his investigation that people wanted credible leaders in the list

of admired leadership qualities. He deduced that “credibility is the foundation of leadership” (p.32).

Posner says that the overriding aspect in our faith in our leaders is that we must believe in them. When they say something we must believe what they say, and we must be able to believe that when they say that they will do something, that they will do it, and also that they are excited in and believe in the future that they talk about. This finding by Posner has been so persuasive and consistent that it has come to be known as the first law of leadership (Posner, 2006). Basically says Posner, “if you don’t believe the messenger, you won’t believe the message” (p.33).

The argument that appears to emerge when looking at leadership values, characteristics and qualities is around the discussion over which of these are traits, and which are characteristics or values. As early as 1841 Thomas Carlyle was researching trait theory trying to identify the physical characteristics of those in his day who rose to power, along with their talents and skills (Carlyle, 1841). Trait theory approaches tend to look at great men in society and try to link significant events across history with the advent of these men, and proponents of trait theory usually list characteristics of certain successful leaders of the past and make the assumption that these same characteristics in anyone will be more likely to develop them into leaders (Heifetz, 1994).

The psychological viewpoint on trait theory has been around what is known as the Big Five Theory, which says that there are five broad factors of personality and this is also referred to as the Five Factor Model (Bass, 1989). Bass says that the Five Factors

Model which was first mentioned in literature in 1933, encompasses the traits of openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism. These traits were in turn broken down into characteristics such as self discipline, planned achievement versus spontaneous behaviour, energy, and compassion, along with anger, anxiety and depression, spanning the five characteristics listed. When utilised in psychometric testing on an individual basis they were displayed as percentile scores in each of these broken down characteristics. If, for example, a person scored in the eighty percentile for conscientiousness, then this would mean that this individual had a strong sense of responsibility and was a very ordered person. Conversely if a rating in the fifth percentile was scored for extraversion, then this supposedly would mean that the subject had a strong need for quiet and solitude (Bass, 1989).

There has been as much criticism over the years of the Big Five Theory as there has been support. Bolman and Deal (1991) say that leaders are not born, rather, they are made, and that anyone who has the desire and willpower can become an effective leader. They say that leadership isn't an instant dynamic but that it takes years of experience imbedded in a framework of education, training and never ending self learning which takes time, effort and sheer determination. Bass (1989) says that there are in fact three ways for people to become leaders. Firstly, that the individual characteristics that make up our personality could naturally mean that people will become leaders, this being the trait theory of leadership. Secondly says Bass, under the Great Events Theory, a major crisis could bring out leadership qualities in the average person that makes them rise to the occasion and take on the mantle of leadership. Bass goes on to explain that the third way that people rise to become leaders is called the *Transformational Leadership Theory*. This comes about when

someone *chooses* to become a leader and then *learns* the skills required for them to succeed in this role. This is the most widely accepted theory of leadership in the study of the subject today (Bass, 1989).

Blake and Mouton (1985) criticise trait theory generally because they say it's too limiting as a description of human personality. They say that the theory is not *theory driven* enough, and relies too heavily on data driven investigation. They go on to explain that they think that certain descriptors tend to cluster together when factor analysis is carried out. Furthermore according to Blake and Mouton, when dealing with the aspects of human personality, they say it does not take into consideration aspects such as religion or faith, gender bias in terms of masculinity and femininity, honesty, which appears thus far to be a singular overriding factor in leader ability, effectiveness, the impact of having a sense of humour, how manipulating or Machiavellian a person may be, as well as thriftiness, conservativeness, and how motivated the individual is (Blake & Mouton, 1985).

The military however, especially the United States military, appear to adhere to the trait model of leadership, and in the selection of people for training as commissioned officers in the Military Academy at West point, they select only those who have shown the highest potential to lead, based on not only a motivation to learn, and those who are achievement driven, but such personality traits as a strong internal locus of control, a self monitoring person, and someone who is open to experience (United States Army Handbook, 1973). Interestingly the same principles appear to emerge even in this trait driven selection process. The army handbook talks about being professional, and breaks this down to loyalty, selflessness, personal responsibility and

integrity, which are very similar to the honesty value which appears to be integral to the essential characteristics of good leadership from previous literature looked at here. They go on to say that their leaders must be able to provide direction and set a good example, motivating and mentoring which equates to the characteristic of inspiring leadership talked about by Posner (2006). The handbook also says that military leaders should know their job and be proficient at it, and know the organisation intimately as well as being able to coach others in what they know. This is possibly in line with the competency dynamic that Posner talks about. One of the most important aspects of military leadership that is stressed again and again in the West Point publication is the ability to plan, and this completes the quartet of values that Posner talks about in his research (United States Army handbook, 1973).

There appears to be many arguments on just what is a trait and what is a value, as well as what is simply a characteristic. The purpose of this thesis is not to debate that subject, but simply to look at the many possible dynamics of what constitutes leadership, and which ones of these traits, styles and values, if any, transfer readily between environments in the opinions of those who lead. Regardless of what these characteristics are called, collectively they form the basis of what is known as the leadership style (Newstrom & Davis, 1993). Newstrom and Davis say that leadership style is the “manner and approach of providing direction, implementing plans, and motivating people” (p.63) they go on to say that there are three basic leadership styles. These three styles are, authoritarian or autocratic, participative or democratic, and delegative or free reign (p.147). While poor leaders tend to adhere to just one style, leaders who are more successful use a mixture of all three styles, with one style usually appearing as more dominant (Newstrom & Davis, 1993).

Styles

At this point it is well to point out that there are in fact *many* leadership styles listed in probably just as *many* publications, and these include; charismatic, situational, transformational, servant, task oriented, participative, transactional bureaucratic, laissez-faire, coercive, command, and vision, to name some of them according to Gardner (2007). To investigate all of these and many others not yet mentioned would be beyond the scope of this thesis and serve little purpose. Rather this literature review and research will concentrate on the more recent findings around which style relates to leader effectiveness.

Hofstede (1977) goes on to say that the authoritarian approach is mainly the approach when those in authority want something done, exactly how *they* want it done and they are not interested in getting any suggestions or advice from those that *they* expect to *do it*. This method however, only works when there is little time, the leader has all the facts required to carry out the task, but most importantly, all of those who are expected to follow these instructions are well motivated, such as certain military situations, for example, combat situations. The participative style according to Hofstede is where the employees or followers are involved either individually or as a representative group in the process of making the intermediate decisions, with the leader making the final call on how things will be carried out. This style usually gains the respect of all those involved in the process of the leader who implements this approach. This style is mutually beneficial and is used when all parties have part of the knowledge individually to make the task come to fruition. This style makes it all

the more important to hire the correct mix of followers that are knowledgeable and skilful (Hofstede (1977)).

The third style outlined by Newstrom and Davis (1993) is the delegative or free reign approach. In this method the leader remains ultimately responsible for the outcome and all decisions that are made, however the followers are permitted to actually make those decisions. This should only be utilised when the employees are capable of analysing the overall situation, and competently, accurately, and confidently able to determine what needs to be done. This should be used when the leader has absolute trust and confidence in those that follow and should be used wisely and with caution (Newstrom & Davis, 1993).

Hofstede (1997) supports Newstrom & Davis (1993) when he suggests that the best of leaders use a combination of all three of these styles, and the selection or combination of any of these is based on the dynamics of the situation or the context of when and how the leader is leading. These dynamics include; the dependence on how much time is available to complete the task, what the leader / follower relationship is based on, including respect / disrespect, or on trust; who in the relationship has the knowledge required to complete the task, the training level of those involved and to what extent the leader is aware of the task, any conflicts between all the players involved, what the levels of stress are between the leader, followers and both combined, whether or not the task is a structured task, and unstructured task, and whether it is complicated or simple, and finally, but not conclusively, what legal restrictions or established protocols must be observed such as health and safety regulations (Hofstede, 1997).

Johnson (2004) says that until the nineteen forties, researchers believed that it was only those people who had specific “mental and physical characteristics or traits” (p.157) that had any chance of being an effective leader. This even extended to whether or not they were good looking. The overriding issue with this approach was that researchers had the problem of deciding, or isolating, the exact traits that applied to the ideal leader, and this idea of traits based leadership was all but abandoned. There are however still those who subscribe to this theory in all or in part.

Johnson goes on to say that those who studied the phenomenon next, suggested that leaders had to change to the dynamics of the situation in which they found themselves. Thus the type of task, the complete characteristics of the followers, along with how well the relationship was between all those involved became of paramount importance over the individual traits and values of the leader in their investigations. These theories became to be known as situational or contingent theories because, as the name implies, they were dependant on the situation or contingencies of the environment in which the leader found themselves (Johnson, 2004). While these theories are still immensely popular there are issues that make them subject to criticism.

Johnson says that there are two important reasons that the situational and / or contingency theories are lacking in substance. Firstly the decision around exactly which style to use is difficult because there are too many factors to be taken into consideration. Secondly the contingency theory gives “too much weight to contextual factors” (p. 158) and Johnson explains that there are many strategies that are

important in many environments that contravene the importance of the elements of the situation (Johnson, 2004). Huber (2006) expands this idea into the dynamics associated with the transactional and transformational leader, an area which is of considerable interest to this work.

Dianne Huber says that following all the research on the trait, attitude and situational leadership period of the last century, investigators centred on the area of just how “leaders produced quantum results” (p.19). This was narrowed down (or categorised) into two main types of leadership styles (Huber, 2006). Huber says that these two styles were essentially those of the transactional and the transformational leader. Before these styles are looked at in depth however, it is of interest to explore the idea of functional leadership theory.

Functional leadership according to Day, Zaccarro and Halpin (2004) can be described as a set of behaviours that help the group achieve their goal. This model does not look at the person as the centre of leadership, but rather this collective set of behaviours. They claim that the primary responsibility of the leader is to cater to the needs of the group, and when the group is successful due to its effectiveness and cohesion brought about by the leader catering to their individual and collective functioning requirements, then the leader has done their job.

Day, et al. say that functional leadership has been generally applied to team leadership but has worked just as well when a broader approach has been used in higher

organisational levels as well. Functions that have been observed by researchers investigating the functional leadership dynamic have been; the motivating of those involved, mentoring and instruction of subordinates, observing what is happening in the overall environment, organising the tasks of those in the team, and then intervening in an active and appropriate way when necessary (Day, et al., 2004).

There are many different behaviours required to make these things happen however, and Day, et al. say that followers have shown through research that they broadly place their leader's behaviour into two groups which they call consideration, and initiating structure. Developing, encouraging and supporting effective relationships is one way that an effective leader could implement the consideration category according to those subordinates involved in the research, and could be put in place by simply showing concern or displaying a supportive approach toward others. When it comes to initiating structure, the leader is focussing on the specifics of the task at hand and the successful accomplishment of this. Behaviours here would include setting the standards to which the team must reach in the carrying out of the task, making sure that all involved know their specific role and where they fit in the team and the task, and then ensuring that those assigned specific responsibilities are held accountable for their achievement to the standard required (Day, et al., 2004).

These functions and behaviours become a basis for looking at the transactional and transformational leadership styles mentioned earlier. Many people have given a definition of these styles, and Burns (1978) is typical when he says that the transactional leader is the one which has been given all the power and responsibility

to lead the team or organisation to accomplish the task. This leader has the power to reward or punish within the team depending on how well the task is completed. The overall relationship with transactional leadership is one of exchange, whereby the follower accomplishes the task in exchange for something else, in modern terms, usually a wage or similar remuneration.

Transformational leadership according to Burns is one of much more interaction and person orientated. Burns says that this style actually requires the leader to motivate the team to encourage efficiency and effectiveness and is based on open and honest communication. Transformational leadership utilises goal achievement and focuses the team on the end state of the task or the eventual desired result. The transformational leader is a very high profile leader who uses organisational structure to achieve the tasks they are given. This leader surrounds themselves with people who are capable of making the little things happen while they attend the bigger picture, while always on the lookout for ideas and innovation that will achieve the overall organisational vision (Burns, 1978).

Following on from this natural change in the emphasis on leadership styles from transactional and transformational, with the changing dynamics of education, social development and the computer age, there came a heavier emphasis on the transformational leader, according to McLaurin and Al Amri (2008). McLaurin and Al Amri say that over time the trait, behaviour and situational theories have all combined to lean more to the change oriented style of leadership, and this in turn comprises of two essential styles in itself. These are charismatic and transformational,

and while they are very much alike in many ways there are also a great many differences. This is very much in line with their idea that leadership is a “dynamic relationship which is based on mutual influence between leaders and followers” P.15). They go on to say that this relationship will eventually evolve into a “higher level of motivation and technical development as it promotes changes” (p.15).

Charismatic leaders are those who have “high self-confidence, a clear vision, engage in unconventional behaviour, and act as a change agent” (p.15) according to McLaurin and Al Amri (2008), but that this type of leader is very aware of the reality concerning the context in which they operate and the restrictions that this environment will impose on their ability to achieve their leadership goals and their overall vision. They go on to say that the main behaviours with charismatic leadership styles include being a role model for those they lead, creating, building and maintaining a clear image for their followers, clearly articulating the team or organisational goals, stimulating the motives of those they lead, and by showing that they themselves have confidence in what they say and believe in.

Transformational leaders try to get their followers to see what they are doing from different perspectives, they endeavour to build up those they lead to realize and achieve their own potential and work to the best of their ability, and make them fully aware of what the organisation as a whole is trying to achieve long term by motivating both peer groups and those they lead to see beyond what is important to them individually as less important than what will be good for the group as a whole McLaurin and Al Amri (2008). Some of the key behaviours of this type of leader can

be “empowerment, role modelling, creating a vision, acting as change agents, and making the norms and values clear to all” (p. 15).

Bass and Avolio (1994) say that while transformational and charismatic leadership is very different from transactional leadership, the good leader will have a little bit of all these styles in their repertoire of styles to achieve the best results. They say that just how much a leader uses the main characteristics of each style depends on what type of leader they are known as. If a person uses a predominantly transformational style they will be known as a transformational leader, interestingly however, if a leader is predominantly a transactional one, they may still use a transformational style in some contexts where appropriate.

McLaurin and Al Amri (2008) explain that while there are many similarities between the concepts of transactional and transformational, such as “vision, ideals, values and charisma” (p.15), some of the major differences include; just how much the context and situation will impact on the style used, the charismatic element being de-emphasised in transformational leadership, as in this style charisma is seen as one of many attributes in the leader and not the only one, and also the probable negative effects stemming from the highly likely self-centeredness of the charismatic leaders style.

Transferability / durability

Regardless of which single style or combination of these styles is used, it has been obvious from the research thus far that just how effective a leader is in one situation

versus another, is the context in which they are operating, and this is supported by Antonakis, Cianciolo and Sternberg (2004) when they say that their and other research shows quite clearly that “leadership is a relation that exists between persons in a social situation, and that persons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in other situations (p.150). They go on to say that it is the *situation* and not so much the *style* of leadership used that is a very important factor in just how effective the leader is.

Antonakis et al. say that research has shown that out of the broad leadership styles of autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire, it has been found that the democratic style, which is most aligned with the transformational leadership approach, had the most “durable effect” (p.150). Not surprisingly, the autocratic leader had a productive result with their team but only when the leader was present in the situation. When this style of leader left their team to carry on in their absence however, the task achievement rate quickly fell away and the style became ineffective.

Pounder (1998) has also said as part of her categorisation of leadership into six major themes, that it was “dependant on the situation” (p.136) and that of all the themes it was “traits, behaviours and their response to different situations” (p.136) that characterise leadership with leaders. Pounder says that while equating leadership with leaders has been “criticised for its narrowness” (p.136) that it “retains it’s potentness in our common language about leadership” (p.136).

“Behaviour is a function of person and situation” (p.6) according to Fairholm and Fairholm (2008) and they say that the behaviour of a leader is contingent on the traits and values, or characteristics of the person involved, in tandem with the individual circumstances of the environment and / or situation. They say that the “potential for transferability and persistence of leadership” (p.7) depends on the variables of no less than twenty nine traits, ranging from chronological age to popularity and prestige, and that all of these “differ with the situation” (p.7).

Scarnati (1999) says that the cockroach can teach us a lot about flexibility in leadership, and that the cockroach has been around for millions of years because it can quickly change and adapt to its environment no matter what the context contains. Scarnati says that the United States Army with all its practical experience, doesn't have any simple formula when it comes to leadership success across all contexts, except to be constantly flexible and have all possible information to hand before committing to any single course of action.

Ken Blanchard has a different view of this durability of leadership between contexts when he says that the best leaders realise that one style is never any better than another, and they adapt the style depending on the needs of each individual situation (Blanchard, 1991). Blanchard says that in situational leadership he has identified four styles which are based around the idea of the mix of transactional and transformational leadership styles, however he terms these directive and supportive, and the leader is free to choose between each depending on the context and the dynamics of the individual situation. Rather than detailing the characteristics of each

style, the description of directive relates to transactional leadership, and supportive reads as the earlier description of transformational leadership.

Blanchard goes on to say that the effective leader chooses between various combinations of the two styles. These mixes are: “high directive / low supportive, high directive / high supportive, high supportive / low directive, and low supportive / low directive” (p.23) and the successful situational leader knows the right time, place and context to use each combination (Blanchard, 1991).

Despite evidence that leadership styles can transfer effectively given the correct mix of traits, values and context (Fairholm & Fairholm, 2008), along with the flexibility that the United States Army subscribes to (Scarnati, 1999), there appears to be no shortage of evidence subscribing to the contrary, and Gabarro (1987) states that research shows that an “executives skills across industries suggests that transferability is limited (p.162). Gabarro goes on to say that the research found that it was inefficient for outsiders of an organisation to gain “organisational and institutional skills” (p.162) and took too much time before they became effective. To support this, Kao, Sinha and Wilpert (1999) who investigated the concept of effective leadership in Thailand, say that research and experience shows that managers and leaders can never assume that they can effectively transfer their leadership practices across different contexts. They say that “It is in the leadership process that the effects of culture become most apparent” (p.269).

Zenger and Folkman (2002) say that there are many examples of successful leaders who do well in one organisation and fail miserably when they move into another business, and they use this evidence to say that they have “compelling evidence that leaders must fit the organisation” (p.20) and that styles do not transfer readily across scenarios. They do go on to say that “leadership always occurs in a context” (p.20) however. They also say that at lower levels organisational fit is not as important as it is at more senior levels.

In support of transferability, Gordon (2000) says that while the “knowledge of the facts relating to transferability of leadership is very meagre and obscure” (p.5), evidence does appear to show that those students who showed leadership ability in different situations when younger, had this ability persist into later life and transferred into college situations as well as their employment and even community contexts. The main weight of evidence for transferability appears to support Fairholm and Fairholm (2008) in their suggestion that it is a combination of the situation and the traits and behaviours of the individual leader that determines the success or otherwise of the leader in differing contexts. Combining this evidence with what Chaleff (2002) and others say about the importance of followership in the leadership equation, and how it is what followers find important in their leaders that matters most across contexts, it would appear that there is some strong evidence that leadership does transfer between environments, but generally only when certain values are part of the leaders characteristics. These values as we looked at earlier from the longitudinal study outlined by Posner (2006) were: honesty, forward looking, competent, and inspiring.

Research question

From what the literature review has revealed, there appears to be many variables in the research on leadership and what impacts on the success or otherwise of leaders across time and around the world, as well as in chronological age, era of personal development, and gender. There appears to be considerable evidence suggesting that followers have the greatest impact on the success of their leaders, and they appear to be the key to whether or not a leader is followed.

They have certain expectations of their leaders and it is suggested that they will only follow when they choose to do so and for leaders who lead with a specific style or range of styles, and only when these are based on traits, values or characteristics that are conducive with the followers expectations and needs. This thesis will endeavour to shed light on the dynamics of these issues.

The question that this research focuses on is, based on self reports, does the average leader have the possibility of being able to transfer their leadership style between contexts, and how important are their particular sets of values and traits, in this transfer? The research will also look at the demographics associated with these leaders, in terms of age and generational era, education, and gender.

CHAPTER THREE
MTHODOLOGY – AIM, APPROACH
AND METHODS

This chapter details the aim of my research and the methodology that I employed to gather and analyse the data. I shall explain my criteria for selection of the participants in my research and offer a selection of profile of the individuals. The research approach I have employed is the Case Study, and I shall explain that choice in this chapter. I shall also go into detail on the overall process I have used when analysing the results of my data collection and the method of how I went about obtaining the information.

Research aim and purpose

The aim of the research was to gain insight into how much a leadership style based on the individual leader's traits and values could be transferred from one context to another with the same level of success. I have also included in my data gathering process some additional demographics on gender, age, and education level. The purpose behind selecting this topic for my research is that for many years as a Territorial soldier / officer, I heard repeatedly that while the military style of leadership worked *for* the military, *in* a military situation, it was useless in a civilian context. As the analysis and conclusion chapters will suggest however, this is not entirely true, and the transferability is based more on the contextual situation and the individuality of the leader. In order to conduct the research with as little bias as possible, I had to acknowledge my own experience of leadership which comes from thirty three years in the Territorial Force Army as an infantryman, including active service, twenty years served in the public service, in employment, education and

training, and more than fourteen years in private sector employment, the military service completed concurrently. I have seen a vast array of leadership styles during that time and have been able to put them in a context of what good leadership perhaps *should* be. The army prides itself on the selection and development of its leaders, and because of this, leadership styles and individual values and traits are under constant observation and guidance. The study of leadership, and the teaching of leadership, is a continual process for all those in the military.

Research approach

Marshall and Rossman (1980) say that the setting in which human behaviour occurs, has a significant influence on that behaviour, and because of this dynamic we should study that behaviour *in* the environment in which it occurs. They go on to say that in the past, many researchers have not been able to find the true meaning of what they were investigating in experimental research because contextual variables such as space and rewards, along with internalised notions of norms, traditions, and values have not been able to be replicated in the laboratory environment.

Merriam (1988) makes some assumptions of qualitative research and says that these include the fact that the qualitative researcher is interested mainly in the process of what they are investigating, more-so than the outcome. Merriam also says that these researchers want to know the meaning of how people make sense of their environment, and how they live their lives and how they experience their activities and personal worldly structure. Creswell (1994) adds to these assumptions and says that qualitative research is largely based on fieldwork where the researcher physically

observes the participant in their natural setting and records their findings in that environment.

The fact that the researcher is the *primary* instrument for all the data collection, and that all other instruments such as questionnaires or electronic /mechanical recording devices are channelled *through* the researcher is another assumption made by Creswell. Creswell also says that this process is inductive and the investigator interprets all the details in their findings into theories, concepts and hypotheses. Both Merriam (1988) and Creswell (1994) state that the qualitative research method is descriptive, and that those using this method are interested in the process and meaning *behind* the data and observations and try to gain an understanding from the words and or pictures collected.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) say that the quantitative or 'objective' researcher can unintentionally destroy valuable data when they code and standardise their findings, as well as inadvertently imposing the researcher's world on the participants. They say that without involving the framework, within which participants interpret, the way they think, how they feel, and the way they act, quantitative researchers cannot begin to understand the human behaviour elements in what they are investigating. Glene and Peshkin go on to say that other assumptions about qualitative research are that they believe that reality is a social construct and the variables involved are extremely difficult to measure because they are complex and interwoven.

They say that the purpose behind qualitative research is to put the research findings in a context, interpret them and try to understand the results from the perspective of the

participant (Glesne Peshkin, 1992). I have chosen to conduct my research using a qualitative approach because of these facts. I wanted to understand how leaders think about the situations in which they find themselves and see if they themselves feel that their individual style is applicable in more than once context. I also want to get an idea of the background of the participant and see if there is a connection between the demographics of gender, age and education level, and the traits and values stated. I believe that the qualitative approach allows me to do this.

Participants

In deciding on the criteria for which I would select the participants for my research, I was primarily interested in those who were currently, or had previously been, in more than one leadership role. I initially sought interest from my colleagues in the Territorial Army as, particularly in the Senior Non-Commissioned officer, Warrant Officer and Commissioned Officer groups, most of these people had some leadership role outside the army as well as through their service. I made application to the military to gain permission to conduct the research but was told that I would not be able to. This precluded me working officially with any personnel who would be interviewed *primarily* in their military role.

I then looked at those people I knew who had a leadership outside of the military and conducted the research from that perspective. Along with my army colleagues I was interested in obtaining a wider perspective of the community and set my criteria as anyone who was in a leadership role as perceived by themselves. This meant that not only could managers, owners, and those in paid supervisory roles participate, but also those who were involved in the community in: volunteer roles, sports team leaders,

parental roles, and basically anyone who believed that they had some form of leadership role regardless of the position, organisation, and context. I initially chose participants whom I knew, however, as people became aware of my research I also had others referred to me as possible participants. To ensure that I would have sufficient numbers for my research I initially sought permission from thirty participants and eventually concluded with twenty three from which I obtained my final data. Of note is the fact that this research was originally commenced in New Zealand, but was finally completed in Western Australia due to my immigration to Perth.

Participant profiles

The twenty three participants generally fit into broad categories of, military, both Territorial and Regular Force service people, those in leadership roles within private enterprise, those in leadership roles within the public service, and those from leadership roles within the community and or family.

Those in the military are in four areas of service. Firstly, two currently serving officers, one in the army at a senior level, with the rank of Major, aged in his forties, and one in the Navy at a junior level holding the rank of Ensign, aged in his early twenties. The Army Major has had long service including operational experience, is married with a young son, and had experience as a Non-Commissioned Officer prior to being commissioned. He has twice been recognised for his leadership ability with awards at a national level as well as one award in the commonwealth decorations system. His service life spans twenty two years including seven years with the Territorial Army and the last fifteen in the Regular Forces. The Naval Ensign is

unmarried and is still undergoing his officer training and has had limited experience thus far, although the majority of his exposure to military life at present is emerged in leadership training. Both officers have education to diploma level.

The second area of service is one military participant who is a retired senior United States Marine Corps officer and held the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. He is fifty six years of age, married with three children, and has education at bachelor degree level. He served for more than twenty five years in the Marine Corps as a regular force officer. He then served a further seven years as a civilian military advisor and is currently serving in Afghanistan as a mentor to the military leadership currently on operations. He has seen prior active service in the Middle East on the Golan Heights in The Syrian Arab Republic, and in the Sinai Peninsula in Egypt, where he held staff officer and United Nations Military Observer appointments. His entire leadership training has been within the United States Marine Corps.

The third category of military service consist of two retired servicemen, one a Captain from the Territorial Force, aged in his early sixties, and one Warrant Officer Class One from the Regular Force, aged in his late forties. The retired Captain is currently a primary school teacher and has a bachelor degree level education. He is married with an adult family, and has had leadership roles in the past including, bank management, Chairmanship of committee's, rugby team coach, and is presently in a chair position and museum curator position in addition to continuing as a primary school teacher. He served in the part time army for a period of ten years.

The ex regular Force warrant officer served a total of twenty five years, as firstly a Territorial Force soldier and then subsequently for twenty years in the Regular Force. He is married with one adult son. He is currently a manager in the public service and has education to diploma level and is still studying. He has deployed on operational service several times.

The fourth and final category of military service is one of solely Territorial service and involves three participants. Firstly a Warrant Officer Class Two aged twenty nine, married with no children and employed in the public service in civilian life. He has education at secondary school level as well as his army courses. He has served part time in the military for eleven years. Secondly an officer with the rank of Major who is in his mid forties, married with two children, has secondary school education in addition to his army courses, and runs his own paint, hardware store business. He has served in the Territorial Force for a period of twenty five years and also in the scouting movement since he was a teenager. He has been a leader in Venturers, Rovers and sporting activities, as well as being a drum major in the local brass band. He has extensive and varied leadership roles from a young age. His military service includes leadership service with the Texas National Guard while visiting the United States of America.

The third and final military participant is a Major in the Territorial Force aged in his early sixties with education to diploma level. He has served in the Territorial Force for twenty seven years and has seen operational service. He has been actively involved in leadership roles from the age of thirteen, with school cadets, Venturer

scouting, in civilian life as a leading tradesman, as well as progressing to union leadership at high levels, and a company director. He is married with a family.

The next category of participant is that of community and family participant. The first person is a married mother with one child who is an former university lecturer with a bachelor degree education, aged in her early thirties. She has also worked in various positions previously that required her to supervise or co-ordinate other people. She has had education in training methods. The second participant is a single mother of five aged in her mid fifties. She has education at bachelor degree level. She has been a mother for thirty five years and is still raising the youngest members of her family. She has had various tutor and training roles through university, been involved in several charities in a leadership role, and recently been involved in being a candidate for a national election as well as being local party chairperson. She has never had any formal leadership training. The final community / family participant is a single mother of an adolescent son and is aged in her early forties with diploma level education and currently still studying. She has had leadership roles in the public service, as a mother, and in private enterprise. She also has a prominent leadership role in her cultural setting. This participant has not had any formal leadership training.

The third category of those involved in my research is that of the public sector leadership participant group. Firstly, is a thirty nine year old mother of 2 children and has a partner, she has education to national certificate level, and is employed in an educational environment involving the hospitality industry. She is also the team manager for a local soccer team in the community. She has never had any formal leadership training. She considers her parenting position as her primary leadership

role. The second participant is a single mother of two adult children who has a doctoral degree in education and is aged in her late forties. Her education also includes two national certificates, one in front line management and one in adult teaching, two bachelor degrees, and a master's degree in professional education and training. She considers her leadership experience to be, thirty two years as a parent, much of this in a single parenting role, fifteen years in professional leadership roles, four years of tutoring and lecturing at university, and two years as a board member. She says that apart from her formal qualifications all her leadership training has been on the job learning.

The third participant in this category is a campus manager of a community based post compulsory education institution, in her early fifties, married, with adult children. She has had over thirty years in management and training of staff at all levels. She has had extensive training in management, training and leadership. The final participant in this category is a leader with many varied roles both presently and previously. She is a solo mother with two adult children and is aged in her early forties with a master's degree. She has held leadership and training roles in the public service, as well as community and cultural groups. She has also had extensive leadership experience with sports teams. This participant has had substantial training from an early age with youth groups and community sponsored youth leadership programmes for which she was identified early as a potential leader, as well as formal leadership courses for her employment over the years both in and out of the public service.

The final category of participants is that of leadership in private enterprise and has eight contributors. The first participant is in her mid thirties and is married with no

children. Her education is a diploma course which she is currently studying towards. She has had no formal leadership training but has had fourteen years in various management / leadership roles, including, clothing retail stores, the public service, and seven years spanning two organisations as a senior employment consultant. The second person is a self employed businessman who runs a debt collection agency employing several staff. He has had no formal education beyond secondary school. He has served in the military during the Rhodesian war as a conscript and learnt leadership from his peers and military leaders. He states that apart from this he has had no formal training in the subject and has learnt by himself, and his philosophy on leadership is simple: to lead “by example”.

Of interest with this participant is that his forebears include his father who was a military officer during World War two and won the Military cross, and his grandfather in World War One who won the Victoria Cross, the penultimate and ultimate decorations for bravery and leadership. He also has several other significant leaders in his family ancestry. This person is also one of the leader’s figures in an organisation who assists his former countrymen to immigrate and assimilate in their adopted country, organises legal support, assists with housing and education for their families, organises community activities, and maintains their historical and cultural institutions on their behalf. He is married with adult children and is in his early fifties.

The third participant in this category is a manager in mid early forties who is married with one young daughter and has education to secondary school level. He has no formal leadership training and has had six years experience supervising teams of up to eight people in the public service as well as managing a team of commercial cleaners

in an accommodation service environment. The fourth person has had no formal leadership training at all and his experience in the field relates to being a father and running groups in a professional setting for therapeutic interventions for drug and alcohol addiction. He is married with a five year old daughter and has a bachelor degree while being close to completing his masters. He is aged in his early to mid thirties.

The next participant is a twenty seven year old married father with one young son. He has education to national certificate level, and his leadership training has consisted to date of workplace leadership training, and safety for supervisors and managers. He is currently a manager in a large bulk storage operation. He has had extensive experience in leadership in industry, including team leader positions, operations supervisor and team shifts supervisor. He has also had sporting leadership experience. He attends regular training in his current position which includes substantial leadership and general management content.

A widow with no children in her mid fifties is the next participant in my study. She has education to course level following compulsory schooling. She has no formal leadership training and has self taught herself how to manage her own business. She has had various leadership roles at a junior level throughout her working life. She has also been involved at a lower level in athletics mentoring and committee membership. The second to last participant is a fifty year old senior manager with post graduate qualifications but not yet to doctoral level. He has been in management and leadership roles for twenty three years and is married with a young family. This participant is currently in an operations management role and has been in his current appointment

for four years, but has had experience at board level as well as leadership roles in the community. He is currently involved with leadership training in his organisation in a programme that has been running for nearly two years. His post graduate qualifications are in social work and social administration.

The final participant is this category and overall is a thirty three year old married father of an infant daughter. He has education to a bachelor degree level and has had much formal training in leadership from the age of eighteen when he enlisted into the Territorial Force of the New Zealand Army. While he was only in the service for a period of four years he states that this was the beginning and solid base of his future leadership development. He was a fully trained commissioned officer in the infantry. He is currently a business manager responsible for multiple sites of an international manufacturing company. He has held various team leader positions, departmental manager, and operational manager before gaining his present position. In these previous roles, he has led between half a dozen employees and up to one hundred staff as an operational manager. Apart from his formal leadership training with the army, he has had six months of part time education in training and development in leadership and management, which was sponsored by his civilian employer.

All those that were involved in the study agreed to have their full details described here, but without their names being mentioned in the text. All but one participant agreed to have their name acknowledged in the formal recognition at the beginning of this thesis. No racial or cultural demographics were collected or used in the research, although participants were a mixture of New Zealand and Australian nationalities, as well as an American citizen. Twelve respondents out of the twenty three said that they

would like a copy either paper or electronic of the final thesis, which I will send to them once it has been formally marked and returned.

Materials

The predominant resource material used in the data gathering process for this research was the questionnaire (see appendix three). The questionnaire was constructed initially from a wide range of questions on leadership and demographics that generally had *may* impact on this phenomenon. This initial format was amended following the initial literature review and narrowed down to specific questions that related to the research question, but remained broad enough to encompass enough evidence to enable me to get an idea of the background and context that my participants came from and existed in.

The questionnaire was designed with questions that enabled me to gauge the preferred leadership style or style of the participants, as well as determining their use of traits and values related to this style in more than one situation. The responses to these questions informed me if the participants would use between one and four of the preferred characteristics that followers would be more likely to follow in any given situation. This had to be in their top four of values and or traits selected to count towards the transferability question. The questionnaire and individual items were written specifically for this research and were not taken from any previous design.

When the questionnaire was used as an interview schedule, it was an unstructured interview and the purpose was predominantly to utilise open ended questions. This was still the intended purpose when the questionnaire was used in isolation by the

participant. This was explained to all participants prior to completing the questionnaire. In addition to this, all participants who did not wish to complete the questions in an interview situation were given access to telephone and email contact details, in the event that they had questions or required further explanation of any part of the questionnaire.

Data collection procedures

The data was collected under four separate conditions. Prior to this collection, all participants were emailed the research information sheet (see appendix one) along with the permission slips (see appendix two) which consisted of the participant copy and a copy for myself as the researcher. Following the receipt of the permission slips, a total of seventeen questionnaires (see appendix three) were sent to participants by email, seven of these were within Australia, however these participants were at a distance that precluded the questionnaire from being hand delivered or a formal interview being conducted, with two of these respondents residing in other states; nine were emailed to New Zealand, and one to Afghanistan.

A total of three questionnaires were hand delivered to participants who preferred to complete the questionnaire in their own time and without having to undergo an interview situation. These were returned in hand written form, typed up by myself and their accuracy confirmed by the participant. Two participants preferred to be interviewed in a face to face situation and these forms were completed by myself, typed up, and once again had their accuracy confirmed by the respondent. The time, place and environment were suggested by the participant and in both cases they were interviewed in their place of residence. The final respondent lived in New Zealand

and agreed to a telephone interview. The time was agreed to and the questionnaire was successfully conducted by telephone. Once again, the responses were typed by myself and then emailed to the participant to confirm the accuracy of the completed document. In all cases where the completed forms were required to be confirmed by the respondent for accuracy, they were found to be not requiring amendment and the participant confirmed that it was a fair and accurate record of the interview with their intent being conveyed as they desired.

The questionnaire was constructed involving questions which could have been open to too much interpretation, and the following procedures were implemented to lessen the impact of this. The questions involving age, education, preferred leadership style, and the traits and values that the individual claims to adopt were all open to a wide interpretation. In the case of determining the age of the participant, I was primarily interested in this from a generational perspective, and during the initial enquiry explained generations in terms of, early baby boomers and late baby boomers, early and late X generation, and the Y generation.

Taspcott (2008) places approximate estimates on birth years for these generational cohorts. Baby boomers were those born during World War Two up until the around nineteen sixty, the X generation came along from the end of the Boomer's until the late nineteen seventies, and the Y generation was from the end of this period until around the mid nineteen nineties. From this I split the generations into early and late by simply dividing the numbers in half and then I asked the respondents if they would place themselves within these years. Without exception all respondents told me their exact age in years. My reasoning for this split was to follow the example of Sessa,

Kabacoff, Deal and Brown (2007) in their generational research on managers, and this was shown to be a reasonable breakdown of age when dealing with attitudes, values and behaviours.

In terms of education levels I adopted the principles of the national Qualifications Framework, adapting it to fit Australian institutions and education levels to accommodate my participants from Australia (Wolf, 1995). I was interested to know those who had not undertaken any formal education beyond their compulsory years. I then grouped all polytechnic, or the Australian TAFE level course, along with diploma qualifications, into one category termed 'tertiary', but not degree level education. I then looked at those with bachelor degrees, then honours or masters qualifications separately, and finally doctoral degrees and above. This education level was linked to questions in the data collection in terms of the importance of training and educational qualifications in the development and perceived success of leadership.

The preferred leadership styles were taken from various literature sources such as Newstrom and Davis (1993) and Gardner (2007), and these listed and described a comprehensive list of leadership styles. From this I was interested in getting the participants self perceived style that they considered that they used in various situations. There is an inherent bias in self perception according to Robins and John (1997) and they question whether or not this bias is used as a means of self promotion. They go on to comment on whether or not there is any credibility in the debate that psychologically healthy individuals are more accurate in the perceptions of themselves. They claim that their research findings support this premise; however

they say that the other side of the debate is that it is more adaptive for people to have overly positive and self enhancing illusions.

Paulhus and John (1998) went on to find that within self enhancement bias there was a distinct self-enhancing tendency called the “egoistic bias” (p.1025) which eventually means that there is a tendency to exaggerate social status and intellectual ability. The second tendency that they found a “moralistic bias” (p.1025) was a self deceptive tendency where there was an inclination to deny “socially deviant impulses” (p.1032) and this resulted in “saint like attributes” (p.1032). In my research I acknowledge these biases and am interested in seeing whether or not the selection of leadership styles that are chosen match the traits and styles that the participants select in concert with these styles and whether they are compatible. I use the same reasoning in the selection of traits and styles.

Ethical considerations

The ethical approval for this research was sought and gained following one rewrite of the material over a question concerning the gathering of cultural demographics in terms of Maori participants. No racial / cultural information was collected, and while my participants contained several Maori respondents along with predominantly non Maori, which included Australian nationals and one American, I did not take these racial / national differences into account when collecting or analysing the data that resulted from this.

Care was taken to ensure that the questionnaire did not contain any racial, culturally sensitive, or gender specific language, however all participants were given the choice

whether or not they wished to answer any or all the questions in the document. If, in the event too many questions were omitted that would negate the value of the remaining information, then that questionnaire would be left out of the analysis. This scenario did not eventuate.

The questionnaires, once returned and printed, were coded using a numerical system to eliminate the possibility of inadvertently identifying the participant. While I could personally identify each participant from the detail on the response form, the identity of the respondent was hidden from any external source. Once the documents had been assimilated into the final thesis they will have been destroyed along with any electronic copies. The details of the responses have been placed in a table of descriptive statistics to maintain a permanent record of responses without any possibility of identifying which respondent belongs to which answer.

My personal involvement in the collection of data has been described above; however because of my exposure to the subject matter over the majority of my life, I was aware that I may be harbouring my own personal opinions and biases. While explaining to, and interviewing respondents, I minimised any chance of introducing opinion by only explaining concepts and clarifying statements, scenario definitions without adding any form of opinion what so ever. This was particularly difficult when clarifying issues on leadership styles as I had my own opinion on certain types of style listed. Very little explanation was necessary however, even with the telephone and face to face interviews, therefore I do not consider that my involvement affected the data collection phase at all. During the interpretation of data, while I will be using an interpretive approach, the method of matching styles with values and traits does

not leave any chance of bias, and while I have my own views on leadership generally, those views can have little impact on what I am researching.

Data analysis methodology

My initial analysis of the information gathered began as soon as information was being received, and continued until all questionnaires were submitted, while leaving the formal analysis until the end of my study. This follows the procedure laid out by Patton (2002) when he says that initial analysis is basically the same irrelevant of what later formal analysis is used in the research. He says that this type of analysis is an on going procedure from the moment the first data is being collected. I have used a matrix analysis to describe the results in terms of numbers and responses and this is included in the results chapter.

When selecting my approach I looked at the three basic research paradigms as outlined by Gall, Borg, and Gall (2003) where they say these consist of the positivist approach of quantitative, scientific research; interpretivism, or qualitative research, and critical science or the critical approach, which explores and critiques the social world, empowering people to overcome their problems.

Positivism according to Gall, Borg and Gall seeks to collect and analyse data from some part of an overall phenomena and can miss important aspects of the overall dynamic, and inadvertently neglect the complete meaning. They go on to say that qualitative or interpretivism says that there is not just one single reality but many, and that these can differ according to the context in relation to chronology and environment (Gall, et al., 2003). Qualitative research according to Strauss and Corbin

(1990) is “any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by statistical procedures” (p. 17). They go on to say that qualitative research should be used when a researcher wants to know more about a new perspective from which from something that is already well known. It can also be used when information is required about something of which there has been little research conducted in the past, or perhaps where the data is required for in-depth study and would be difficult to analyse quantitatively. Finally they say that this type of research is used where the investigation wants to identify variables which may later be the subject of a quantitative or positivist study (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). It is for these reasons that I have selected to carry out a qualitative study.

According to Strauss and Corbin, the first step in the analysis is to conduct an open coding procedure where the data is put into conceptual categories following identification and initial naming. The goal of this procedure is to produce multi-faceted and highly descriptive categories from which is formed an initial framework to work from. Following this initial coding the researcher conducts what is sometimes referred to as axial coding where the data is now compared against itself and combined to begin to form the larger picture of the phenomenon. It is important at this phase to not merely describe but gain a better understanding of what the research topic is about (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Finally according to the authors, this conceptual model, which has been arrived at through open coding and axial coding, is translated into a narrative which the reader can understand and derive meaning from.

In terms of an overall method, Stake (1995) says that there are five main types of qualitative research, which are “the case study, grounded theory, phenomenology,

ethnography, and historical methods” (p. 5). The one I have decided to use in my research is a multiple case design of a case study as it is designed to research a phenomenon that is contemporary and look at it within its real-life environment. In addition to this, the case study method allows the researcher to triangulate the data collected because of its multiple analysis techniques and strengthen the findings from the research and the subsequent conclusions.

During the analysis I conducted a cross case search for any patterns that may have presented themselves and compared them to other patterns to see if the evidence produced, strengthened the initial finding. This technique is described in great detail by Yin (2002) and goes on to say that by the use of these methods, the researcher is forced to go well beyond the initial findings of the research and make the chance of accurate and reliable findings much more likely. Yin additionally says that researchers can also use quantitative data to confirm and corroborate the qualitative findings. This can be done with matrices and flow charts showing the frequency of occurrences. I will be using a matrix in my results chapter. While I examined the raw data, I used what I found in my interpretations to find connections between the object of my research and any outcomes presented, and always with reference to the original question stated in my research, which follows the technique used by Hamel, Dufour and Fortin (1993).

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA COLLECTION RESULTS

This chapter outlines the results I obtained from my data collection. I have collated all the empirical data into a table at the end of the chapter (see table 1.) for ease of reading. The results for the remainder of this chapter I shall describe under the same subject headings as they are listed on the questionnaire (see appendix three).

Participant history

In question one the participants were asked to outline the leadership roles in their lives and talk about their experience and any formal training they had received to allow the analysis to put the following responses into the context of their life history as it related to the topic. . This response to this question ranged from not being answered at all to complete life histories. Those who wrote more than one paragraph on their history and training were six male respondents, all military and all in the commissioned officer bracket. They spanned all age groups and all education levels. All but one would use punishment as a leadership tool, and four of them prefer a situational style of leadership with the remaining two preferring authoritative/ servant and participative. Four respondents chose honesty as a value they use in leadership situations, with one also choosing competence and one also choosing forward thinking. One respondent did not choose any of the preferred traits. This respondent was the youngest of the participants aged in his early twenties. All participants disagreed that education was more important than experience when it came to leadership ability, and three of these considered experience was more important than training, while the remaining three thought the opposite.

Those who wrote only one paragraph consisted of seven females and six males. The females were aged in the X generation with five respondents and the early Baby Boomer generation with two respondents, while the males were three in the early X generation, one in the early Baby Boomer, and with two in the early Y generation. They spanned all education levels and five did not see punishment as an effective leadership tool while the remaining eight did. Seven respondents selected a situational style of leadership while two chose transformational, one chose participative, one servant; one transactional and one said 'all'. All but two chose honesty as a preferred value with competence being chosen by seven and inspirational being picked by four. Forward looking was selected by two respondents. All but one respondent considered experience more important than formal education and this person had education to post graduate level. Five participants thought that training was more important than experience and eight thought the contrary.

The remaining four participants wrote one short sentence or nothing and two were male with two female, ranging from bachelor degree through diploma, national certificate and secondary schooling. Two thought punishment was a legitimate tool and two did not. Two chose task oriented leadership style, one chose servant and one chose all styles. All selected honesty as a value with one participant selecting forward looking as well. One participant was early Y generation, one was early baby boomer and two were late baby boomers. All disagreed that education was more important than experience and all agreed that experience was more important than training.

Education level

This was generally well completed and was filled in by all respondents. Four respondents had education to secondary school level and no further, four to national certificate level, five had diploma's, seven had bachelor degrees, one a masters degree and two were educated to doctoral level. Of the four with secondary level education all were male and all were late baby boomers. Two approved of punishment as a leadership tool and two said they would not use it. Three chose honesty as a trait and one did not. One chose competence as well and one chose forward looking. One selected his leadership style as situational, one objective based and participatory, and two chose all styles. All selected experience over education in importance and one chose training as more important while the other three said that experience was more important.

Of the four educated to national certificate level, three were female who was one early X and two early baby boomer generation , and one was a male who was early Y generation. Two agreed with punishment and two disagreed with punishment as an effective tool. The male chose all types of styles, with one woman choosing task oriented, another with transactional, charismatic and servant, and the remaining selecting servant. All four chose honesty as a style and three selecting competent in their top four. All four chose experience over education and three out of four saying that experience is more important than training.

Five respondents were educated to diploma level and these consisted of three males and two females ranging in age from the Y generation, late X, three from the late baby boomer's. All but one would use punishment as a leadership tool and the styles they

chose were situational, servant, participatory, transactional and servant. There chose honesty as a value and two of these had forward looking as a second in the top four, while two others chose competent with one of these have inspiring as their second choice. All four considered experience to be more important than education and two thought that experience was more important than training, with the remaining two saying that training was more important than experience.

A bachelor degree was held by seven participants, five males and two females. Three of these were late X generation and four were baby boomers, two early and two late. All males agreed with punishment along with one female. The baby boomer female did not agree. Five chose situational leadership as their preferred option while one chose authoritarian / servant, and one chose task oriented. All but one chose honesty as a value, three of these also chose competence, one chose forward looking and one chose inspirational. All respondents said that experience was more important than formal qualification and five thought that experience was more important than training with two saying the training was more important than experience.

One forty five year old female had a master's degree and she did not agree with punishment as a tool in leadership. Her preferred style was a mixture of situational, participative and transformational, and her values were honesty, competent and inspiring. She believes that experience is more important than education but that a leader should have training to be effective.

Two participants had education to post graduate / doctoral level. One had her PhD and one was still studying. The duo consisted of one female who did not agree with using

punishment, and one male who did. The male selected a mix of situational, participative and servant leadership styles, and listed all the values of honesty Inspiring, forward looking and competence in the top value choice. They believed that is was essential to have formal qualification as well as training to be a good leader. The female chose authoritarian and transformational styles along with values of inspiring, honesty and forward looking. She stated that experience is more important than tertiary qualifications in leadership, and that experience is also more important than training.

Gender

In terms of gender, there were fourteen male and nine female participants. Four females were in their mid fifties, two in their mid forties and three in their early, middle and late thirties respectively. Six females chose honesty as their number one value in leadership and two more had it as their second choice. All females had at least one of the top four values in their top four chosen list, and five had two, with four having three. Two of these women chose situational as their preferred style of leadership and two chose the servant style. One selected transformational and one chose transactional with the remaining three saying they liked to use task oriented, management by objectives, and authoritarian respectively. Their educational achievement spanned all categories except that all had progressed further than the compulsory secondary schooling. All the female participants thought that experience was more important than tertiary qualifications in leadership and all but two thought that experience outweighed training.

Of the fourteen male participants, one was in his early twenties, two in their late twenties, two in their early thirties, three in their mid forties, four in the early to mid fifties, and two were in their early sixties. Only two of the males did not use punishment as a leadership tool. Six males preferred style of leadership was situational, two said a mix of all, and the remaining six chose one of the following: management by objectives, servant, participatory, transactional, authoritative, and task oriented.

Seven chose honesty as their number one value with four selecting it as their second. One chose competence as their first choice and another chose forward looking. Only six had more than one of the preferred values list in their selection with two being the most except for one respondent who had all four. Five only had one in their list however this was honesty. Two males did not have one of the preferred values on their list. One of these was in his early sixties and one in his late twenties. The respondent with all four was in his early fifties, at doctoral level education, believed in punishment and was the only one that said that tertiary qualifications were more important than experience in leadership. His style choices were firstly situational, and then participatory and servant. Of the remaining participants five thought that training was more important than experience and the remaining eight said the opposite applied.

Punishment

Fifteen of the participants said that they agreed with punishment as a leadership tool with three of these being female and twelve male. The males ranged across all generational groups while the females were all in their mid to late thirties. Leadership

styles for the females were transformational, management by objectives, and transactional. The two males who did not use punishment had management by objectives and situational their style choice. One male had competency followed by honesty as his values, while the other had just honesty. Both believed that experience overrode tertiary qualifications and training in leadership. Of the three women who chose punishment, all had competency as a values, two had honesty as their first choice and two had inspiring as their third choice. The two participants who were at doctoral level education, and had in one case chosen all four values, and in the other case three, were opposed in their view on punishment. Both were approximately the same age and had style choice including transformational and situational. The female opposed punishment in leadership. Both agreed however that they would dismiss staff in illegal behaviour was found, and both did not submit an answer when asked if corporal punishment in children was an option.

Age

Three participants were in their twenties, both males, five were in the thirties, three females and two males, five in their forties, two females and three males, eight were in their fifties, four females and four males, and two were in their sixties, both male. All three of the males in their twenties believed in punishment and had education ranging from two at National certificate level and one with a diploma. Two were in the military. One chose competence as a value, one chose honesty and competence and one did not include any of the preferred values. Participatory and transactional were chosen by the military males and the third participant chose 'all' as his leadership style. All thought experience was more important than tertiary qualifications and training in leadership.

The five respondents in their thirties chose situational and task oriented from the two males, with honesty as their value in isolation. All those in this group, both male and female chose punishment as a leadership tool and these three were the only age bracket in the females who chose it. Both males had bachelor degrees and one of the females. The other two females had national certificate level education. The three females chose transformational, management by objectives and transformational as styles, and once chose competence and inspiring as her values while the other two chose honesty and competence for one, and honesty, competence and inspiring for the other. All agreed that experience was better than tertiary education and any training.

The next age group were in their early to mid forties and consisted of three females and three males. The females ranged in education from national certificate, diploma and doctoral degree. No females agreed with punishment as a leadership tool. The females in this age group chose authoritarian, servant and situational as their style, and honesty as a value along with forward looking for one, inspiring and forward looking for another, and competent and inspiring for the third. All chose experience over qualifications and training.

From among the three males, one chose punishment and two did not, two had secondary education and one had a diploma, and two chose situational as their preferred style while one chose objective based management. All chose honesty while one chose competence in addition to this value, and one chose forward thinking as their preferred values. All chose experience over qualifications and training.

In the late baby boomer category, there were four males and three females. The males all chose punishment and the females did not. As far as styles re concerned for the males, two chose situational, one chose servant and one said all. Two chose honesty and nothing else in the list of preferred values, and one chose honesty and competency while the last one chose all four of the preferred values. This was the doctoral level participant who thought tertiary qualifications and training was more important than experience. The other three thought that experience was more important and had a bachelor degree, a diploma and secondary education proportionately.

The females in this age group had post compulsory education but not to national certificate level and one had a bachelor's degree. One chose situational, one servant and one task oriented as their styles. All three chose honesty and two of them chose competence as their values. All considered experience was better than tertiary qualifications and two chose experience over training, with one saying that training was essential in leadership.

The final participants in the age category were two males in the early baby boomer era, or in their early to mid sixties. One was situational in their style and the other was a mix of authoritarian and servant. One chose forward looking and honest as their vales and the other had none of the preferred values. Both say that experience is more important than tertiary qualification and training in being a good leader.

Styles

Eight participants chose situational as their preferred leadership style, two female and six male. One chose transformational, two chose task oriented, two chose management by objectives, two chose transactional, two chose authoritarian, three chose servant, two chose authoritarian, and one chose participatory, with two choosing all styles. Those choosing situational styles were six males and two females. All those who chose this style were thirty years old or older. All but one participant in this group chose honesty except one, and this person was in the sixty plus age group. Other values chosen were forward looking and honesty, with one person choosing all the preferred values. This entire group chose punishment as a leadership tool except two female and one male. This entire group chose experience over tertiary qualifications and training except one.

Of those that chose servant style one chose punishment and two did not, and these two were females. All selected honesty as a style and one also chose competency and one forward looking. Two held bachelor degrees and one had a diploma. All considered experience more important than tertiary qualifications and training.

Two chose all styles and they were twenty seven and fifty years old. Both believed in punishment and one had a degree while two had national certificate and diploma level education respectively. Both chose honesty and one chose competence as well. Both said that experience was more important than qualifications and training.

Two participants chose task oriented styles of leadership, one thirty four year old male with a bachelor degree and one fifty four year old female with a national certificate

level education. Both chose honesty as their first and only value and the male chose punishment while the female did not. Both chose experience over training and tertiary qualifications.

Two respondents chose authoritarian, one sixty plus year old male and one forty nine year old female with opposite views on punishment. Both chose honesty as their second choice with the male also picking forward looking as first and the female selecting inspiring as first and forward looking as third choice. While they both thought that experience was more important than tertiary qualifications the male thought that training was more important experience.

Of the two participants that chose transactional, one was female and one was male and both agreed with punishment as a leadership tool. Neither had education to degree level, the male chose none of the values preferred while the female selected honesty first and then competence. Both selected experience over qualifications and training.

The four remaining participants were one male at forty five years old, who chose objective based management, had secondary education, did not believe in punishment, and chose competency and honesty a their second and third choices. The other male was twenty two year old, chose participatory as their style and competence as their only value, believed in punishment and had diploma level education. He strongly believed in experience over qualifications and training.

The two remaining participants were female in their early thirties and both believed in punishment. One had a degree and one had a national certificate. One chose

competence and honesty and the other, with the degree, chose honesty, competence and inspiring. Both agreed that experience was better than qualifications, how the one with the degree though that training was more important than experience.

Values

Honesty was chosen as first value seven times for males and six times for females, four times as second choice for males and twice as second choice for females.

Forward looking was chosen once from a male as first choice once as second choice and once as third choice. It was chosen once as second choice by a female and once as third choice. Competency was chosen once as first choice for a male, three times as second choice and once as fourth choice. One female chose it as her first choice, three chose it second and two chose it third. Inspirational was only chosen once by a male as his second choice and also by one female as first choice. Three females chose it as their third choice. Four people only had one of the preferred values in their first four choices and it was honesty each time, with three males and one female.

Ten participants only selected two of the preferred values in their first four choices and nine of these had included honesty in their choice, with the gender split being five and five. Three females chose three of the values with honesty in all and competence scoring second and inspirational third in two of these participants and forward looking being third choice for the third female. Only one participant chose all four of the values in the order of honesty, inspirational, forward looking and finally inspirational. Honesty was chosen by nineteen participants overall.

Motivation

Motivation to become leaders is varied but most participants 'fell' into the role unless they were commissioned officers in the military and upon joining were placed into officer selection and training programmes based on their education levels. The data from this question is anecdotal and is recorded by age and gender and style choice.

Early thirties female, management by objectives with honesty, competent and inspiring: Motivated by motherhood through love and wanting the best her daughter, and as a lecturer wanting her students to succeed. Early thirties female, transformational with competence and inspiring: motivated by recognition, being able to assist others to succeed and a desire to be in control.

Late thirties female, situational leadership, honesty and competence: had leadership roles 'thrust' upon her, helping out with family and allows flexibility in employment.

Early forties female, Servant style, with honesty and forward looking: belief in own ability, wanting to make a difference for now and future generations, frustration with existing leadership, a desire to instil fairness and justice, belief in a different style of leadership and belief that a particular group needs were not being met. This participant remains in the role because of the strong inspiring leadership above her, the new challenges and working with like minded people.

Mid forties female, situational style with honesty, competence and inspiring: family expectations because she was the youngest and most educated and very "extroverted. She was not afraid to ask questions and challenge authority. Enjoy watching people grow and develop. Late forties, authoritarian style with inspiring, honesty and forward looking: frustrated with the limitations placed on her and no one else stepped forward.

She now remains in these roles to make a difference to society and to have an ability to influence. Mid fifties female, task oriented with honesty: Always been a motivated person with a strong sense of justice and fairness. Mid fifties female, situational with honesty and competency: got into leadership out of a sense of self worth, loyalty to herself, determination and self satisfaction. Mid fifties female, servant style with honesty and competence: a real abhorrence to inequality in her area of society and finds it more rewarding if she is getting involved. Usually there are no others who will do the job.

Early twenties male, participative style with honesty: always been outgoing, confident and happy to take charge. Enjoys having people look to him to organise and lead. Late twenties male, adopts all styles with honesty and competence: wanted leadership roles for status, better work and remuneration. Wants and needs to be in leadership roles. Late twenties male, transactional style with no values chosen in top four: saw that he could do better than those above him and 'fell' into the role. Enjoys motivating and developing people. Early thirties male, situational style with honesty: took on leadership roles for the challenge and excitement. Mid thirties male, task oriented style with honesty: a sense of responsibility, love and commitment. Providing benefits to others.

Mid forties male, objective based leadership style with competence and honesty: to develop new skills, progress his career, and increase in remuneration. He is eager to justify the faith that people have in him, particularly senior management. Mid forties male, situational style with honesty: a personal challenge and a desire to serve the community, personal goals and wanting to "give something back" for rewards gained.

Mid forties male, situational leadership with honesty and forward thinking: an intellectual and personal challenge, and to provide a better environment for those who follow.

Fifty year old male, servant style with honesty: motivated by ambition and personal goals, to effect change, support other and have a sense of worth. Fifty year old male, situational with honesty, influence, forward thinking and competence: motivated to achieve high performance of targets set by others. Early fifties male, all styles with honesty: motivated by wanting the job done right and nobody else could do it right in their opinion. Mid fifties male, situational with honesty and competence: Love for his children and the military organisation he belongs to, to share knowledge and to belong to an organisation that rewards good leadership.

Sixty year old male, authoritarian style with forward looking and honesty: a sense of ability to get worthwhile tasks achieved, a sense of duty and seeing things turn out better when he is in the leadership role. Early sixties year male, situational with honesty: motivated by a feeling of a need to help and get involved, and the feeling that he can achieve results with the satisfaction that achieving brings. This participant also likes the recognition and support of his followers.

Scenarios

The completion of the scenarios ranged from full description event by event action descriptions in one case, through to a paragraph, a sentence or two, a list of values used, and finally two respondents said they didn't have time to complete those questions. The scenarios were taken from literature in leadership scenarios with

suggested solutions and the reported solutions were assessed on this basis. Twelve were generally well written and would have set a process in place for remedial action however three of these did not list any of the four preferred values in their list of applied values to the situation. The remaining nine listed anything between one, two three or all four of the preferred values. Two respondents used actions which skirted around the main issue but may have achieved limited results. These people used three and four values each. The remaining two respondents answered fully but their solution would probably not have been effective in remedying the situation. Both of these participants had, in one case, one value listed, and in another case, two. Two respondents did not really address the issue but interestingly listed three out of the four preferred values in their application to the solution. The three who did not explain their strategy but gave a list of values, list one, two and three, respectively.

The second scenario had nine 'workable' solutions, with six of them being the same participants as the first scenario. All these responses listed the values preferred and ranged from instance of one only up to three at the most. Nine participants had responses that were unlikely to have resulted in an appropriate outcome, however six listed a range of the desired values while three listed none. The three respondents who only listed their values all had between one and three values listed.

Overall of the six whose solutions were most likely to have been effective, all were male and spanned all the age groups. Their overall preferred leadership styles were; task orientated, situational, transactional, participatory, situational and situational. In the first scenario the styles used were: management by objectives, autocratic, authoritative, transactional, transformational, task oriented. In the second scenario the

styles preferred were: transactional, servant, servant, servant, transactional, and transactional. These styles were listed in the same order of participant each time.

Additional comments

Eight respondents added additional comments, five were male and three were female.

All except one female who was thirty nine years were in the upper age group and all the males were either in the military or were ex military. Comments were, “Theory is useless without practice”, “Responsibility is a key to leadership, leaders are responsible to and for those who lead”, “Mentoring / exposure to good/bad leadership styles is an important aspect of leadership. The latitude to make mistakes in a safe environment and learn from them so you do not make them in an unsafe environment”, “Everyone leadership styles differ. Mine are based on a strong sense of justice, caring and empathy and treating staff like extended family to bring the best out in them”.

Another respondent added their own traits that they thought important such as: humility and diligence, instead of values and traits such as determination and dependability. Another respondent said, “Life experiences teach you to be a good leader. Generalised situations can place you in the role of a leader even if you are unaware of the placement yourself. I was an accidental leader whereby I was part of an organisation that was losing its leaders and the position was thrust upon me. I didn’t know what to do and while I was initially terrified I learnt as I went along” (Participant number nineteen).

One participant said that “Whilst leadership is an individual thing, some leadership styles come from those from whom we serve. The styles that we observe can be relevant in being able to see what works and what does not, and for us to consequently change our style appropriately. I see it as important to understand that my style is being looked at in the same way by those I lead” (Participant, number four).

The comments from the last participant (Number eleven) were the longest, and came from the retired United States Marine Corps (USMC) Lieutenant Colonel currently serving as a military advisor (civilian) in Afghanistan. His comments covered one and a half pages and listed, with explanations, traits that the USMC valued not only in their leaders, but also in their lowest ranked Marine. These included “integrity, dependability, bearing, courage decisiveness, endurance, enthusiasm, initiative, judgement, justice, knowledge, tact, unselfishness and loyalty”. He added principles by which their leaders live and conduct themselves, these include: “Know yourself and seek self improvement, be technically and tactically proficient, develop a sense of responsibility among your subordinates, set an example, know your Marines and look out for their welfare, keep your Marines informed, seek responsibility and take responsibility for your actions, ensure tasks are understood, supervised and accomplished, and, train your Marines as a team”. These comments and advice from a highly trained, formally recognised, professional and successful leader conclude my results chapter.

Serial	Age and gender	Education Level	Values and traits selected in top four in priority if they contained: Honesty (H), Forward looking (F), Inspirational (I), Competent (C)				Punishment as a leadership tool Y/N	Education is more important than experience A/D	Experience is more important than training A/D	Preferred Leadership Style
			1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th				
1	33 M	Bachelor Deg.		H			Y	D	D	Situational (all)
2	40+ M	Secondary	C	H			N	D	D	Management by objectives
3	40+ M	Diploma	H	F			Y	D	D	Situational
4	40+ M	Secondary	H				N	D	A	Situational
5	50+ M	Diploma		H			Y	D	A	Servant
6	22 M	Diploma		C			Y	D	D	Participatory
7	27 M	National cert.	H	C			Y	D	A	All
8	50 M	Secondary	H				Y	D	A	All
9	29 M	Secondary					Y	D	A	Transactional
10	60+ M	Bachelor Deg.		H			Y	D	A	Situational
11	56 M	Bachelor deg.	H	C			Y	D	A	Situational
12	60+ M	Bachelor deg.	F	H			Y	D	D	Authoritarian and Servant
13	34 M	Bachelor Deg.	H				Y	D	A	Task oriented
14	50+ M	Post Graduate	H	I			Y	A	D	Situational / Servant / Participatory
15	56 F	Bachelor Deg.	H		C		N	D	A	Servant / Autocratic / Situational
16	50+ F	National cert.	H				N	D	A	Task orientated
17	30+ F	Diploma	C		I		Y	D	A	Transactional / Situational
18	30+ F	Bachelor deg.	H	C	I		Y	D	A	Management by objectives/ Situational
19	39 F	National cert.	H	C			Y	D	A	Transactional/Charismatic/Servant
20	50 F	PhD.	I	H	F		N	D	D	Authoritarian / Transformational
21	40 F	Diploma	H	F			N	D	A	Servant
22	50+ F	National cert.		H	C		N	D	D	Situational
23	45 F	Masters Deg.	H	C	I		N	D	A	Sit//Transactional/Participatory

Table 1. Matrix of raw data.

CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis follows the same order of the questions in the questionnaire

Participant history

It would appear that those who have not had any formal training in leadership are still aware of the values that followers prefer in their leaders. All but one of these people had situational styles of leadership among their preferred style, and included honesty, competency, inspiring and forward looking throughout their choices of values and traits used. Those nine respondents who had completed intensive training all had selected situational or transactional as their preferred style and all included the preferred values in their list except the transactional leader. These results would tend to suggest that regardless of background and training, those with leadership experience generally, find that followers only follow if the leader adopts the preferred values listed by Posner (2006), and eventually adopt those values and traits if they wish to be successful leaders.

This result appeared to be constant regardless of age and gender. Oshagbemi (2004) and (Kakabadse, 1999) both say that gender is irrelevant in the leadership dynamic and this appears to be equally so in the background of the individual leader.

Oshagbemi (2004) also said that age had an impact of leadership style while Deal (2006) stated that it was more dependant on the era that the leader was raised in. The results here do not show any difference in age or era impacting on style or values and

traits. This may be due to the specific group of participants that took part in the research and could not be generalised to a larger population.

Overall in terms of life history, the results tend to suggest that there is little difference between those who were involved in leadership from a young age, chose it as a career, and were subject to intensive training, versus those who encountered leadership responsibility later in life, or had it 'thrust' upon them without any training at all. This finding would seem to support Pounder (1998) when he says that both parties in the leader /follower relationship influence each other and when Mark and Pless (2005) say that both raise the others performance and motivation. This evidence seems to support the theory that the follower changes the leader.

All those who had not been formally trained had been in full time leadership roles or part time for many years before completing the questionnaire. While there is no evidence to support this, it would certainly have been enough time for the leader / follower relationship to have developed to a stage where the leader could have been 'shaped' by the follower. This follows Goethals and Sorenson (2006) assertions that followers have a lot of power which if utilised can have an effect on the way that the leader performs their role.

Preferred style

The preferred style of the participants does not appear to reflect the age, gender, history or education dynamic in any of the participants. Given the wide range of participant profiles one might expect some poor examples of leadership, however based purely on the written material this does not appear to be the case. If, as Bass and

Avolio (1994) and McLaurin and Al Amri (2008) among others say, that the leaders who get the best out of their followers, and who appear to have the values that followers want in their leaders, are those who use a transactional, transformational and or charismatic style of leadership, or use a mixture of all styles depending on the situation, then there is no apparent difference in any of those involved in this research.

All of the participants had more than one style, and generally changed their style depending on the situation, in most cases, using a mixture of styles as the situation demanded. All of the participants appear to be very aware of the needs of those that follow them and adapt their style to accommodate this. This according to Day, Zaccarro and Halpin (2004) is essential to good leadership and is in line with the functional leadership model that they discuss.

The participants were given a list of styles to choose from and descriptions of each of these which may have led to the dynamics of egoistic or moralistic bias that Robins and John (1997) and Paulhus and John (1998) talk about. Some may have selected the leadership style that they would like to be known for but don't necessarily use. This is not supported by the background history, selection of values and the general comments however which suggests that one of these areas matches the other and would be difficult to construct if the biases discussed were in play.

It was interesting to note that given that all the participants were either young but intensively trained in leadership, or older with either training and or extensive experience, that eighteen of them had a style response of either "all" styles or situational, or listed more than two or three styles which suggested "all" or

“situational”, all of which are very much the same thing according to Hofstede (1997) supports Newstrom & Davis (1993). This style has all the traits and values associated with what followers want in their leader and will more readily follow which suggests transferability across contexts according to Antonakis, Cianciolo and Sternberg (2004). The other three respondents who put their styles as servant, task oriented or transactional, when addressing the scenarios and the questions on their two or more life leadership roles, used other styles depending on the situation including situational. These responses suggest that they use different styles depending on the context, and as they used some of the preferred traits and values this suggests a situational style which in turn, if is used in conjunction with the appropriate vales and traits suggests transferability.

Preferred traits and values

While most people would like to think that they are honest, or amend their answers to reflect this as Robins and John (1997) and Paulhus and John (1998) suggest, it is interesting to see that nineteen out of twenty three participants listed it as one of their preferred values and or traits, and even the other four respondents, in their scenario responses and their general comments, suggested that being truthful, having integrity or having a reciprocal relationship, intimated that honesty was important in their relationship with their followers, suggests that they had this as an underlying value, not only in their leadership dynamic but in general in relationships in their life. This suggests, as Cohan (2003), and particularly Posner (2006) says that followers not only prefer this trait/value in their leaders, but that they are more likely to follow this person in any given environment than any other trait / value and that this group of

participants in particular would have less trouble than most in moving between contexts with their leadership styles.

Posner (2006) also said that the next preferred value/trait that followers prefer is forward looking and five participants chose this as one of their top four preferred values. It is of interest to note that this value was only chosen by those who were forty plus, or, more specifically in the early 'X' generation and complete baby boomer era. Owrarn (1997) says that baby boomers were averse to looking at the future generally, and it has only been in recent years that this generation has looked forward to what lies ahead, both personally and professionally. Owrarn says that boomers and the early X generation felt that they were 'different' from other generations and that that has affected how they relate to the older and younger generations, as they were born in an era of huge social change. This in turn affects how they feel about their followers as generally they are in the X and Y generation.

Generally, in terms of transferability, despite the findings of Owrarn (1997), most participants displayed an interest in looking toward the future, and as Posner (2006) suggests, this is a trait that followers look for in their leaders. This suggests one again, transferability of leadership style.

Competence was chosen eleven times by respondents and was equally spread between first, second and third choices. This was an interesting choice as most participants thought in their descriptive narratives that it was important for leaders to know about their business and what they were doing, not only in terms of their general nature of their industry or profession, but in the area of leadership in particular. Interestingly

Bennis (1989) says that cognitive ability is important and yet very few participants listed intelligence as a value they treated with any importance. Posner (2006) says however that organisations today are too complex for a leader to know all the 'ins and outs' of the individuals tasks of those they lead and followers want people who know their industry and the dynamics of leadership.

Competence was chose by all age groups and gender. In the narratives by respondents this was a strong theme even when it was not listed. A lot of participants entered leadership roles generally because they were unsatisfied with those that they had as leaders at the time. This dissatisfaction arose generally because they though they were incompetent. Most respondents spoke of the ability to "get on with people" and talked of the importance of "relationships" and their importance, and this is reinforced by Posner (2006). Respondents generally found this very important and this again suggests transferability if this trait is utilised across all contexts in which the leader finds themselves.

The final value that Posner (2006) mentions is inspiring, and this is listed only four times by respondents. This has been listed by only one male and three females and two of these female believe in punishment as a leadership tool. There appears to be no similarities between the respondents other than the punishment dynamic. This is interesting that there is such a low rate of response from participants as Daft and Lengel (2000) say that their research shows that this value / trait is preferred seventy eight per cent of the time closely in third place behind honesty and visionary. If the leader is not inspiring according to Posner (2006) then there is little likelihood that the follower will back them even if the other traits and values are in existence. While this

trait comes in third it is nevertheless a very important one when it comes to transferability.

Overall it is the traits and values that make up the leadership styles that are important in transferability as it is these that the follower values the most and will follow regardless of the context or environment according to Pounder (1998).

Scenario one and two

Those with a workable solution in scenario number one suggests that when it comes to the actual working nature of a leadership problem, those with a combination of the most experience and the most training have the most workable solutions and these participants all selected one or more of the values most desired in leaders by their followers. While this could mean that these leaders have the ability to transfer their style between contexts it is really in isolation unless they can be successful in more than one situation. This negative finding supports Gabarro (1987) as well as Kao, Sinha and Wilpert (1999) and Zenger and Folkman (2002) who all say that leadership ability is not enduring across all contexts. However the fact that six of the participants did effectively utilise the same traits / values and appropriate leadership styles in both scenarios while being completely different problems, and had workable solutions, supports Fairholm (2008) who says that success is based purely on the traits, values and characteristics of the individual leader and the circumstances of the particular environment at the time.

Given that only six of the same respondents had workable solutions in scenario number two, suggests that the other six participants in scenario number one and the

other three participants in scenario number, while being successful leaders in specific scenarios, were not able to successfully transfer their ability between contexts, and this supports Zenger and Folkman (2002) who say that transferability is not able to be conducted easily and depends on the dynamics of the organisation and how well the leader has become immersed in its individual culture.

Motivation

While a selection of participants had no ambition to be a leader, there were those who had the desire from an early age. From the data collected it would suggest that those who wanted to lead from an early age certainly had more of the values associated with the leadership style that the follower would prefer to follow. Those with the most motivation appeared to be among those of military backgrounds, although one civilian had the ambition to be in leadership positions from an early age. Some participants said that their motivation stemmed from the fact that they did not have faith in the early leaders and thought that they could do better. Deci and Ryan (1985) say that intrinsic motivation comes from rewards that originate for the task that is being performed, and they say that this form of motivation is usually associated with those who have higher educational levels. Extrinsic motivation comes from external sources, in the case of leadership this would be the remuneration that some participants say they enjoy. Unfortunately as Bandura (1997) says, this type of motivation usually ends in satiation and the individual loses interest in the task that brought the reward. Basically the explanation simply means that people are either internally motivated or externally motivated.

The internal motivation of some participants was less obvious in the study than those who were externally motivated. They listed their motivation in such things as power, money, status, wanted to be admired and have control over others. These people appeared to have less of the desired values and traits than those who chose more internal motives such as wanting to help people, see them develop, wanting to make a better society. This finding would suggest that those who were intrinsically motivated were more likely to have transferable leadership styles than those who were extrinsically motivated. There are many other theories on motivation; however the responses from these particular participants lend themselves to the intrinsic / extrinsic model for the purposes of this analysis.

Education and training versus experience

Cutler (2002) says that in the past it was usually the better educated that became the leaders and followers generally just followed them. He says that today the follower is often more educated than those that lead them and because of this they expect more from their leader than just demands, commands, and orders. Followers need motivation and want to know the reason for their work. If it is not forthcoming then they will be de-motivated. Cutler says that this is because both leader and followers need to have a mutual level of understanding that only comes about through the same levels of education, unlike the past where one outweighed the other and the leader had a sense of moral superiority. The participants in this study had a range of education levels, and there appeared to be little difference in the styles, traits and values that they selected.

The participants ranged from the youngest age with diploma education and had the values that suggest transferability, through to the early baby boomer generation with the same attribute. This was constant through gender as well. Overall educational appeared to have no impact on transferability of style across contexts.

Age

Age according to Gardner (2007) has nothing to do with chronological time in years when it comes to leadership, but more about the era in which the leader was raised. While there was difference in the styles used between the generational cohort in this study it was minimal and the overall selection of traits appeared to be more relevant. Deal (2006) said that leaders from the earlier baby boomer generation usually had a much more authoritarian style and the later generations were less rigid in their style.

According to the results of this data there was no or little difference in the styles between the generations, and while it was a small population sample, it was across a wide generational gap and type of leadership role. It would appear that those who selected the most preferred values were female with one male and all but one of these people were forty five years plus. The other remaining female was in her early thirties. This supports Kakabadse (1999) who says that the 1990's were a much more caring decade as far as personnel management was concerned, and allowed women to show their softer side and use values aligned leadership styles which were more acceptable to followers. While this may go some way to explaining the younger female, it does not explain the older ones, unless they were not too indoctrinated in earlier styles and changed once the situation allowed them to.

Alternatively Eagly, Karau and Makhijani (1995) suggest that women have these styles when they are working in an environment where there are more female workers than male and there may be some basis for this phenomenon in this theory. The females who scored two of the preferred values ranged in age from mid thirties through to mid fifties. When it comes to the male group there appears to be little evidence of age influencing values as apart from the fifty year old who scored all four preferred values the other males who scored at least two were spread from twenty seven years through to early sixties in age. This conflicts with what Oshagbemi (2004) found, when he said that his research shows that males vary considerably in the selection of leadership styles based on the preferred values of the follower.

The data from this study suggests that age is irrelevant in the transferability of leadership styles between different contexts which conflicts with both Oshagbemi (2004) and Phillips (1998) who says that there are distinct differences between the age or generation groups, and puts the average cut off in age at round thirty five. However the findings tend to support Oshagbemi (2004) to a certain extent as he also found that the generational groups were similar in the area of directive and delegatory type leadership.

Gender

Both Oshagbemi (2004) and (Kakabadse (1999) say that gender is irrelevant in any dynamic associated with leadership. This study found that females tended to select the values that followers prefer more often than their male counterparts. Thirty three per cent chose three or more of these preferred values than the males who only had one

participant select four, which is approximately only 6.6 per cent. Five out of nine females selected two of the preferred values which equates to 55.5 per cent, versus five males out of fourteen at 35.7 per cent. Females chose only one preferred value once, which is 11.1 per cent versus males who chose only one were five out of fourteen which is 35.7 per cent, and while no females chose none of the preferred values, one male did out of fourteen, which equates to 7.1 per cent.

This supports Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt and van Engen (2003) who said that women were found to use a transformational style of leadership more than their male counterparts. These values are more aligned to the transformational style of leadership than those styles traditionally used by men. This style used by females has also according, to Eagly, et al., been more effective in modern times than other styles.

The other phenomenon that was found in the data in this thesis was the self reported leadership styles. Females reported that they used a situational, transformational or charismatic style of leadership more than the male participants. Seven out of nine females said that they utilised these styles at any given situation which equals 77.7 per cent, while eight out of fourteen men reported the same which is 57.14 per cent of these participants.

The main difference between these self reports, are however, the related values chosen to correspond with these styles. In the case of the females, all those who chose the styles listed above had values that corresponded with these styles, however with the male respondents, four of the eight or fifty per cent did not have values relating to their chosen style. This would mean that in fact only 28.57 males reporting using the

correct mix of style and value versus 77.7 per cent of females. When assessing this I used an equation of two or more correct values to mean that there would be some weighting towards the style matching the values. These findings while inconclusive with a small population sample and the methods used, still suggest that females may be more inclined to use the values and leadership styles that followers generally prefer, and there are more likely to be able to maintain success as a leader across more contexts than the male leader.

Transferability

As mentioned in the literature review, Antonakis, Cianciolo and Sternberg (2004) say that theirs and other research shows quite clearly that “leadership is a relation that exists between persons in a social situation, and that persons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in other situations (p.150). They also say that the democratic style of leadership shows the most likelihood of durable effect when compared to other styles. Pounder (1998) says that of anything it is “traits, behaviours and their response to different situations” (p.136) that make the best leader.

The data suggests that, if this is so, then females of all ages, educational levels and experience, tend to have a better chance of transferring their leadership skills from one context into other areas of leadership. Fairholm and Fairholm (2008) say that durability in leadership depends on no less than twenty nine traits and these range in importance but include gender, age and education. While the age of participants in this study was complete in all the generations currently in the workforce generally, there were no females in the under thirty year old bracket and this may have influenced the findings. Similarly, the lowest education in the male bracket was

secondary education were four out of fourteen, while all females in the study had post compulsory education of some kind, with almost half being university educated.

From the context of background, despite very successful careers of many of the respondents there were no military participants who appeared to have the correct mix of values and leadership styles. This raises the question, if the theory on followership of Chaleff (2002) and other researchers holds true, as to whether soldiers follow their leaders because they 'want' to, or whether it is simply a result of their 'indoctrination' or the discipline system that they have been subject to from the very first day of their, in some cases, very long career.

Of interest, out of the females that did appear to have the most durable leadership ability, five of the nine said that they did not believe in punishment of any kind as a leadership tool, and preferred to use the issuing or removal of reinforcement. When the males are added to this equation, only four of eleven thought that punishment was a wrong tool to use. Two thirds of the female participants generally were against punishment. Out of the four participants who had the most transferability overall, the split between punishment or not was fifty percent. This suggests that the application of punishment as a tool has no influence on the durability of leadership ability.

It would appear that durability or transferability of leadership as Antonakis et al. (2004) and Pounder 1998) say, is dependant on many variables, some of those I have investigated in this study. While the evidence here suggests that females generally tend to have the more values and leadership styles that followers want, look for, and follow generally, it cannot be said that females alone have this ability. The data

suggests that this ability can be achieved regardless of age, generational era, gender, education, training and experience, and may even include the leadership style selected.

CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion

“The final test of a leader, is that he leaves behind him in other men, the conviction and the will to carry on”.

WALTER LIPPMAN

The primary aim of this research was to ascertain whether or not the leadership styles and ability someone has in one environment or context was readily transferable into a completely different area of leadership or contextual situation. The group of participants I recruited were from a pool of people who were already successful in their individual areas to all or some degree. What gave depth to the study were the people who in themselves did not even consider themselves to be in leadership positions. Many of these people showed genuine humility when asked to participate as they did not think that they were leaders or had anything to contribute, not only to the subject matter, but to scientific research generally.

From the tribes that Keesing and Strathern (1998) when they talk about tribes never uniting *for* but usually uniting *against*, to the Assiniboin Indians and their specific leadership culture; from the suicidal sperm of Boehm (1999) and Brown (1991), through to the Bonobo monkey of de Waal (1997) and onto Soviet leaders of the twentieth century described by Matlock (1995), leadership has been one of the most researched, talked about, argued over, and resulted in, grand or horrific consequences, than any other phenomena (Allman, 1996).

Like all ability, whether it be of a practical nature such as carpentry or mechanics; or of professional nature such as medicine or law, the argument is never so much whether or not the individual is proficient, but can they achieve the same results once they are 'out of the office'. Anyone can get results on the perfect day, with the perfect tools, and in the perfect situation for what they were trained for. The professional and competent perpetrator of any skill is the one who can perform their task in any environment, and such is the nature of leadership as well.

If we listen to Clark (2005) and his research on the Seneca Indians, then we would sack our leaders as soon as they did not meet our expectations or failed to do what we wanted them to do. If we adhered to the theory of McDermott (2008) we would get rid of any leader over the age of thirty five as they are subject to mental illness and every other malady that makes them ineffectual. If however we took cognisance of Ket de Vries (2003), we would not let anyone lead us until they were well into their forties.

Kakabadse (1999) advises us to ignore gender and follow anyone regardless of whether they are male, female or gay, while Eagly, Karau and Makhijani (1995) suggest that perhaps women are the ones to follow, but only if we ourselves are of that gender, because if we are male then we should only listen to Kennedy & Mendus, (1897) whose research of Plato, Aristotle and others say women are inferior. Korac-Kakabadse and Korac-Kakabadse (2001) suggest that this is all irrelevant and that their other issues we should be concerned about, and Snyder (2006) states strongly that gay leadership including both homosexual and lesbian leaders are the ones we should be looking at to set the example and style into the twenty first century.

Ira Chaleff (2002) sends us off in another direction when he says that we should partially ignore the dynamics of the leader and look closely at the follower, or more importantly, the relationship that exists between both parties. Drucker says it even more strongly when he states that “The only definition of a leader is someone who has followers” (p.73). According to Bovee and Thill (2005), however this area of interest in followship is so new that the scientific community has first to acknowledge its existence and importance before any positive advance can be made. This study on transferability focuses on the importance of followship in the equation, and data suggests that without it there would *be* no leaders.

All the evidence investigated here suggests that followers are the important dynamic in leadership research, and without acknowledging their needs and expectations, the current generation of leaders will fail abysmally. These needs and expectations revolve around the traits, values and characteristics that followers require and look for in their leaders if they will follow them willingly in any situation. As suggested in the research, these values are: honesty, forward looking, competence, and the ability to be inspiring. To follow on from this, the leadership styles that tend to embody these values more than others are, situational, charismatic, and transformational.

As discussed in the analysis of the thesis, it would appear that the research data suggests that females are more likely to possess these abilities, which in turn gives strength to the possibility of durability of leadership, and the ability to move across contexts with success. The weakness in the research is acknowledged however and there are many variables that need to be taken into account, and much more research

on this subject carried out before any firm conclusions can be made and generalised to the wider population.

Implications on future research

The purpose of this research is to encourage future investigation into the subject of transferability and its wider implications for leadership selection and training. As Strauss and Corbin (1990) suggest, qualitative research can be used when the investigator wants to identify variables about a little known subject so that quantitative research has a starting point.

Further research may focus on the actual measurement of leadership ability outside of the participant's personal opinion of their own prowess. A longitudinal approach may prove to be the most effective method of finding evidence to support the theory that properly selected, well trained, and widely experienced leaders can in fact move between contexts regardless of the follower, the task and the environment.

Further research might need to involve a much larger population group and possibly the introduction of psychometric instruments to effectively measure leadership ability and the biases that Paulhus and John (1998) and Robins and John (1997) discuss in their research on egoistic and moralistic biases. The research conducted by Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal and Brown (2007) on generational studies and the research by Posner (2006) over two decades and beyond could be a basis for future investigation in the durability of leadership.

References

- Aldrich, R. & Wotherspoon, G. (2001). *Who's who in gay and lesbian history*. United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Allman, W. (1996). *The serotonin candidate*. Forbes: FYI,134. Retrieved May 3, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 10179762).
- Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A.T., & Sternberg, R.J. (2004). *The nature of leadership*. USA: Sage Publications.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barker, A. (1992). *Transformational nursing leadership: A vision for the future*. Fairfield, CT: Jones and Bartlett publishers.
- Barker, C., & Cor, R. (2003). *The 7 heavenly virtues of leadership*. Sydney: McGraw-Hill.
- Barrett, R. (1998). *Liberating the corporate soul: Building a visionary organisation*. USA: Butterworth-Hienmann.
- Bass, B. (1989). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free press.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1994). *Improving organisational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, C.A: Sage Publications.
- Beck, R., Black, L., Krieger, L., Naylor, P., & Shabaka, D. (1999). *World History: Patterns of interaction*. IL: McDougal Littell.
- Belkin, A., & Bateman, G. (2003). *Don't ask, don't tell" Debating the gay ban in the military*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.

- Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Reading, M.A: Addison-Wesley.
- Bennis, W. (1993). *An invented life*. Reading, M.A: Addison-Wesley.
- Blanchard, K. (1991). Situational view of leadership. *Executive Excellence*, 8(6), 22.
Retrieved April 28, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 393640).
- Boehm, C. (1999). *Hierarchy in the Forest*. London: Harvard.
- Blake, R., & Mouton, J. (1985). *The managerial grid III: The key to leadership excellence*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1991). *Reframing organisations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bovee, C. & Thill, J. (2005). *Excellence in business communication (6th ed.)* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson-Prentice Hill.
- Bradley, O.N., (1951). *A Soldiers story*. New York: Henry Holt and Company Inc.
- Bradley, O.N., (1948). *DA Pam 22-1 leadership*. USA: Department of Defense.
- Brown, D. (1991). *Human Universals*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Carlyle, T. (1841). *On heroes, hero worship, and the heroic history*. Boston, M.A: Houghton Mifflin.
- Chaleff, I. (1992). *The courageous follower. Standing up to and for our leaders.*(2nd ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Chaleff, I. (1995). *The courageous follower*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

- Claburn, J. (2004). *Flexibility: Today's leaders adjust, adapt, overcome*. Infantry, 93 (2), 25-27. Retrieved April 27, 2009, from academic research library database. (Document ID: 834493201).
- Clark, J. (2005). *Appleseeds*. Peterborough: Cobblestone publishing company.
- Cohan, P. (2003). *Value leadership: The 7 principles that drive corporate value in any economy*. USA: Wiley.
- Collins, J. L. (1953). *FM 22-100, Command and Leadership for the Small Unit Leader*. USA: Department of Defense.
- Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crockett, W. (1981). "Dynamic subordinancy." *Training and Development Journal*, pp.155-164.
- Cutler, T.J. (2002). *The bluejackets manual*. Annapolis, Maryland: U.S. Naval Institute.
- Daft, R., & Lengel, R. (2000). *Fusion leadership*. San Francisco: Koehler publishers, Inc.
- Day, D., Zaccarro, S., & Halpin, S. (2004). *Leader development for transforming organisations: Growing leaders for tomorrow*. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Deal, J. (2006). *Retiring the generation gap: How employees young and old can find common ground*. USA: John Wiley and Sons.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. New York: Plenum.
- D'Emilio, J. (1989). *Hidden from history: Reclaiming the gay and lesbian past*. USA:

New American Library.

de Waal, F. (1997). *Bonobo: the forgotten ape*. USA: University of California Press.

de Waal, F. (2006). *Apes in the family: Our inner ape*. New York: Riverhead books.

Drucker, P. (1996). *The executive in action: Managing for results, innovation, and entrepreneurship the effective executive*. USA: Harper Collins Publishers.

Eagly, A. & Johnson, B. (1990) *Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis*.
Psychological bulletin, 108, 233-256.

Eagly, A., Karau, S., & Makhijani, M. (1995). *Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis*. Psychological bulletin, 117, 125-145.

Eagly, A., Johannesen-Schmidt, M., & van Engen, M. (2003). *Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing men and women*. Journal of social issues, 57, 781-797.

Fairholm, M.R. & Fairholm, G.W. (2008). *Understanding leadership perspective: Theoretical and practical approaches*. CA: Springer.

Foss, K. (1994). *The logic of folly in the political campaigns of Harvey Milk*. USA: New York university press.

Gabarro, J. (1987). *The dynamics of taking charge*. USA: Harvard business press.

Gall, M.D., Borg, W.R., & Gall, J.P. (2003) *Educational research: An introduction*.
(7th ed.) White Plains, New York: Longman.

Gardner, H. (2007), *Responsibility at work: How leading professionals act (or don't act) responsibly*. USA: John Wiley and sons.

Gardner, J. (2001). *Telecommunications management: Industry structures and*

planning strategies. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge: Harvard university press.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*.
White Plains, NY: Longman.

Goethals, G. & Sorenson, G. (2006). *The quest for a general theory of leadership*.
USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Goldsmith, M., Greenberg, C., Robertson, A., & Hu-Chan, M. (2003). *Global
leadership: The next generation*. USA: Prentice Hall.

Gordon, J. (2000). *Black leadership for social change*. USA: Greenwood publishing
group.

Hamel, J., Dufour, S., & Fortin, D. (1993). *Case study methods*. Newbury Park, CA:
Sage.

Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, M.A: Harvard
University Press.

Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York,
NY: Doubleday.

Hock, D. (1999). *Birth of the chaotic age*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers,
Inc.

Hofstede, G. (1977). *Culture and organisations: Software of the mind*. New York:
McGraw-Hill.

Huber, D. (1995). *Leadership and nursing care management*. USA: Saunders
publishing.

- Huber, D. (2005). *Leadership and nursing care management*. (3rd ed.) USA: Saunders publishing
- Huber, D. (2006). *Leadership and nursing care management*. (3rd ed, illustrated). USA: Elsevier health Sciences.
- Johnson, C. (2004). *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership: Casting light or shadow*(2nd ed.). USA: SAGE Publications.
- Jones, M. (2002). *Social psychology of prejudice*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Kakabadse, A. (1991). *The wealth creators: Top people. Top teams and executive best practice*. London: Kogan page.
- Kakabadse, A., Okazaki-Ward, A., & Myers, A.(1996). *Japanese business leaders*. London: International Thompson.
- Kakabadse, A. (1999). *Younger does not mean better*. The British journal of administrative management, 9-11. Retrieved June 10, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 38966502).
- Korac-Kakabadse, A. and Korac Kakabadse, N. (2001). *From tacit knowledge to knowledge management: leveraging invisible assets*. London: John Wiley and sons Ltd.
- Kao, H., Sinha, D., & Wilpert, B. (1999). *Management and cultural values: the indigenization of organisations in Asia*. USA: Sage publications.
- Keesing, R.M., & Strathern, A.J. (1998). *Cultural anthropology: A contemporary Perspective*. 3rd ed. USA: Earl McPeck.
- Kellerman, B. (2008). *Followship*. USA: Harvard Business Press.

- Kelly, R. (1992). *The power of followship: How to create leaders people want to follow and followers who lead themselves*. New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Kennedy, E. & Mendus, S. (1987). *Women in western political philosophy*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf books.
- Ket de Vries, M. (2003). *Organisational paradoxes*. USA: Routledge.
- Kingsmill, D (2009). *How experience failed us*. Management today, 22. Retrieved April 27, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 167999291).
- Klenke, K. (1996). *Women and leadership: a contextual perspective*. New York: Springer publishing company, Inc.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (2005). *The leadership challenge workshop: Facilitators guide*. USA: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated.
- Kummer, H. (1968). *Social organisation of Hamadryas baboons*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- Lundin, S. & Lancaster, L. (1990). "Beyond leadership: The importance of followship." *The Futurist*, pp. 18-22.
- McDermott, R. (2008). *Presidential leadership, illness, and decision making*. USA: Cambridge university press.
- MacDonald, I., Burke, C., and Stewart, K. (2006). *Systems leadership: creating positive organisations*. USA: Gower publishing, Ltd.
- McLaurin, J. R., & Al Amri, M. B. (2008). *Developing and understanding of charismatic and transformational leadership*. Allied academies conference. Academy of organisational culture, communications and conflict. Proceedings,

13(2), 15-19. Retrieved June 18, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database, (Document ID: 1618977181).

Maak, T., & Pless, N. (2005). *Responsible leadership*. California: Rutledge.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1980). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Matlock, J. (1995). *Autopsy on an empire: The American ambassadors account of the collapse of the Soviet Union*. USA: Random house.

Merriam, S.B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, N. (1994). *Out of the past: Gay and lesbian history from 1869 to the present*. San Francisco: Vintage books.

Morgan, H., Harkins, P., & Goldsmith, M. (2004). *The art and practice of leadership coaching*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Newstrom, J., & Davis, K. (1993). *Organisational behaviour – Human behaviour at work*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Novick, L., Morrow, C., & Mays, G. (2007). *Public health administration: principles for population based management*. USA: Jones & Bartlett Publishers.

Nye, J. (2008). *The powers to lead*. USA: Oxford university press.

Oshagbemi, T. (2004). *Employee relations*. United Kingdom: Emerald group publishing Ltd.

Outcalt, C., Farris, S., & McMahon, K. (2001). *Developing non-hierarchical leadership on campus: case studies and best practices in higher education*. Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press.

- Owram, D. (1997). *Born at the right time*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (3rd ed.)*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- Phillips, D. (1998). *Executive decision*. California: Entrepreneur Media, inc.
- Paulhus, D.L., & John, O.P. (1998). Egoistic and moralistic biases in self-perception: The interplay of self-deceptive styles with basic traits and motives. *Journal of personality*, 66, 1025-1060.
- Posner, K. (2006). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Wiley-India.
- Pounder, D. G. (1998). *Restructuring schools for collaboration: promises and pitfalls*. USA: SUNY press.
- Remnick, D. (1994). *Lenin's tomb: the last days of the Soviet empire*. USA: Vintage books.
- Robins, R.W., & John, J.P. (1997). *The quest for self-insight: Theory and research on the accuracy of self-perception*. New York: Academic press.
- Rost, J. (1991). *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. Westport: Praeger.
- Rush, R. (2006). *NCO guide (8th ed.)*. USA: Stackpole books.
- Santrock, J. (2007). *A topical approach to life-span development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Scarnati, J.T. (1999). Beyond technical competence: the fundamentals of flexibility. *Participation & empowerment*, 7(7), 194. Retrieved April 28, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 82396048).
- Sessa, V., Kabacoff, R., Deal, J. & Brown, H. (2007). *Research tools for the*

psychologist-manager: Generational differences in leader values and leadership behaviours. The Psychological – Manager Journal, 10(1), 47-74, Retrieved April 27, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 1275651061).

Snyder, K. (2006). *The G Quotient: Why gay executives are excelling as leaders – and what every manager needs to know.* USA: John Wiley and sons.

Stake, R.E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sullivan, R., (1993). *AR 600-100, Army Leadership.* USA: Department of Defense.

Sykes, J.B. (Ed.).(1982). *The concise oxford dictionary* (7th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Taspcott, D. (2008). *Grown up digital: How the net generation is changing your world.* USA: McGraw-Hill.

Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Thornton, G. (1992). *Assessment centres in human resource management.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

United States Army handbook, (1973). *Military leadership.* USA: Routledge.

Valentine, S. (2004). *Men and women supervisor's job responsibility, job satisfaction, and employer monitoring.* USA: Springer Netherlands.

Ward, A., Sumpter, D., Couzin, I., Hart, P., & Krause, J. (2008). *University of*

Leicester; When following the leader can lead into the jaws of death. NewsRx Health & Science, 234. Retrieved May 4, 2009, from Academic Research Library database. (Document ID: 1516793641).

Wickham, J. A., (1983). *FM 22-100, Military Leadership*. USA: Department of Defense.

Wickham, J. A., (1986). *FM 22-100, Military Leadership*. USA: Department of Defense.

Wickham, J. A., (1987). *AR 600-100 Army Leadership*. USA: Department of Defense.

Wickham, J. A., (1987). *DA Pam 600-80, Executive Leadership*. USA: Department of Defense.

Wickham, J. A., (1987). *FM 22-103 Leadership and Command at Senior Levels*. USA: Department of Defense.

Wilson, E.O. (1975). *Sociobiology: The new Synthesis*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Wilson, E. (2000). *Sociobiology: the new synthesis*. USA: Harvard university press.

Wolf, A. (1995). *Competency-based assessment*. Buckingham: Open University press.

Yin, R.K. (2002). *Case study research: design and methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zenger, J.H., & Folkman, J. (2002). *The extraordinary leader: Turning good managers into great leaders*. USA: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix One

Information Sheet for Thesis

Transferability of Leadership Styles, Traits and Values across Contexts

Thank you for considering to be a part of this master's thesis study into the transferability of leadership styles, traits and values across contexts and environments. The aim of the study is to explore whether the traits that make up leadership, and the style and values of leadership used in one context, are transferred either wholly or in part to another context.

I am interested in hearing about your leadership experiences and opinions about leadership generally. I would like to gain a better understanding of your experience of leading people in the various positions you occupy in either your professional and / or personal life. This may also be in the form of parenting.

If you agree to be part of the study there will be one interview that will take approximately 60 to 90 minutes. The interview will be recorded. The interviews will later be typed out and you will be given a copy to check for accuracy and intent. If you do not wish to be interviewed then you can be given the questionnaire which will take approximately one hour to complete.

Very careful measures will be taken to protect your privacy and confidentiality. If you do not wish to be identified in the final thesis document, once the interviews have been written up, any identifying information such as addresses and names will be replaced with a confidential coding system that will be safely stored. When the results of the interview are published, I will also be very careful to ensure you will not be able to be identified. If however you do wish your contribution to this research to be acknowledged, and to be identified by name in the participant profile and in the acknowledgements, there is an opportunity in the permission slip to do this. Your individual responses will not be linked to your name.

If you agree to take part in this research, you have the right to:

- 1 Refuse to answer any particular question, and to withdraw from the study at any time throughout the process.
- 2 Ask any further questions about the study that may occur to you during your participation.

- 3 Be given access to a summary of the findings from the study when it is concluded.

The study is being carried out by myself, (Jonathan Dick) as part of my master's degree, and I will be supervised by Doctor Cate Curtis and Professor Jane Ritchie, both of whom are part of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (Psychology) of the University of Waikato. Please feel free to contact either myself or my supervisors about any issues, questions, or concerns you have about the study or the way it is being carried out. Contact details are as follows:

John Dick
278 Hamilton Road
Spearwood
PERTH 6163
WEST AUSTRALIA
Phone No. 08 94941087
Mobile No. 04 38996 343
Email: dicko009@hotmail.com

Doctor Cate Curtis
University of Waikato
Private Bag
HAMILTON
NEW ZEALND
Telephone: (+64 0) 7 856 2889 ext 8669
Email: ccurtis@waikato.ac.nz
Web: <http://www.waikato.ac.nz/wfass/staff/psyc/ccurtis>

Professor Jane Ritchie
University of Waikato
Private Bag
HAMILTON
NEW ZEALAND
Ph 0800 9245286
Email: psyc0123@waikato.ac.nz

University of Waikato
Psychology Department
CONSENT FORM

PARTICIPANT'S COPY

Research Project: Transferability of Leadership Values, Styles and Traits Across Contexts

Name of Researcher: John Dick

Name of Supervisor: Doctor Cate Curtis / Professor J. Ritchie.

I have received an information sheet about this research project or the researcher has explained the study to me. I have had the chance to ask any questions and discuss my participation with other people. Any questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

I agree to provide information to the researcher under the conditions of confidentiality set out on the information sheet.

I wish to participate in this study under the conditions set out on the Information Sheet.

I agree to participate in this research project and I understand that I may withdraw at any time up until the 31st of August 2009, and decline to answer any particular questions in the study. If I have any concerns about this project, I may contact the convenor of the Research and Ethics Committee (Dr Robert Isler, phone: 838 4466 ext. 8401, e-mail r.isler@waikato.ac.nz)

I want my name to be mentioned in the participant profile YES / NO

I want my name to be listed in the formal thesis acknowledgement YES / NO

Participant's Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix Two

University of Waikato
Psychology Department
CONSENT FORM

RESEARCHER'S COPY

Research Project: Transferability of Leadership Styles and Traits Across Contexts

Name of Researcher: John Dick

Name of Supervisor: Doctor Cate Curtis / Professor J. Ritchie.

I have received an information sheet about this research project or the researcher has explained the study to me. I have had the chance to ask any questions and discuss my participation with other people. Any questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

I agree to provide information to the researcher under the conditions of confidentiality set out on the information sheet.

I wish to participate in this study under the conditions set out on the Information Sheet.

I agree to participate in this research project and I understand that I may withdraw at any time up until the 31st of August 2009, and to decline to answer any particular questions in the study. If I have any concerns about this project, I may contact the convenor of the Research and Ethics Committee.

I want my name to be mentioned in the participant profile YES / NO

I want my name to be listed in the formal thesis acknowledgement YES / NO

Participant's Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix Three

INTERVIEW SHEET

Question 1.

Tell me about your history of leadership roles in your life, including your length of experience.

Question 2.

What formal training have you had in leadership development?

Question 3.

What qualifications do you have in general? (From secondary school forward.)

Question 4.

Do you think you generally use a democratic, autocratic, free reign or laissez-faire style of leadership? (Explain each).

Question 5.

Tell me about your primary leadership role?

Question 6.

Tell me about your secondary and subsequent leadership roles?

Question 7.

What style of leadership do you think you use in each of these roles?

Question 8.

What individual traits do you think you use in each of these situations?

Question 9.

What values do you apply in each of these roles?

Question 9.

Why do you use different styles, traits and values in the different situations?

Question 10.

Would you use the same styles, traits and values in both situations if you could?

Question 11.

Out of this list of leadership styles, traits and values (show list), how would you rate them in order of importance for a leader in general? (Use numbering system to identify the three areas to use later)

Question 12.

I am going to read you a short story involving a leadership problem. What would you do in this situation? (Read story).

Question 13.

What style, traits and values do you think you used here, and why?

Question 14.

I am going to read you a second short story involving a leadership problem. What would you do in this situation? (Read story).

Question 15

What style, traits and values do you think you used here, and why?

Question 16

Can you please tell me if you agree or disagree with the following statements?

a. It is essential to have formal tertiary qualifications to be a good leader.

Agree / Disagree

b. It is essential to have formal training of some kind to be a good leader.

Agree / Disagree

c. Experience is more important than tertiary qualifications to be a good leader.

Agree / Disagree

d. Experience is more important than training to be a good leader.

Agree / Disagree

Question 17

Do you have any additional comments that you think would be relevant to this study, including your thoughts on the transferability of yours or other leadership styles?

TRAITS

Sense of Justice
Honesty
Inspiring
Straightforwardness

Dependability
Forward-looking
Intelligent
Determination

Loyalty
Competent
Maturity

VALUES

Honesty
Ambitious
Creativity
Collaboration
Supportive

Courage
Self control
Justice
Competency

Fairness
Broad minded
Love
Autonomy

STYLES (See overleaf for definitions)

Charismatic leadership
Situational leadership
Transformational leadership
Autocratic leadership
Task-oriented leadership
Management by objectives

Participative leadership
Transactional leadership
Servant leadership
Laissez-faire leadership
Authoritative leadership

Transactional leadership - the idea that effective leadership is based on a reciprocal exchange between leaders and followers. Transactional leadership involves giving employees something in return for their compliance and acceptance of authority, usually in the form of incentives such as pay raises or an increase in status.

Transformational leadership - creates voluble and positive change in the followers. A transformational leader focuses on "transforming" others to help each other, to look out for each other, be encouraging, harmonious, and look out for the organization as a whole. In this leadership, the leader enhances the motivation, moral and performance of his follower group.

Charismatic leadership - Charismatic leadership is leadership based on the leader's ability to communicate and behave in ways that reach followers on a basic, emotional way, to inspire and motivate. We often speak of some sports and political leaders as charismatic (or not).

Situational leadership - This is a term that can be applied generically to a style of leadership, but that also refers to a recognised, and useful, leadership model. In simple terms, a situational leader is one who can adopt different leadership styles depending on the situation.

Autocratic leadership - This style is used when leaders tell their employees what they want done and how they want it accomplished, without getting the advice of their followers. Some of the appropriate conditions to use it is when you have all the information to solve the problem, you are short on time, and your employees are well motivated.

Task-oriented leadership - The task-oriented leader focuses on the job, and concentrates on the specific tasks assigned to each employee to reach goal accomplishment.

Management by Objectives - Management by objectives is a systematic and organized approach that allows management to focus on achievable goals and to attain the best possible results from available resources. It aims to increase organizational performance by aligning goals and subordinate objectives throughout the organization. Ideally, employees get strong input to identify their objectives, time lines for completion, etc. This style includes ongoing tracking and feedback in the process to reach objectives.

Participative Leadership - Consultative management method that encourages others to participate. Leadership decisions are achieved as the end result of group participation. Participative management is the process of consultative management.

Servant Leadership - Servant leadership is one of the most popular leadership models around today. The servant leader serves the people he/she leads which implies that they are an end in themselves rather than a means to an organizational purpose or bottom line. They devote themselves to serving the needs of organization members, focus on meeting the needs of those they lead, develop employees to bring out the best in them, coach others and encourage their self expression, facilitate personal growth in all who work with them, and listen and build a sense of community.

Laissez-faire leadership - also known as the "hands-off" style. It is one in which the manager provides little or no direction and gives employees as much freedom as possible. All authority or power is given to the employees and they must determine goals, make decisions, and resolve problems on their own.

Authoritative leadership - the ability to mobilize people towards a vision. This style is most effective when a new vision is needed or when the path to that vision is not always clear. One of the interesting aspects of this

style is that even though the leader is considered an authority, they allow the followers to figure out the best way to accomplish their goals.

LEADERSHIP SCENARIO 1

You are a senior management executive answering only to the General manager / owner in a large production company. Six months ago your employer appoints Bruno, her boyfriend, as your new sales department manager, Bruno is very flamboyant, loud and outgoing. Bruno was put in charge of your seven sales people, all of whom are young, aggressive and impressionable. Bruno was appointed because he had a track record of “getting the sales”. After six months of having him on the job, sales have increased about five percent, which is not as much as you and the management team had hoped. Meanwhile the disturbing trend is that sales staff are now dressing less conservatively, are becoming loud, have started using coarse language and have begun to tell potentially offensive jokes. Furthermore their expense reports seem to be getting larger and larger. Since they are representing you in the field, what actions, if any, will you take?

LEADERSHIP SCENARIO 2

In your spare time from dealing with Bruno, you are a scout leader with your local scout troop. You enjoy time away with your mix of impressionable young boys and girls. Your troop has worked well at the yearly jamboree often doing more than their share of work around the camp, to the extent that your troop are becoming a little disheartened that they are often working while others are having leisure time. Your efforts have not gone unnoticed however and your fellow leaders tell you confidentially that you are being nominated by your immediate superior for a prestigious national award which would assure wide media recognition and promotion in the scout movement, something you have always aspired to. This would mean leaving your current troop behind. The next day is a planned activity that your troop has been looking forward to and everyone is extremely excited about.

Your superior comes to you the next morning and informs you at the last moment as you are about to leave, that your troop have drawn the “short straw” again and must do unpleasant kitchen and camp duties whilst the other troops go swimming and play sports all day. You only have 10 minutes to do something about what you consider a huge injustice to your troop before everyone else, including your superior, leaves for the activities some miles away.