Part I
Leadership

2

A Critical Review of Leadership Theory

Beverly Alimo-Metcalfe

2.1 Introduction

This chapter adopts a critical approach to reviewing developments in leadership theory. It begins with a general overview of research relating to the evidence of an association between leadership and individual and organizational performance, before describing the main stages in the history of the study of this complex and fascinating subject.

2.1.1 The importance and the complexity of leadership research

It is hardly surprising that the topic of leadership is one of the most popular areas of study in the field of organizational behavior and organizational studies, since it is widely assumed that leadership affects the link between individual effectiveness and organizational performance (Barling et al., 1996; Bass, 1998; Crant, 2000; Keller, 2006; Yukl, 2010), in part as a result of having a significant impact on subordinates' attitudes to work, which, in turn, affect their work-related behaviors (e.g. Bass, 1998; Belschak & Den Hartog, 2010; Northouse, 2010; Rowe et al., 2005; Strauss et al., 2009).

2.1.2 Issues of leadership and performance measurement

There are, however, few studies that show a causal link between leadership and performance that is measured objectively, and for which the potentially confounding effect of contextual variables has been controlled (e.g. Jing & Avery, 2008; Keller, 2006). Of those studies which have examined the relationship between leadership and measures of effectiveness or performance, most have been cross-sectional in nature rather than longitudinal; thus causality cannot be inferred (Gardner et al., 2010; Hunt, 2004; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe & Gardner, 2000).

The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Leadership, Change, and Organizational Development, First Edition. Edited by H. Skipton Leonard, Rachel Lewis, Arthur M. Freedman, and Jonathan Passmore.

Several studies have used subjective assessments of effectiveness, by individuals who are also rating the leaders' behavior, style, or competencies. The potential influence of common-source and common-method variance is regularly cautioned by leadership researchers (e.g. Avolio et al., 1991; Barling et al., 2002; Chang et al., 2010; Jermier & Kerr, 1997; Waldman et al., 2001; Walumbwa et al., 2004), although Spector (2006) and Spector & Brannick (1995) assert that this may be overstated.

The validity of the outcome performance measurement, or "criterion" variable, is clearly a crucial issue (e.g. Dionne et al., 2002; Keller, 2006; Scherbaum et al., 2006), but the literature can be confusing in relation to the use of the term "performance." For example, some studies adopt it when referring to subjective measures of performance, as is the case where individuals rate their own or their unit's performance (e.g. Pillai & Williams, 2004), as opposed to assessing it using some objective measure of performance (e.g. Jing & Avery, 2008; Hoogh et al., 2004). Even when objective measures are adopted, there have been criticisms that the range of measures has been limited, for example to financial measures, such as net profit margin (Koene et al., 2002; Waldman et al., 2001) or business unit sales (e.g. Barling et al., 1996; Hoogh et al., 2004), or to nonfinancial measures such as customer or employee satisfaction, rather than adopting both types of outcome measure, which would strengthen criterion validity (cited in Jing & Avery, 2008, p. 73).

Other studies relating to "leader performance" or effectiveness are referring to subordinates' subjective ratings of the impact of their supervisor on their attitudes to work, or general views of their supervisor, such as ratings of "satisfaction with leadership style," the impact their supervisor has on their motivation, and their assessment of the "extra effort" they exert as a result (e.g. Bass, 1998; Judge & Bono, 2000; Judge et al., 2002; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe et al., 1996). The use of leadership performance in this case might, therefore, be regarded more accurately as an investigation of the construct validity of the model of leadership being assessed.

Other criticisms cited in the literature include: a lack of distinction between studies of leadership at the macro-level (e.g. organizational) versus the micro-level (individual or group) (Dansereau et al., 1984; House & Aditya, 1997), or inappropriately measuring and analyzing data or drawing inferences from the data (Yammarino et al., 2005; Yammarino & Dansereau, 2009); a disregard for the importance of the variable of social distance (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2005; Antonakis & Atwater, 2002; Avolio et al., 2004; Cole et al., 2009; Shamir, 1995; Waldman & Yammarino,1999); a narrowness of focus of researchers on a limited range of leadership paradigms (Jing & Avery, 2008), and related to this, a presumption of the generalizability of US research findings to a non-US context (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2001, 2005; House & Aditya, 1997; Hunt & Peterson, 1997; Smith & Bond, 1993); that research which has been based on all, or predominantly, male samples, has been unquestioningly applied to the general management population (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995, 2010, 2011; House & Aditya, 1997); a lack of regard for the importance of context (Avery, 2004; Bryman, 1996; Conger, 1998; Jing & Avery, 2008; House & Aditya, 1997; Liden & Antonakis, 2009; Lowe & Gardner, 2000); and the narrow scope of research, mainly on dyadic processes between leader and follower, which has neglected the influence of leadership in team-based contexts (Klein & House, 1995; Lim & Ployhart, 2004; Schaubroeck et al., 2007; Shamir, 1999; Yukl, 2010).

This chapter will critically review the key stages in the development of leadership theory.

2.2 Leadership: A Critical Review of the Literature

It has been suggested by Northouse (2010) that "Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (p.3). While this provides a useful starting point, it will be seen in the following sections that definitions have changed over time.

Since leadership must be viewed in the context of its time, it is important to bear in mind the fact that environmental factors such as social, technological, economic, political, and ecological change have a significant impact on what is meant by "leadership," the challenges it is addressing, and the resulting models that dominate any specific era. It is, however, also true that most of the published research has been undertaken in the US, and therefore it is US models that have dominated the "received wisdom" as to what is leadership.

The formal academic study of leadership, which began in the 1930s, is replete with theories, models, and approaches, some of which build upon and extend earlier approaches, and others of which directly challenge them. In analyzing this body of work, it is important to be aware of conceptual and methodological considerations.

During this 80+ year period, it is possible to distinguish five principal stages. The following sections describe these stages and take a critical look at their contributions to the development of leadership theory.

2.2.1 Stage 1: the "trait" theories

The major focus of the pioneering leadership researchers was to identify the personal qualities and traits that distinguished leaders from followers, the underlying premise being that leadership is innate, as opposed to learned. Among the traits that were investigated were "energy," "dominance," and "intelligence," but findings were inconsistent. This is probably not surprising, since the situation was not taken into account. Reviews by Stodgill (1948), Mann (1959), Gibb (1947), and Jenkins (1947) led to the conclusion that there were few, if any, traits that were universally associated with leader effectiveness. Although this led to the general abandonment of such investigations, Stodgill, who believed that the qualities, characteristics, and skills that a leader needs to possess are, to a large extent, determined by demands of the situation they face, urged researchers to study the nature of the interaction between certain situational variables and traits.

In their review of trait theory, House & Aditya (1997) remark that the early studies were conducted at a time when personality theory was not well evidenced by empirical studies, and test-measurement theory was in its infancy. It is also not well known that these early "trait studies were almost entirely based on samples of adolescents, supervisors and lower-level managers" (House & Aditya, 1997, p. 411).

A few decades later, there was a re-emergence of interest in the role of personal traits and appearing leader-like, especially in the wake of the "new paradigm" models of "charismatic–inspirational" leadership (e.g. Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; House, 1977). This was also true for the literature relating to "Implicit Leadership Theory," which asserts that most individuals, as a result of their socialization, have internalized beliefs about the characteristics and behaviors of what makes "a leader," which affect the way in which they behave in relation to their own leadership approach, and how they respond to individuals in leadership roles (Hollander & Julian, 1969; Lord et al., 1984; Lord et al., 1982). In their meta-analysis of trait studies, Lord et al. (1986) identified three traits which were significantly associated with followers' perceptions of leadership: "intelligence," "dominance," and "masculinity," the latter two of which clearly have implications for women in relation to being identified as having leadership potential (e.g. Fletcher, 2004; Lyness & Heilman, 2006; Schein, 2001).

More recently, writers concerned with identifying the "dark side" of leadership (e.g. Furnham, 2010; Hogan et al., 1994; Lipman-Blumen, 2004) have made a significant contribution to our understanding that the same personality traits which make some leaders attractive, such as charisma, inspiration, vision, courage, and resilience, can become a destructive force to those around them and their organization if they are exhibited in their extreme forms, and if there is a lack of concern for, or a lack of insight into, the impact they are having. This shall be discussed in more detail in Section 2.2.4.1.

2.2.2 Stage 2: the "behavioral" approach

The discouraging reviews of the 1940s served to divert the attention of psychologists away from the characteristics of who leaders were, to how they behaved *in relation to* influencing their followers. Studies were conducted in laboratory settings, in which behaviors were observed—mainly of students (House & Aditya, 1996)—and in field settings, in which individuals were asked to rate people in authority—typically someone at a supervisory level. These data were then related to various criteria of leader effectiveness (House & Aditya, 1996). Among the most important studies were those of Bales and colleagues at Harvard (Bales, 1954), Stodgill and colleagues at Ohio State University (Stodgill & Coons, 1957), and researchers at the University of Michigan (Kahn & Katz, 1953; Likert, 1961; Mann, 1965).

Such behavior was described as the "leadership style" adopted by the leader. Although well over 30 different models were developed, most can be described in terms of four styles: (1) *concern for task*—also called "production-orientated"; (2) *concern for people*—also called "employee-centered"; (3) *directive leadership*—also called "authoritarian" or "autocratic"; (4) *participative*—also called "democratic." In some studies, styles such as directive and participative were represented as discrete types of leadership; in others they were regarded as opposite poles of a single dimension. However, an individual may be highly participative in certain situations, but highly directive in others (Wright, 1996).

No consistent pattern emerged from studies investigating the impact of these leadership behaviors in relation to various criterion variables, including subordinate satisfaction, or a range of subordinate or supervisory effectiveness measures, including productivity (House, 1971; Larson et al., 1974; Yukl, 2010). Reasons for the inconsistency in findings include a multitude of factors, among them a failure to take account of the variables in the situation, the effect of any interaction between subordinate behaviors on the way in which the leadership style was manifested, and the nature of the criterion variable selected (e.g. Northouse, 2010; Yukl, 2010). Other reasons might relate to the validity of the measure adopted (Bass, 1990; Schriesheim et al., 1976). In common with the trait studies, leadership was studied mainly at the supervisory or junior management position.

Despite these limitations, the behavioral approach was valuable in that it broadened the focus of leadership research to include how leaders act in relation to their followers/subordinates, and distinctions were drawn between task-related behavior and relationship-related behavior, and directive versus participative styles. It also provided a tool for informing training and development. It was not, however, able to show how leadership behaviors are linked to performance outcomes; nor, unsurprisingly, did it succeed in identifying a universal style that would be effective in most situations.

2.2.3 Stage 3: the "situational" and "contingency" approaches

Towards the latter years of the 1960s, there was an increasing appreciation for understanding the importance of contextual factors in influencing the effectiveness of leadership behaviors, in particular variables associated with the specific task or project in which leaders were interacting with subordinates.

The situational models of leadership that emerged emphasized the importance of a range of variables, such as the levels of subordinate competence and confidence in the tasks they were performing, or their "maturity"/"developmental level" (Blanchard et al., 1993; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, 1988). Other models that were developed to support a manager in making the correct decision as to the leadership style to adopt incorporated additional factors unrelated to the subordinate, such as the amount of time available, the importance of the technical quality of the decision, and the extent to which the manager possessed sufficient information to make the appropriate decision (Vroom & Jago, 1988; Vroom & Yetton, 1973).

The strengths of the situational models are that they encourage managers to consider a range of variables when selecting an appropriate leadership style in any situation, and stress that flexibility in approach is key to effectively influencing the behavior of subordinates in achieving an objective. In addition, they provide practical guidance as to how to enact the style. The benefits to researchers include suggestions as to which variables might be important to consider when investigating leadership effectiveness.

While these models assume that managers, in the main, have the facility to modify their leadership style, one model in particular does not accept this premise. Fiedler's contingency model (Fiedler, 1964, 1967; Fiedler & Chemers, 1974) emerged from his research in, mainly, military organizations, in which he observed the styles of leaders in a variety of situations (Northouse, 2010). It is based on the proposition that a manager's leadership style depends on their personality (Fiedler, 1972) and is thus to a large extent inflexible. Therefore, what is critical to leader effectiveness is matching the leader to the situation, rather than vice versa.

Fiedler identified three variables which he believed to be of particular importance when creating the leader–situation match. These were *leader–member relations*—or the strength of warmth and loyalty between the leader and the follower, measured by the Least-Preferred Co-worker (LPC) Scale; *task structure*—or the degree to which there is only one specific way in which the task can be achieved successfully; and the *position power* of the leader—that is, the amount of authority they have to reward or discipline subordinates.

Conclusions as to the validity of the model are equivocal. For example, two meta-analyses found partial support for the theory (Peters et al., 1985; Strube & Garcia, 1981), but Vecchio (1983) challenged the findings on the basis of faulty selection of studies and inappropriate statistical analysis (House & Aditya, 1996), although this charge was refuted by Strube & Garcia (1983). More fundamentally, several researchers have questioned the construct validity of the LPC, which is a key component of the theory since it measures the "natural" style of the leader. Triandis (1993), for example, states, "The weakest point of the theory is that we do not *really* understand what LPC (least preferred co-worker) is" (p. 169). Wright (1996) refers to the LPC as "an enigmatic personality questionnaire"

(p. 53). Schriesheim & Kerr's (1977) remark that the LPC is a "measure in search of a meaning" (p. 23) would appear to aptly summarize these comments.

With respect to the contributions of Fiedler's model, it should be borne in mind that it was developed over half a century ago and is regarded as the first major situational model. Importantly, it initiated the switch from focusing purely on the personality traits of leaders, to emphasizing also the importance of contextual variables (Liden & Antonakis, 2009), and particularly the relationship between leader and follower.

In addition to the criticisms cited above, given that the model is based on the inflexibility of leadership style, if it were correct then individuals in leadership positions would have to be moved around an organization as the task structure and position power varied, which is hardly practical. Further, it does not take account of the characteristics of subordinates, including their skills and knowledge, and their preference for the leadership style of their supervisor/manager (Wright, 1996), but rather it appears to focus on the manager's "implicit notions of a preferred subordinate/followership." Nor does it reflect the evidence that leadership can be developed, or that the responsibilities and roles of a manager typically change when they are promoted.

2.2.3.1 LMX theory Although space does not allow a detailed description of the theory and research surrounding leader–member exchange (LMX) theory, which emerged from the vertical-linkage dyad model (Dansereau et al., 1975), it should be noted that this particular perspective on leadership contributed significantly to focusing on the nature of the dyadic interactions between leaders and their followers (Graen, 1976; Graen & Cashman, 1976). As the name suggests, this concerns an exchange between the parties, and one key result is the formation of in-groups and out-groups. More recent research has extended the theory by looking at the impact of empowerment as a moderator of the consequences of these relationships on attitudes to work, such as job satisfaction, and job performance and organizational citizenship behaviors (e.g. Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Harris et al., 2009; Northouse, 2010), and by relating the theory to leadership at the team level (Naidoo et al., 2008).

While LMX theory has played an important role in emphasizing the importance of the relationship between a leader and each of their followers, it is not without its critics. In brief, the criticisms include: that the emphasis on in-groups and out-groups can lead to discrimination, with those followers fortunate enough to enjoy a positive relationship with their leader receiving certain privileges, although this has been contested (e.g. Harter & Evanecky, 2002; Scandura, 1999); that there might be differences between the leader's perspective on the relationship and that of the follower; and that of the few studies that have compared leader and follower ratings of the relationship, a meta-analysis by Gerstner & Day (1997, cited in Schyns & Day, 2010) found that the average correlation was only .29, which should not come as a surprise given the findings from multisource feedback studies (e.g. Fleenor et al., 2010). There have also been criticisms of the content validity of the measures used in LMX research (Schriesheim et al., 2001), and whether the use of the unidimensional scale should be replaced by a multidimensional one (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

In the context of recent developments in leadership theory, moving towards the notion of leadership as a shared process (see later sections), it will be interesting to see whether this has any significant impact on the LMX theory.

It should be noted that the contingency and situational models were developed in the 1960s and early 1970s, by US researchers, at a time when the economy was booming in the West and when greater efficiency of production was the major focus of organizations.

They later came to be regarded as being concerned with "management," rather than "leadership" (Bryman, 1992, 1995; Northouse, 2010), since they were mainly focused on maintaining status quo, while enabling organizations to be more efficient and effective. This notion of leadership was inadequate in helping managers and organizations deal with the pace and magnitude of the changes which faced Western organizations in the recession following the oil crisis of 1973, coupled with the growing strength of competition from East Asian economies. A new notion of leadership was required to deal with continuous change and unpredictability.

2.2.4 Stage 4: the "charismatic–inspirational models"—"heroic" leadership

In response to these challenges, a number of US psychologists developed what are described as "new paradigm" models, with their emphasis on mobilizing an organization in some future direction and handling change (Bryman, 1993, 1996).

The models that were developed emphasized different aspects of "neo-charismatic" leadership (House & Aditya, 1997), including "charisma" (Conger, 1988, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House, 1977), "vision" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Sashkin, 1988; Tichy & Devanna, 1986), "transformation" and "transaction" (Bass, 1985, 1998; Kouzes & Posner, 1997).

A "charismatic" leader is seen as one who possesses certain personality characteristics and acts in ways that result in trust, obedience, identification with them, and confidence in success (e.g. Conger & Kanungo, 1988, 1998; House, 1977). In "visionary" leadership, "vision" refers to an attractive and believable future state, which organizational stakeholders will help to achieve (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Sashkin, 1988; Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

Recent reviews of published leadership research (e.g. Avolio et al., 2009; Gardner et al., 2010;) have stated that the most commonly adopted "neo-charismatic" model is Bass's model of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985, 1998). "Transformational" leaders are characterized by being able to motivate colleagues and followers to view their work from new perspectives; be aware of their team's and organization's mission or vision; attain higher levels of ability and potential; and look beyond their own interests towards those that will benefit the group (Bass, 1985). The model of transformational leadership comprises the following four transformational components: *idealized influence*—exhibiting high levels of integrity and providing a strong sense of mission, articulated in an exciting vision, which result in being admired and respected such that their followers wish to emulate them; *inspirational motivation*—communicating positive expectations of followers, which motivates and inspires those around them by providing meaning, optimism, and enthusiasm for the achievement of a shared vision; *intellectual stimulation*—encouraging followers to challenge assumptions and beliefs held by themselves, the organization, and the leader, and to reframe problems and approach old solutions in new ways; *individualized consideration*—actively developing the potential of followers by creating new opportunities for development, coaching, mentoring, and paying attention to followers' needs and desires.

The model also contains two transactional components. "Transactional" behaviors are based on an exchange relationship between leader and follower, or a quid pro quo, in return for the desired behaviors: *contingent reward*—the desired follower actions are rewarded, while disapproved actions are punished or sanctioned; *management by exception (active) and management by exception (passive)*—these are corrective transactional behaviors, which include critical feedback and negative reinforcement. The former involves a monitoring of performance, and intervention when judged appropriate; the latter involves correction only when problems emerge. Finally, "*laissez faire*"—a style of leadership that is, in fact, an abrogation of leadership, since there is an absence of any transaction. It is deemed to be most ineffective (Bass, 1998).

Transformational leadership is regarded as superior to transactional leadership because the latter results in expected outcomes, whereas the former results in performance that achieves "beyond expectations" (Bass, 1985). Bass (1997) argued that, while context and contingencies are a source of variance, the fundamental phenomena transcend organizations and countries.

Given the popularity of the neo-charismatic theories and the ubiquitous use of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) as a research instrument, it is hardly surprising that there is a wealth of research on the subject. Lowe and Gardner's (2000) content analysis of articles published in the highly respected *Leadership Quarterly* between 1990 and 2000 revealed that 34% were based on these models; however, in a similar review a decade later, this had fallen to 12.6% (Gardner et al., 2010), largely due to the fact that "a plethora of competing perspectives had emerged over the past decade to challenge these perspectives, suggesting that diverse seeds for a potential paradigm shift have been planted" (Reichers & Schneider, 1990, cited in Gardner et al., 2010, p. 936).

One of the major strengths of Bass's (1985) model of transformational leadership is that it shifted the direction of leadership thinking from a utilitarian focus on influencing others by adopting a transactional approach between leader and follower, to an emphasis on the importance of leadership as having a moral dimension and being concerned with the "greater good." It also stresses a focus on the needs of "followers" by providing a sense of meaning in what they do in relation to their organizational role, and actively seeking opportunities to develop them (e.g. Bass, 1985, 1998). There is evidence from studies using the MLQ that transformational leadership is significantly associated with subordinate satisfaction, motivation, commitment, and performance (e.g. Bass, 1998; Lowe et al., 1996; Skakon et al., 2010; Tims et al., 2011; Yukl, 1999).

2.2.4.1 Criticism of "neo-charismatic" leadership models (referred to earlier as the "charismatic–inspirational" models) Various models that make up the "neo-charismatic" approach have been criticized on conceptual and methodological grounds (e.g. Bryman, 1996; Northouse, 2010; Yukl, 1999), while Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe (2001, 2005) have expressed concern about the assumed generalizability of models derived from the US private and military sectors to a non-US and public-sector context. North American researchers have also raised the issue of a US-centric approach to leadership (e.g. Gardner et al., 2010; House & Aditya, 1997; Hunt & Peterson, 1997; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Smith & Bond, 1993; Triandis, 1993).

Conceptually, "new paradigm" models have been criticized for resulting in models of "distant" (Shamir, 1995), often "heroic" leadership, since they were based largely on observations of senior or top-level executives, yet were commonly adopted, uncritically, in research and leadership-development activities that related to "close" or "nearby leaders," such as individuals' immediate bosses (e.g. Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2005; Mintzberg, 1999; Northouse, 2010)—an example of the relevance of the level-of-analysis issue mentioned earlier. The literature on transformational leadership has been criticized for lacking conceptual clarity and for treating transformational leadership as a personality trait or predisposition rather than as a behavior which can be learned (e.g. Bryman, 1992)—a view that was rebutted by Bass and Avolio (1993).

The construct, convergent, and discriminant validity of the MLQ, which is the most commonly adopted instrument for assessing transformational leadership, have attracted criticism from researchers who have found high levels of intercorrelations between the four supposedly distinct transformational dimensions of the model (e.g. Carless, 1998; Tejeda et al., 2001; Judge & Piccolo, 2004), and even between the scales measuring the transformational dimensions and the transactional dimensions of contingent reward (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). In their investigation of the validity of the MLQ, which they describe as "the most thorough and comprehensive meta-analysis of the transformational or charismatic, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership literatures" (p. 756), Judge and Piccolo found evidence that the transactional dimension of contingent reward yielded validity coefficients of comparable or even higher value in predicting some of the criterion variables than was predicted by the transformational scores. This finding contradicts one of the fundamental assertions of the model, that transformational leadership is superior to transactional leadership (Bass, 1985, 1998).

Emphasis on the "charismatic" characteristics of leaders, which represents a return to an interest in the association between personality and leadership, has also come in for closer scrutiny as awareness has grown of the "dark side of charisma" (e.g. Conger, 1990; Furnham, 2005; Hogan et al., 1990; Howell, 1988; Yukl, 1999). Some researchers have urged organizations not just to focus on identifying the presence of certain positive characteristics, but equally to ensure the absence of "dark-side" traits, particularly those that alienate other colleagues, most importantly subordinates (Hogan et al., 1994; Hogan & Hogan, 2001). House & Howell (1992) distinguish between two kinds of charismatic leadership: personalized (self-aggrandizing, exploitative, authoritarian) and socialized (altruistic, collectively oriented, egalitarian) (House & Aditya, 1997). Bass (1998) was mindful of the way in which the attraction of transformational leadership could be manipulated to serve the needs of the leader, rather than their co-workers/direct reports and their organization, and he coined the term describing such individuals as "pseudotransformational."

Yukl (1999) warns that some charismatic leaders use manipulative behaviors such as "exaggerating positive achievements and taking unwarranted credit for achievements," "covering up mistakes and failures," and "blaming others for mistakes" (p. 296). In a cross-sectional study, Tosi et al. (2004) found no evidence of a relationship between the degree of perceived charisma of CEOs of Fortune 500 companies and their companies' performances, but interestingly, did find a significant positive relationship between their "charisma" rating and their remuneration package. They add a warning that boards of organizations "should be a bit more circumspect in advocating charisma as a criterion for the selection of CEOs" (p. 414).

This last point has important implications for those involved in selection processes. Early leadership research focusing on the relationship between personality and those who were observed as emerging as leaders in unstructured/leaderless groups found that traits that typically emerged included: dominance, extraversion, sociability, ambition or achievement, and self-confidence (Mann, 1959; Stodgill, 1948). Subsequent research obtained similar findings (e.g. Gough, 1990; Kenny & Zaccaro, 1983; Lord et al., 1986; Rueb & Foti, 1990). These findings relate, in turn, to the notion of Implicit Leadership Theory (ILT), referred to in Section 2.2.1; that is, we attribute leadership ability to individuals who are seen as possessing the characteristics that are consistent with our notions of what a leader should be like. For many people, these characteristics reflect aspects of being charismatic. Hogan et al. (1994) warn of the potentially damaging consequences of not guarding against the inordinate influence of the attraction of charismatic candidates in selection processes.

Further criticism, voiced by Yukl (1999), is that the transformational model is elitist and antidemocratic, and suffers from "heroic leadership" bias, because the theory stresses that it is the leader who influences the followers to do exceptional things—a perspective it shares in common with both "charismatic" and "visionary" models. Bass & Avolio (1993) and Avolio (1999) have contested the criticism of elitism, arguing that transformational leadership can be directive and participative as well as democratic and authoritarian. Northouse (2010), however, maintains that, given the elitist nature of the original samples adopted in developing the model (see later), the criticism of elitism raises valid questions about the generalizability of the model of transformational leadership. A more fundamental criticism of these models is that they fail to acknowledge the reciprocal influence of the follower–leader relationship or the concept of shared leadership, which will be discussed Section 2.2.8.

Although implicitly value-laden, "transformational" leadership has the potential for both exponential benefit and catastrophic failure, depending on the ethical disposition of the leader (e.g. O'Connor et al., 1995, cited in Lowe & Gardner, 2000, p. 511).

Methodologically, several neo-charismatic models have been criticized for being based on noninclusive samples with respect to gender and ethnicity (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2005). This applies to the original research of Bass and Avolio (based on an original sample of $n = 70$ male senior South African executives, of whom one was black, and all of whom were male). In relation to ethnicity, Booysen's (2002) and Booysen and Nkomo's (2010) research presents evidence of differences in notions of leadership between black and white managers in South Africa, while the Globe Project has pointed to differences as well as similarities in the "operationalization" of leadership constructs such as "charisma" and what is regarded as culturally appropriate behavior of leadership among managers in different countries and cultures (Den Hartog et al., 1999; House et al., 1999). Several writers have documented the history of leadership research from the perspective of gender and concluded that there has been a distinct male gender bias with respect to the construction of leadership (e.g. Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995, 2005; Calas & Smircich, 1996; Fletcher, 2004; Heilman, 1983; Jacobson & Jacques, 1990; Kark, 2004; Schein, 1994). They have also found evidence of gender-based differences in implicit notions of leadership (e.g. Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995, 2005, 2010, 2011; Eagly, 2007; Schein, 1994, 2001, 2006). It has been argued that the ramifications of such bias for women, in relation to organizational selection, promotion, appraisal, and performance-evaluation practices, are considerable (e.g. Alimo-Metcalfe, 1994, 2004, 2010; Eagly et al., 1992; Fletcher, 2004; Foschi, 2000; Lyness & Heilman, 2006; Pazy & Oron, 2001).

The conclusion from such research is that unless the original sample on which a model of leadership is developed reflects the diversity of the general population, the model developed will serve to perpetuate the perspective, values, and behaviors of the dominant group, to the exclusion of nonmembers of that group.

Finally, the methodology adopted in developing many of the neo-charismatic models was often based on self-reports; that is, on asking top or senior managers to identify the characteristics that make leaders, such as themselves, successful. In their review of the self–other rating agreement in leadership, Fleenor et al. (2010) state that it is generally accepted that self-ratings of leadership are susceptible to leniency bias and therefore are not considered to be accurate predictors of leadership outcomes, citing several studies that have provided evidence of their lack of validity in relation to others' ratings or objective measures of outcome criteria (Ashford, 1989; Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988; Mabe & West, 1982; Yammarino & Atwater, 1993, 2003). It is interesting to note that Fleenor et al. (2010) list several factors that tend to be associated with "inflated" self-ratings, which include: being male, older, and at a senior level of management. These biographical characteristics are similar to those in the typical population on whom the neo-charismatic models have been based.

2.2.5 Stage 5: post-heroic models of leadership

In the wake of a series of corporate scandals, including the fall of Enron, AmCom, and Lehman Brothers, and the global banking crisis, which is regularly attributed to the greed and hubris of those in the most senior organizational roles, there was growing dissatisfaction with the legacy of the neo-charismatic models, which are commonly referred to as models of "heroic" leadership.

One notable response to these models has been the popularity, in both the professional managerial and academic publications, of a new genre of leadership texts, which have denounced the notion of attributing organizational success or failure to the presence of a "saviour" figure as crass, or expressed in academic terms, as "the romance of leadership" (Bligh et al., 2011; Meindl et al., 1985). Others have promoted the notion of "quiet leadership" (Badaracco, 2002) and "managing quietly" (Mintzberg, 1999) and the ethical responsibilities of leadership, some of whose publications predate the "heroic" models. Most notable of these is Robert Greenleaf, who coined the term "servant leadership" in the 1970s, which he conceives of in terms of integrity, selfless service to others, and power sharing (Greenleaf, 1970, 1996). There is an increasing interest in comparing the values of servant leadership, and its principles, to more recent models of leadership, such as the transformational model (e.g. Stone et al., 2004). Liden and colleagues (2008) have developed a seven-factor measure of servant leadership, which was found to "make a unique contribution beyond transformational leadership and LMX in explaining community citizenship behaviors, in-role performance, and organizational commitment" (p. 161).

New notions of leadership have evolved which emphasize the ethical behavior of leaders, while growing attention is being paid to the conceptualization of leadership as a social process; that is, as dynamic and fluid. Leadership is increasingly regarded as not being about "doing to" others, but about what emerges from the way people "do with" others; that is, how we work with and relate to each other, as colleagues. These include models of "ethical," "authentic," and "distributed" leadership.

2.2.6 Ethical leadership

Early models of leadership were concerned with increasing efficiency in production-focused contexts (e.g. behavioral, situational), and later models with the need to cope with ambiguity, greater competition, and change (namely, neo-charismatic). However, following the disaster of the global economic crisis, the major concern is not simply economic survival but also restoring trust in leaders and "doing leadership differently"—by stressing the importance of a values-based approach and, importantly, the integrity of those in leadership positions.

In the wake of the furor following the collapse of Enron and other major scandals, several commentators have blamed the popularity of the neo-charismatic models for promoting a highly egocentric approach to leadership. In a chapter published posthumously, UK scholar Ian Mangham (2011) describes the "late twentieth-century business leader" as operating in a culture "that emphasizes individualism, aggression, ruthless behavior, risk-taking, competitiveness and the importance of short-term results, whilst paying lip service to the moral dimension of business" (p. 51). Much of the blame for this moral decay has been directed at the education provided by business schools, which "not only fails to improve the moral character of students, it actually weakens it" (Etzioni, 2002) by promoting the principle that the main responsibility of business is to maximize shareholder value. Some writers have directed their disapproval at "elite" UK and US business schools and the models of leadership they have promulgated uncritically over the last 2 decades (Salaman, 2011; Tourish et al., 2010; Tourish & Vatcha, 2005). Salaman (2011) goes so far as to blame the world recession that began in 2008 on "the qualities and behaviors adoringly associated with this conception of leadership" (p. 57).

While it might be tempting to attribute the blame for such disasters on a body of literature promulgating a particular approach to leadership, for example Bass's (1985) model of transformational leadership, that would be far too simplistic an argument, and moreover a travesty of the values underlying the original conceptualization of the model (see Bass, 1985, 1998; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999).

When critically examining any model of leadership, leadership should be seen in the context of the time in which it emerged. Bass's model was formed, at least in part, in response to what he believed to be the limitations of the situational and contingency models, which emphasized the use of contingent reinforcement as the essential activity of leadership (Bass, 1985, p. xiii). He encouraged a very new perspective of leadership, in which "Managers who aspire to become transformational leaders must pay attention to each of their subordinates, sharing their concerns and development needs, and treating them as individuals" (p. xiv). These were entirely new concepts in relation to the role and activities of leadership, which had been characterized in terms of a transactional, utilitarian relationship between boss and subordinate. Bass was aware of the seduction of the attraction of transformational leaders, noting that "if leaders can command such love, trust and confidence, they can also use their power for evil ends, for selfish aggrandizement at the expense of others, as well as for good, for satisfying the needs of their followers" (p. xiv). Similarly, other neo-charismatic theorists, including Conger & Kanungo (1988, 1998), were aware that charismatic leaders could use their influence to exploit followers for their selfish gain.

Turning to recent developments in the literature regarding the importance of ethics in the practice of leadership, some researchers have become interested in investigating ethical leadership behaviors as a component of leadership, or have sought to explore ethical leadership as a particular style of leadership (Kalshoven et al., 2011).

2.2.6.1 Models of "ethical" leadership One example of the latter approach has been the model of ethical leadership developed by Brown and Treviño and colleagues (Brown & Treviño, 2006; Brown et al., 2005; Treviño et al., 2003). Its basis is Bandura's notion of social-learning theory (Bandura, 1986), which posits that behavior is influenced by a combination of the influence of one's external environment and intrapersonal psychological factors. Brown et al. (2005) define the concept of ethical leadership as "the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making" (p. 120). The defining characteristic of "ethical" leadership is consistent with the principle on which "transformational" and "authentic" leadership is based—that is, acting for the greater good (cf. Burns, 1978)—in that it places the good of those who are led over the self-interest of the leader, and can be related to the concept of "leader as servant" (Greenleaf, 1970, 1996). Ethical leaders are characterized as honest, caring individuals who make decisions based on fairness, and who not only frequently refer to ethical standards, but also use appropriate rewards and punishments (a *transactional* approach) to reinforce them. Critically, their behavior is consistent with the views they espouse (Brown & Treviño, 2006; Brown et al., 2005; Treviño et al., 2000, 2003).

Brown & Treviño (2006) propose a range of individual and contextual variables that influence the behaviors of ethical leadership and its impact on follower motivation, satisfaction, and commitment. The development of the Ethical Leadership Scale (ELS) was based on initial exploratory research (Treviño et al., 2000, 2003) into the nature of ethical leadership, which involved asking 20 senior executives and 20 ethics/compliance officers, using structured interviews, to consider an ethical leader with whom they had worked and "to answer broad questions about the characteristics, behaviors, and motives of that leader" (Brown & Treviño, 2006, p. 596). Augmenting the data collected with information from a literature review, a 10-item ELS was developed, which was tested in a range of construct-validation studies (p. 570). Findings from these studies include that "subordinates' perceptions of ethical leadership predict satisfaction with the leader, perceived leader effectiveness, willingness to exert extra effort on the job, and willingness to report problems to management." (p. 597). Brown and Treviño describe the shared and distinguishing characteristics of ethical leadership, Bass's model of transformational leadership, and the notion of authentic leadership (p. 597).

Kalshoven and colleagues (Kalshoven & Den Hartog, 2009; Kalshoven et al., 2011) have expressed their reservations as to the value of the ELS as a unidimensional measure of ethical leadership in providing an understanding of how ethical leadership contributes to leader effectiveness, because it combines what they have found to be three distinct dimensions of the construct (De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2008). These are: *fairness*—acting fairly and honestly; *power sharing*—listening to followers' ideas and opinions and allowing followers to be involved in decision making concerning their work; and *role clarification*—communicating openly and clarifying responsibilities and roles.

In a study exploring the possible mediation effects of prototypicality (the extent to which a leader's behavior is regarded as exemplifying how group members should behave) and trust in a leader, on the relationship between ethical leader behavior and perceived leader effectiveness, Kalshoven and Den Hartog analyzed data from $n = 244$ direct reports rating reporters' line managers (two direct reports per manager) on two instruments. Leadership effectiveness was assessed by three measures, including: (1) certain items from the MLQ on leader effectiveness; (2) a measure of trust in the leader (Cook & Wall, 1981); and prototypicality, which was assessed with three items adapted from Platow & van Knippenberg (2001). McAllister (1995) distinguished between cognitive (character) and affective (relational) trust, with the latter as the particular focus for this measure. The researchers found that there was a relationship between ethical leader behavior and being perceived as an effective leader; prototypicality and trust mediated this relationship. In support of their argument that there are three dimensions of ethical leadership, Kalshoven and Den Hartog found separate relationships between the variables (see Kashoven & Den Hartog, 2009 for details). More recent work by Kalshoven et al. (2011) led to the identification of a further four dimensions of ethical leader behavior—*people orientation*, *integrity*, *ethical guidance*, and *concern for sustainability*—and the development and validation of the Ethical Leadership at Work Questionnaire (ELW).

As Kashover & Den Hartog (2009) point out, since their study was cross-sectional, causal relationships could not be inferred. There is a need for longitudinal research into perceptions of ethical leadership behavior, perceptions of leader effectiveness, and objective outcome measures, with an attempt to control for a range of contextual variables. It would also be useful to gather data on "effectiveness" from a range of different sources, for example by using 360/multisource feedback instruments, which include not only the typical range of internal raters, but also relevant external-stakeholder ratings.

2.2.6.2 Issues to consider in relation to ethical leadership In relation to the development and conceptualization of any model of ethical leadership, at least two matters are worth considering.

Brown and Treviño do not provide biographical details of the sample of senior executives and ethics/compliance officers on whose descriptions of ethical leaders their report was based. Since gender has been found to relate to how ethical decisions are construed and moral dilemmas analyzed, this information is important. In the development of the ELS, Kalshoven et al. (2011) augmented analysis of the relevant extant literature with data collected via interviews with a Dutch sample of eight managers and seven employees (43% and 50% male, respectively).

GENDER AND ETHICS In her book *In a Different Voice*, Carol Gilligan points out that Kohlberg's classic theory of moral development (Kohlberg, 1958, 1973; Kohlberg & Turiel, 1971) reflected a masculine perspective of morality, not simply because of his gender, but because he based his interviews on 72 male (US) adolescents. She asserts that a masculine orientation of moral reasoning revolves around rules, regulations, rights and principles, and impersonal notions of formal justice, whereas a feminine perspective on morality focuses on relational principles and the ethics of care and compassion, and is more concerned with contextual, affiliative factors. One wonders whether the different tenor and emphasis of the US and Dutch models of ethical leadership were in any way influenced by cultural or gender differences in the original samples. Kalshoven et al. (2011, p. 66) state that the low power-distance aspect of Dutch culture might have affected their findings.

Gilligan's work spawned research examining whether there is a significant relationship between gender and how ethical and moral decisions are made. The results have proved to be equivocal, with some studies finding that women are rated higher on ethical and moral decision making, across a range of occupational groups and general population samples (e.g. Carnes & Keithley, 1992; Chonko & Hunt, 1985; Cole & McQuinn, 1992; Dawson, 1997; Ferrell & Skinner, 1988; Ricklets, 1983), and others finding no significant difference (e.g. Dubinsky & Levy, 1985; Fritzsche, 1988; Kidwell et al., 1987; Singhapakdi & Vitell, 1990). Studies that have focused on student populations have yielded a similar pattern of variations in findings (see Dawson, 1997 for details).

BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS Since it is reasonable to assume that many business students have the ambition to become organizational leaders, it is interesting to note that business-studies students have been found in several studies to score lower on ethical attitudes than non-business students (e.g. Crown & Spiller, 1998; Klein et al., 2006; Timiraos, 2002). Worryingly, it would appear that there is evidence that students who cheat in school or college are likely to cheat in the workplace (e.g. Callahan, 2004; Granitz & Loewy, 2007; McCabe et al., 2006). These findings have implications for researchers who conduct studies relating to ethics on such student populations.

In their article on business ethics and gender, McCabe et al. (2006) assert that "corruption and bribery are among the most important business ethics issues faced by companies today and that bribery causes serious economic, political and environmental damage. In addition, most US corporations demonstrate little or no connection between ethics, corporate social responsibility and compliance efforts" (p. 109).

Against this backcloth, the results relating to business students might be regarded as somewhat depressing. McCabe et al. recommend, among others things, that those involved in business education provide opportunities for students to consider the consequences of the ethical decision-making behaviors, and that organizations consider the associated traits and values, and related values of egalitarianism, when determining their recruitment and reward practices.

The developing field of ethical leadership, and future research on the effect of ethical leadership on leader, team, and organizational effectiveness, can make a significant contribution to these activities.

2.2.7 Authentic leadership

The development of the theory of authentic leadership emerged as another response to the demand for greater attention to be paid to the importance of integrity and transparency in business and public life, and the means of holding leaders accountable for their behaviors and actions.

The authentic-leadership theory was developed by Avolio and colleagues (Avolio et al., 2007; Gardner et al., 2005), who state that it emerged over several years "from the intersection of the leadership, ethics, and positive organizational behavior and scholarship literatures" (Walumbwa et al., 2008, p. 92). They also point out that it is still in its early stages of development, and argue that evidence from a range of disciplines, including social, cognitive, and positive psychology and organizational studies, have revealed the benefits of understanding the nature of authenticity and its positive effects on individuals' self-esteem, well-being, and performance (e.g. Grandey et al., 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2001). While recognizing that the concept of authenticity is derived from the Greek word meaning "be true to oneself," Walumbwa and his colleagues assert that its application to modern notions of leadership implies a multidimensional construct of which being true to oneself is only one component (Walumbwa et al., 2008).

Authentic leadership shares some features in common with the model of ethical leadership, perhaps most important of which are altruism (Brown & Treviño, 2006) and a strong internal moral perspective (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; May et al., 2003; Walumbwa et al., 2008). It has been defined as "a pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self development" (Walumbwa et al., 2008, p. 94). Key characteristics of authentic leaders are that they exhibit a pattern of openness and clarity in their behavior towards others, by sharing the information needed to make decisions, accepting others' inputs, and providing constructive feedback to their followers (Avolio et al., 2004; Gardner et al., 2005). The theory also stresses the importance of leader and follower development as a key aspect of the definition (Walumbwa et al., 2008).

The initial development of the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) (Avolio et al., 2007) was based on reviews of the literature from published sources and dissertations, discussions with graduate students and faculty working in the area of leadership research, and the comparison of categories emerging from these data-collecting activities with a content analysis of experienced doctoral students' descriptions of authentic leaders. A review of the literature was then conducted in relation to ethical and transformational leadership, creating a new pool of items to be content analyzed by academic faculty and doctoral students in relation to the four categories (Walumbwa et al., 2008).

In a series of validation studies, the contribution of the ALQ to explaining variance in three dependent variables—organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Wayne et al., 1997), organizational commitment (OC) (Mowday et al., 1979), and satisfaction with one's supervisor (Smith Kendall & Hulin, 1969)—was compared with the assessment of ethical leadership, using the 10-item measure developed by Brown et al., (2005), and transformational leadership, as assessed by the MLQ Form 5X (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The ALQ was found to contribute unique additional variance in predicting the three dependent variables (Walumbwa et al., 2008).

On the basis of a confirmatory factor analysis of the pool of 16 items, four scales emerged: leader self-awareness, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, and balanced processing. Walumbwa et al. (2008) pointed out, however, that the four factors "are not independent and that a single second-order factor accounts for this dependence. Thus, our results suggest that it might not be reasonable to conceptualize the measures as assessing entirely separate and distinct constructs. Moreover, the relatively high convergent validity among the factors of self-awareness, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, and balanced processing suggests that they convey less unique information as they form a higher order construct" (p. 101).

Similar to comparisons made by Brown & Trevino (2006), Walumbwa and colleagues also offer a summary description of the conceptual overlap and distinctions between ethical, transformational, and authentic leadership theories (see Walumbwa et al., 2008).

Given the concern for greater integrity and transparency in modern leaders, and the promise offered by these models in exploring these topics, it would be interesting to have known the results of an exploratory factor analysis of the combined items from the ALQ, MLQ, and ELS (and ELW), and whether any new conceptualizations of values-based leadership behaviors emerged, and to have then examined their impact on various criteria.

As was stated in relation to ethical leadership, it would be useful, and indeed important, to include details of the biographical characteristics of the sample of faculty and students (and the subjects of their research) employed in the development of this model, since age, gender, ethnic background, and occupational group may possibly, or even probably, have influenced the constructs of leadership.

2.2.8 Distributed leadership

In parallel with the developments of the ethical and authentic "post-heroic" models of leadership, which have focused on the values base of leadership, there has been a fundamental paradigm shift in thinking about the nature of what leadership is in knowledge-based economies. As Margaret Wheatley (2001) states, organizations are trying to manage knowledge, which is "inherently invisible, incapable of being quantified, and born in relationships, not statistics." This requires organizations to create the environment in which human potential is realized by working together in collaboration, generating or applying knowledge (e.g. Kanter, 2001; Meyerson, 2000), and creating what some refer to as social capital (e.g. Bilhuber Galli & Müller-Stewens, 2011; Day, 2000). The implications for leadership are considerable.

Unlike the models of ethical and authentic leadership, which still focus very clearly on the notion of leadership as a function of individuals occupying certain organizational roles, the concept of "distributed leadership" (DL) is grounded in the notion of leadership as a fluid and emergent property of a social process (Spillane, 2006), enacted by groups of individuals, or a network of interacting individuals (Gronn, 2000). DL conceptually overlaps with other approaches of a similar tenor, including the notions of "shared" (Pearce & Conger, 2003), "collaborative" (e.g. Raelin, 2006), and "democratic" leadership (Geer, 1996). Thorpe et al. (2011) assert that the terms "distributed" and "shared" leadership denote different, though related, concepts. DL is best regarded as describing a "*structural*" arrangement, whereby leadership responsibilities are delegated to individuals in different roles and at different levels in an organization; indeed, one of its strongest proponents describes it as "a new architecture for leadership" (Gronn, 2000). On the other hand, shared leadership describes a *process* through which leadership behavior is enacted.

Fletcher (2004), who uses the term "post-heroic" leadership rather "distributed," believes that this conceptualization of leadership has three characteristics: (1) *leadership as practice*—shared and distributed; this moves it from the study of the characteristics of individuals in formal leadership roles "to conceptualize leadership as a set of shared practices that can and should be enacted by people at all levels" (p. 648); (2) *leadership is a social process*—"something that occurs in and through relationships and networks of influence" (p. 649); (3) *leadership as outcome*—"The kinds of social interactions that can be called leadership result in learning and growth for the organization as well as the people involved" and "that depends on the ability to create conditions where new knowledge—collective learning—can be co-created and implemented" (p. 649).

This perspective on defining leadership transforms the notion of "follower" from one of passive recipient in the leadership relationship to one of key actor in "doing leadership." DL also transforms the status of "situation" from a mere contextual variable to the locus of leadership. For example, Spillane, a leading writer in the field of DL, regards "situation" as an important component of understanding leadership practice, stating: "My argument is not simply that situation is important to leadership practice, but that it actually constitutes leadership practice—situation defines leadership practice in interaction with leaders and followers. This way of thinking about situation differs substantially from prior work" (Spillane, 2006, p. 145).

There has been a strong tradition of applying the principles of DL in the education sector, and especially in relation to school leadership, where there is a wealth of literature on the subject (e.g. Bolden, 2011; Gronn, 2004, 2008; Harris, 2008; Spillane 2006; Spillane et al., 2001), but there has been increasing interest from other sectors (e.g. Thorpe et al., 2011). As far as empirical validation is concerned, most of this literature emanates from studies in schools relating to student learning, teacher effectiveness, and school improvement, and findings are mixed (see Bolden, 2011 for a review). Bolden also cites research which has suggested that the distribution of leadership can have a negative effect on team performance and lead to a reduced sense of stability and security and "boundary management issues" (Bolden, 2011, pp. 158–259). Other commentators have identified concerns in relation to how DL is adopted (e.g. Leithwood et al., 2006; Wright, 2008).

Space does not permit a comprehensive discussion of DL, but given the opportunities that it offers to explore a wholly new paradigm of leadership, and the possibilities it might offer in maximizing the realization of human potential in organizations facing the challenges of operating in knowledge-based economies, it undoubtedly deserves greater attention from researchers and practitioners.

Although researchers and commentators in the field of DL are critical of the inordinate emphasis on leader-centric models of leadership, many of whom are cited in the previous section, several are concerned that DL not be seen as the panacea for leadership (e.g. Bolden, 2011). Among the myths of DL that Spillane & Diamond (2007) dispel are (1) that DL is the new template for leadership and management; (2) that it disaffirms the need for a formal leader; and (3) that everyone is a leader (cited in Bolden, 2011, p. 257).

Formal leaders are still required to exercise their responsibility in managing staff and achieving organizational goals. The question then becomes for psychologists, how can leadership best be enacted by these individuals, such that they can create a culture in which the potential for DL is achieved, and which creates the conditions that encourage, facilitate, and sustain innovation, exploitation of ideas, and collective learning (Yukl, 1999).

It would seem reasonable to assume that for DL to be enacted effectively requires, or is more likely to succeed if there is, a high level of willingness among individuals to engage in activities that support both individual and organizational growth; indeed, Fletcher (2004) states this as a condition of such leadership. This brings us to the literature relating to employee engagement, which has become a major area of interest for organizations, not least because it has been found to be significantly associated with individual well-being and performance, and positive organizational outcomes, including low turnover and absenteeism, high organizational commitment, and superior performance (e.g. Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2008; Bakker, 2009; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009).

2.2.9 Engaging leadership

Organizational psychologists have long been aware of the importance of employee attitudes to work in affecting levels of performance (e.g. Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Subsequent analyses by Judge et al. (2001) have found a significant relationship between job attitudes and individual levels of performance, while Harter & Schmidt (2008) add that this relationship extends to organizational outcomes such as increased profit, sales, and customer ratings, fewer accidents, and reduced staff turnover (Harter et al., 2002, 2010). Harter & Schmidt (2008) add that, "These practically important relationships are likely a reflection of differences in level of cognitive and emotional involvement and enthusiasm employees have for their work and companies, leading to discretionary effort, which in turn leads to a host of positive business outcomes" (p. 36).

Discretionary effort is at the heart of the potency of engagement in supporting the success of organizations.

Employee engagement is used at different times to refer to psychological states, traits, and behaviors, as well as their antecedents and outcomes. For example, Kahn (1990) regards engagement as the "harnessing of organizational members' selves to their work role. In engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during their role performance" (p. 694). Schaufeli et al. (2002) regard employee engagement as "a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption" (p. 74), while Wellings & Concelman (2005) suggest that engagement is "an amalgam of commitment, loyalty, productivity and ownership … [and that it is] the elusive force that motivates employees to higher (or lower) levels of performance."

Some psychologists prefer to operationalize the exercise of discretionary behavior as "proactivity" (e.g. Belschak & Den Hartog, 2010; Crant, 2000; Frese & Fay, 2001; Parker, 2000; Sonnentag, 2003; Strauss et al., 2009). Den Hartog & Belschak (2007) focused on "personal initiative," adopting the definition created by Frese & Fay (2001) that this is "work behavior characterized by its self-starting nature, by its proactive approach and by being persistent in overcoming difficulties that arise in the pursuit of a goal" (cited in Den Hartog & Belschak, 2007, p. 601). Crant (2000) defined "proactive behavior" as "taking the initiative in improving current circumstances; it involves challenging the status quo rather than passively adapting to present conditions" (p. 436). Such behavior can also be seen in the form of: adapting to new circumstances; offering to collaborate with others; putting in extra effort; increased personal, team, or organizational efficiency; innovation; and talking enthusiastically about one's work, team, or organization (e.g. Thomas et al., 2010).

Strauss et al. (2009) maintain that prior to their investigation of the effect of transformational leadership on proactivity, there was no evidence of the influence of leadership, citing Frese et al. (1999) and Parker et al. (2006). Their own survey study did find evidence that transformational leadership had a significant impact on employee proactivity, but also that level of leadership was an important factor in distinguishing the form and specific aspect of impact. Leaders at a team level appear to facilitate proactivity by increasing employees' confidence to initiate change, whereas transformational leadership of organizational leaders (i.e. senior managers) seems to increase proactivity by enhancing employees' commitment to the organization.

While this finding provides valuable information regarding the association between leadership and proactivity and/or engagement, criticism of the instrument (the MLQ) on which the US model of transformational leadership is based (described in Section 2.2.4.1) is relevant. Most pertinent, in this context, is the fact that it was developed from the perceptions of "distant" leadership, on predominantly male samples, and typically based on self-report (e.g. Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2005; Watters, 2008).

These factors, combined with the intention of investigating the nature of "nearby," day-to-day leadership, from the perspective of a gender- and ethnic-inclusive sample of staff, in UK public- and private-sector organizations, led Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe to conduct a new investigation. They were interested in identifying specifically those behaviors which "had a particularly powerful effect on the staff's motivation, job satisfaction, commitment, self-confidence, or performance" (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2001). The criteria for identifying such leadership behaviors are relevant since they are similar to the outcomes that are assessed when ascertaining levels of engagement.

The researchers adopted a Grounded Theory approach (Parry, 1998) to eliciting constructs of "nearby" leadership using repertory-grid interviewing techniques (Kelly, 1955), and augmented these data with information from a literature review and focus groups (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2001). The sample was deliberately *inclusive* in relation to age, ethnicity, gender, and level in the organization. Over 2000 behavioral constructs were content analyzed independently by two psychologists (a female and a male), a pilot instrument was developed and distributed among 200+ UK organizations (local government and health), and over 2000 responses were factor analyzed (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2001). This resulted in the development of an instrument, the *Transformational Leadership Questionnaire (TLQ)*, which describes the model of "engaging" transformational leadership. The reliability and validity of this instrument have now been well established among a wide range of private and not-for-profit

Structure of the Engaging Transformational Leadership Questionnaire (TLQ)™

Engaging individuals

- Showing genuine concern
- Being accessible
- Enabling
- Encouraging questioning

Engaging the organization

- Supporting a developmental culture
- Inspiring others
- Being decisive
- Focusing team effort

Engaging all stakeholders

- Building shared vision
- Networking
- Resolving complex problems
- Facilitating change sensitively

Personal qualities and values

- Being honest and consistent
- Acting with integrity

Plus

- 10 measures of the Impact on staff engagement & well-being at work

Figure 2.1 The Transformational Leadership Questionnaire (TLQ) ™ Training Manual. (2004). Leeds: Real World Group.

organizations (e.g. Alban-Metcalfe & Alimo-Metcalfe, 2000, 2007; Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2001, 2005, 2006; Alimo-Metcalfe et al., 2011; Dobby et al., 2004; Kelly et al., 2006).

The research version of the TLQ includes six scales (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2005), and the developmental 360 model includes an additional eight scales, which emerged from the items excluded from the original factor analysis (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2006). Figure 2.1 describes the total of 14 scales that make up the 360 instrument. These have been arranged in four clusters, which include the leadership scales relating to the four aspects of engaging leadership: (i) personal qualities and values; (ii) engaging individuals; (iii) engaging the organization; and (iv) moving forward together (which includes engaging with the wider range of internal and external stakeholders, and behaviors that encourage cross-organization and inter-organization partnership working).

The tenor of the model reflects both a servant leadership and a DL approach, while recognizing formal leadership responsibilities. Ten "facets" of the impact on direct reports are included in the 360 instrument. These facets, which are measures of attitudes to work (including job satisfaction, motivation, and job and organizational commitment) and employee engagement as evidenced by an independent study (van der Kleij, 2011), and well-being at work (including reduced job-related stress) (e.g. Alimo-Metcalfe et al., 2008), enable the determination of the criterion validity and discriminant validity of the TLQ.

More recently, as a result of a longitudinal investigation which adopted a measure of team culture based on the dimensions of this engaging leadership model, a cause–effect relationship has been found between a culture of engaging leadership and the productivity of multiprofessional teams, where productivity was measured objectively (Alimo-Metcalfe & Bradley, in preparation; Alimo-Metcalfe et al., 2007, 2008). The research, which involved a national sample of $n=741$, controlled for the effect of contextual factors including the multi-disciplinary composition of the team.

2.3 Conclusion

This review has sought to critically review major models of leadership that have reflected the historical developments in leadership theory. Unfortunately, because of space limitations, some models have not been discussed, including the relatively new notion of "public integrative leadership" (see *Leadership Quarterly Special Issue*, 21(2), 2010), and spiritual leadership (see *Leadership Quarterly Special Issue*, 16(5), 2005). It is hoped that students of the topic will read primary source materials, so that they can adopt a critical stance when reviewing any specific aspects of the literature.

The increasing interest in the subject of leadership reflects the considerable importance of this phenomenon. As younger generations of researchers become the commentators of the future, the forces that have influenced their socialization, their hopes, and their experiences will produce new and exciting perspectives on this fascinating subject.

With the combined forces of globalization, and the influence of advances in social media, the wealth of new models and theories should increase exponentially. The enormous speed of growth of new economies will, hopefully, lead to a richer range of perspectives on the topic, which, by virtue of their very diversity, will also bring challenges. It is time for the leadership literature to be enriched by the influence of deeper multicultural studies than could have been described by the pioneering and visionary GLOBE project, initiated by Robert House in 1993 (e.g. House et al., 2004). It is hoped that the business schools will also adopt and encourage an open, multicultural, and critical approach to the texts they recommend and the models they discuss.

References

Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Alban-Metcalfe, R.J. & Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (2000). An analysis of the convergent and discriminant validity of the Transformational Leadership Questionnaire. International Journal of Selection & Assessment, 8(3), 158–175.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (1995). An investigation of female and male constructs of leadership and empowerment. Women in Management Review, 10(2), 3–8.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (2004). Leadership: a masculine past, but a feminine future? In Gender & Excellence in the Making, a Report of the European Commission, Women & Science Unit, Joint Research Centre. Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (2010) Developments in gender and leadership: introducing a new "inclusive" model. Gender in Management: An International Journal, 25(8), 630–639.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (2011). Les sexes et le leadership: un plafond de verre ou de béton armé? In L. Côté Louis, editor. La gouvernance: Frontières, Dispositifs et Agents. Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. & R.J. Alban-Metcalfe (2001). The development of a new transformational leadership questionnaire. The Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 74, 1–27.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. & Alban-Metcalfe, J. (2005). Leadership: time for a new direction? Leadership, 1, 51–71.

Alban-Metcalfe, J. & Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (2007). The development of the private sector version of the (Engaging) Transformational Leadership Questionnaire. Leadership & Organisational Development Journal, 28(2), 104–121.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. & Alban-Metcalfe, J. (2006). More (good) leaders for the public sector. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 19(4), 293–315.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. & Alban-Metcalfe, J. (2008). Engaging Leadership: Creating Organisations that Maximise the Potential of Their People. London: CIPD.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B., Alban-Metcalfe, J., Bradley, M., Mariathasan, J., & Samele, C. (2008). The impact of engaging leadership on performance, attitudes to work and well-being at work: a longitudinal study. The Journal of Health Organization and Management, 22(6), 586–598.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B., Alban-Metcalfe, J., Bradley, M., & Alban-Metcalfe, J. (2011). The impact of an engaging style of leadership on staff attitudes to work and wellbeing: evidence of criterion and "predictive" validity in a Primary Care and a Secondary Care (Acute) Hospital Trust. Paper presented at the British Academy of Management Conference, Birmingham, September 13–15.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B., Alban-Metcalfe, J., Samele, C. Bradley, M., & Mariathasan, J. (2007) The impact of leadership factors in implementing change in complex health and social care environments: NHS Plan clinical priority for mental health crisis resolution teams (CRTs). Department of Health NHS SDO, Project 22/2002.

Antonakis, J. & Atwater, L. (2002). Leader distance: a review and a proposed theory. Leadership Quarterly, 13(6), 673–704.

Ashford, S.J. (1989). Self-assessments in organizations: a literature review and integrative model. In L.L. Cummings & B.W. Staw, editors. Research in Organizational Behavior, 11. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. pp. 133 – 174.

Avery, G.C. (2004). Understanding Leadership: Paradigms and Cases. London: Sage.

Avolio, B.J. (1999). Full Leadership Development: Building the Vital Forces in Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B.J. & Gardner, W.L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 16, 315–338.

Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., & Walumbwa, F.O. (2007). The Authentic Leadership Questionnaire. Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden.

Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Walumbwa, F.O., Luthans, F., & May, D.R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: a look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. Leadership Quarterly, 15, 801–823.

Avolio, B.J., Walumbwa, F.O., & Weber, T.J. (2009). Leadership: current theories, research, and future directions. Annual Review of Psychology, 60, 421–449.

Avolio, B.J., Yammarino, F., & Bass, B. (1991). Identifying common methods variance with data collected from a single source: an unresolved sticky issue. Journal of Management, 17(3), 571–587.

Avolio, B.J., Zhu, W., Koh, W.L., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25, 951–968.

Bakker, A. B. (2009). Building engagement in the workplace. In C.L. Cooper & R.J. Burke, editors. The Peak Performing Organization. Oxon, UK: Routledge. pp. 50–72.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social Foundation of Thought and Action. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Barling, J., Loughlin, C.A., & Kelloway, E.K. (2002). Development and test of a model linking safety-specific transformational leadership and occupational injuries. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 488–496.

Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E.K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal & financial outcomes: a field experiment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(6), 827–832.

Bass, B.M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? American Psychologist, 52, 130–139.

Badaracco, J.L. (2002). Leading Quietly: An Unorthodox Guide to Doing the Right Thing. Harvard, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Bales, R.F. (1954). In conference. Harvard Business Review, 32(2), 44–50.

Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations. London: The Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1990). Bass and Stodgill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Applications, 3rd edition. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1998). Transformational Leadership: Industrial, Military, and Educational Impact. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. Public Administration Quarterly, 17, 112–121.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (2004). Multifactor leadership questionnaire: manual leader form, rater, and scoring key for MLQ (Form 5x-Short). Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden

Bass, B.M. & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 181–217.

Belschak, F.D. & Den Hartog, D.N. (2010). Different foci of proactive behaviour: the role of transformational leadership. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83, 267–273.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985) Leaders. New York: Harper & Row.

Bilhuber Galli, E. & Müller-Stewens, G. (2011). How to build social capital with leadership development: lessons from an explorative case study of a multibusiness firm. Leadership Quarterly. In press; available online at http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleListURL&_method=list&_ArticleListID=1860400770&_sort=r&_st=13&view=c&_acct=C000005458&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=5944594&md5=fea79b928f4e55ffd65d9daad462ad99&searchtype=a.

Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, D., & Nelson, R. (1993). Situational leadership after 25 years: a retrospective. Journal of Leadership Studies, 1(1), 22–36.

Bligh, M.C., Kohles, J.C., & Pillai, R. (2011). Romancing leadership: past, present, and future. Leadership Quarterly, 22, 1058–1077.

Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organisations: a review of theory & research. International Journal of Management Reviews, 13, 251–269.

Booysen, L.A.E. (2002). Addressing challenges facing black and white women managers in South Africa. Siren: Journal of the Institute for Gender Studies, 9(1), 4–13.

Booysen, L.A.E. & Nkomo, S.M. (2010). Gender role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics: the case of South Africa. Gender in Management: An International Journal, 25(4), 285–300.

Brown, M.E. & Treviño, L.K. (2006). Ethical leadership: a review and future directions. Leadership Quarterly, 17, 595–616.

Brown, M.E., Treviño, L.K., & Harrison, D.A. (2005). Ethical leadership: a social learning perspective for construct development and testing. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97, 117–134.

Bryman, A. (1993). Charismatic leadership in business organizations: some neglected issues. Leadership Quarterly, 4(3/4), 289–304.

Bryman, A. (1996). Leadership in organizations. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W.R. Nord, editors. Handbook of Organizational Studies. London: Sage. pp. 276–292.

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

Calas, M.B. and Smircich, L. (1996). From the women's point of view: feminist approaches to organisation studies. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. Nord, editors. Handbook of Organization Studies. London: Sage. pp. 218–257.

Callahan, D. (2004). The Cheating Culture: Why More Americans Are Doing Wrong to Get Ahead. London: Harcourt.

Carless, S.A., (1998). Assessing the discriminant validity of transformational leader behaviour as measured by the MLQ. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 71, 353–358.

Carnes, K.C. & Keithley, J.P. (1992). Does the limited tenure of internal auditors hamper fraud detection? Business & professional Ethics Journal, 12, 3–25.

Chang, S., van Witteloostuijn, A., and Eden, L. (2010). Editorial: common method variance in international business research. Journal of International Business Studies, 41, 178–184.

Chonko, L.B. & Hunt, S.D. (1985). Ethics & marketing management: an empirical examination. Journal of Business Research, 13, 339–359.

Cole, M.S., Bruch, H., & Shamir, B. (2009). Social distance as a moderator of the effects of transformational leadership: both neutralizer and enhancer. Human Relations, 62(11), 1697–1733.

Cole, E.B. & Coultrap-McQuin, S. (1992) Toward a feminist conception of moral life. In E.B. Cole & S. Coultrap-McQuin, editors. Explorations in Feminist Ethics. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. pp. 1–11.

Conger, J.A. (1989). The Charismatic Leader: Behind the Mystique of Exceptional Leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J.A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. Organizational Dynamics, 19, 44–45.

Conger, J.A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: an insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 145–169.

Conger, J.A. (1998). Qualitative research as the cornerstone methodology for understanding leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 9, 107–121.

Conger, J.A. & R.N. Kanungo, editors (1988). Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J.A. & R. N. Kanungo, editors (1998). Charismatic Leadership in Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Cook, J. & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53, 39–52.

Crant, J.M. (2000). Practive behaviour in organisations. Journal of Management, 26(3), 435–462.

Crown, D.F. & Spiller, M.S. (1998). Learning from the literature on collegiate cheating: a review of empirical research. Journal of Business Ethics, 17, 683–700.

Dansereau, F., Alutto, J., & Yammarino, F.J. (1984). Theory Testing in Organizational Behavior: The Variant Approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, B.A. (1975). A vertical-dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: a longitudinal investigation of the role making process. Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 13, 46–78.

Dawson, L.M. (1997). Ethical differences between men & women in the sales profession. Journal of Business Ethics, 16(11), 1143–1152.

Day, D.V. (2000). Leadership development: a review in context. Leadership Quarterly, 11(4), 581.

De Hoogh, A.H.B. & Den Hartog, D.N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: a multi-method study. Leadership Quarterly, 19, 297–311.

Den Hartog, D.N., House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., Dorfman, P.W., et al. (1999). Culturally specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? The Leadership Quarterly, 10, 219–256.

Dionne, S.D., Yammarino, F.J., Atwater, L.E., & James, L.R. (2002). Neutralizing substitutes for leadership theory: leadership effects and common-source bias. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 454–464.

Dobby, J.A. & Tuffin, R. (2004). Police Leadership: Expectations and Impact. London: Home Office Online Report 20/04.

Dubinsky, A.J. & Ingram, T.N. (1984). Ethics in retailing: perceptions of retail salespeople. Journal of Academy of Marketing Science, 13, 1–16.

Dubinsky, A.J. & Levy, M. (1985). Ethics in retailing: perceptions of retail salespeople. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 13, 1–16.

Eagly, A.H. (2007). Female leadership advantage & disadvantage: resolving the contradictions. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31, 1–12.

Eagly, A.H., Makhijani, M.G., & Klonsky, B.G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: a meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 111, 2–33.

Etzioni, A. (2002). When it comes to ethics, B-schools get an F. The Washington Post, August 4th, p. B4.

Ferrell, O.C. & Skinner, S.J. (1988). Ethical behaviour and bureaucratic structure in marketing research organizations. Journal of Marketing Research, 25, 103–109.

Fiedler, F.E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkovitz, editor. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, volume 1. New York: Academic Press. pp. 149–190.

Fiedler, F.E. (1967). A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiedler, F.E. (1972). Personality, motivational systems, and behavior of high and low LPC persons. Human Relations, 25(5), 391–412.

Fiedler, F.E. & Chemers, M.M. (1974). Leadership and Effective Management. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Fletcher, J. (2004). The paradox of post-heroic leadership: an essay on gender, power, and transformational change. Leadership Quarterly, 15(5), 647–661.

Fleenor, J.W., Smither, J.W., Atwater, L.E., Braddy, P.W., & Sturm, R.E. (2010). Self–other rating agreement in leadership: a review. Leadership Quarterly, 21, 1005–1034.

Foschi, M. (2000). Double standards for competence: theory and research. Annual Review of Sociology, 26, 21–42.

Frese, M. and Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative: an active performance concept for work in the 21st century. Research in Organizational Behavior, 23, 133–187.

Frese, M., Teng, E., & Wijnen, C.J. (1999). Helping to improve suggestion systems: predictors of making suggestions in companies. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20, 1139–1156.

Fritzsche, D.J. (1988). An examination of marketing ethics: role of the decision maker, consequences of the decision, management position, and sex of the respondent. Journal of Macromarketing, 8, 29–39.

Furnham, A. (2004). The Dark Side of Behaviour at Work. Palgrave Macmillan.

Furnham, A. (2005). The Icarus syndrome. Presentation to the British Psychological Society Annual Occupational Psychology Conference, Warwickshire, January.

Furnham, A. (2010). The Elephant in the Boardroom: The Causes of Leadership Derailment. Palgrave Macmillan.

Gardner, W.L., Avolio, B.J., Luthans, F., May, D.R., & Walumbwa, F.O. (2005). Can you see the real me? A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. Leadership Quarterly, 16, 434–372.

Gardner, W.L., Lowe, K.B., Moss, T.W., Mahoney, K.T., & Cogliser, C.C. (2010). Scholarly leadership of the study of leadership: a review of The Leadership Quarterly's second decade, 2000–2009. Leadership Quarterly, 21(6), 922–958.

Geer, J.G. (1996). From Tea Leaves to Opinion Polls: A Theory of Democratic Leadership. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gibb, C.A. (1947). The principles and traits of leadership. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 4, 267–284.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a Different Voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Graen, G.B. (1976). Role making processes within complex organizations. In M.D. Dunnette, editor. Handbook of Industrial & Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally. pp. 1202–1245

Graen, G.B. & Cashman, J. (1975). A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: a developmental approach. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson, editor. Leadership Frontiers. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press. pp. 143–166.

Graen, G.B. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. Leadership Quarterly, 6, 219–247.

Graen, G. & Schiemann, W. (1978). Leader-member agreement: a vertical dyad linkage approach. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 206–212.

Granitz, N. & Loewy, D. (2007). Applying ethical theories: Interpreting and responding to student plagiarism. Journal of Business Ethics, 72(3), 293–306.

Gough, H.G. (1990). Testing for leadership with the California Psychological Inventory. In K.E. Clark & M.B. Clark, editors. Measures of Leadership. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America. pp. 355–379.

Grandey, A.A., Fiske, G.M., Mattila, A.S., Jansen, K.J., & Sideman, L.A. (2005). Is "service with a smile" enough? Authenticity of positive displays during service encounters. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 96: 38–55.

Greenleaf, R.K. (1970). The Servant as Leader. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Greenleaf, R.K. (1996). On Becoming a Servant Leader. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: a new architecture for leadership. Educational Management and Administration, 28(3), 317–338.

Gronn, P. (2004). Distribution of leadership. In G.R. Goethals, G.J. Sorenson, & J. MacGregor Burns, editors. Encyclopedia of Leadership, volume 1. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 351–355.

Gronn, P. (2008). The future of distributed leadership. Journal of Educational Administration, 46(2), 141–158.

Harris, A, (2008). Distributed leadership: according to the evidence. Journal of Educational Administration, 46(2), 172–188.

Harris, M.M. & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. Personnel Psychology, 41, 43–62.

Harris, K.J., Wheeler, A.R., & Kacmar, K.M. (2009). Leader-member exchange and empowerment: direct & interactive effects on job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and performance. Leadership Quarterly, 20, 371–382.

Harter, N. & Evanecky, D. (2002). Fairness in leader-member exchange theory: do we all belong on the inside? Leadership Review, 2(2), 1–7.

Harter, J.K. & Schmidt, F.L. (2008). Conceptual versus empirical distinctions among constructs: implications for discriminant validity. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1(1), 36–39.

Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., Asplund, J.W., Killum, E.A., & Agrawa, S. (2010). Causal impact of employee work perceptions on the bottom line of organizations. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5(4), 378–389.

Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., & Hayes, T.L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 268–279.

Heilman, M.E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: the lack of fit model. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings, editors. Research in Organizational Behavior, 5. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. (1969). A life-cycle theory of leadership. Training & Development Journal, 23, 26–34.
Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. (1988). Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources, 5th edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
Hogan, R., Curphy, G.J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: effectiveness and personality. American Psychologist, 49(6), 493–505.
Hogan, R. & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: a view from the dark side. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9, 40–51.
Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K.E. Clark et al., editors. Measures of Leadership. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America. pp. 343–354.
Hollander, E.P. & Julian, J.W. (1978). A further look at leader legitimacy, influence, and innovation. In L. Berkowitz, editor. Group Processes. New York: Academic Press. pp. 153–165.
Hoogh, A.H.B., den, den Hartog, D.N., Koopman, P.L., Berg, H.T., van den Berg, P.T., van der Weide, J.G., & Wilderom, C.P.M. (2004). Charismatic leadership, environmental dynamism & performance. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 13(4), 447–471.
House, R.J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 321–338.
House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson, editors. Leadership: The Cutting Edge. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 189–207.
House, R.J., et al., editors. (2004) Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies. London: Sage.
House, R.J. & Aditya, R.N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: quo vadis? Journal of Management, 23(3), 409–473.
House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., Dorfman, P.W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., Gupta, V., & associates (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project Globe. Advances in Global Leadership, 1, 171–233.
House, R.J. & Howell, J.M. 1992. Personality and charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 3, 81–108.
Howell, J.M. 1988. Two faces of charisma: socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In J.A. Conger & R.N. Kanungo, editors. Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. pp. 213–236.
Hunt, J.G. (2004). What is leadership? In J. Antonakis, A.T. Cianciolo, & R.J. Sternberg, editors. The Nature of Leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 19–47.
Hunt, J.G. & Peterson, M.F. (1997) Two scholars' views of some nooks and crannies in cross-cultural leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 8, 343–354.
Jacobson, S.W. & Jacques, R. (1990). Of knowers, knowing, and the known: a gender framework for revisioning organizational and management scholarship. Paper presented to The Academy of Management Annual Meeting, San Francisco, August 10–12th.
Jenkins, W.O. (1947). A. review of leadership studies with particular reference to military problems. Psychological Bulletin, 44, 54–79.
Jermier, J.M. & Kerr, S. (1997). Substitutes for leadership: their meaning and measurement—contextual recollections and current observations. Leadership Quarterly, 8, 95–101.
Jing, F.F. & Avery, G.C. (2008). Missing links in understanding the relationship between leadership and organizational performance. International Business & Economics Research Journal, 7(5), 67–78.
Judge, T.A. & Bono, J.E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(5), 751–765.
Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M.W. (2002). Personality & leadership: a qualitative & quantitative review. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 765–780.

Judge, T.A & Piccolo, R.F. (2004). Transformational & transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their validity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(5), 755–768.

Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Bono, J.E., & Patton, G.K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: a qualitative and quantitative review. Psychological Bulletin, 127, 376–407.

Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4), 692–724.

Kahn, R.L. & Katz, D. (1953). Leadership practices in relation to productivity and morale. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander, editors. Group Dynamics. New York: Harper & Row.

Kalshoven, K. & Den Hartog, D.N. (2009). Ethical leader behavior and leader effectiveness: the role of prototypicality and trust. International Journal of Leadership Studies, 5(2), 102–120.

Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D.N., & De Hoogh, A.H.B. (2011). Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): development and validation of a multidimensional measure. Leadership Quarterly, 22(1), 51–69.

Kanter, R.M. (2001). E-volve! Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kark, R. (2004). The transformational leader: who is (s)he? A feminist perspective. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17(2), 160–176.

Keller, R.T. (2006). Transformational leadership, initiating structure & substitutes for leadership: a longitudinal study of research & development project team performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(1), 202–210.

Kelly, G.A. (1955). The Psychology of Personal Constructs, volumes 1 & 2. New York: Norton.

Kelly, A., Johnson, P., & Gill, R. (2006). Time for change: a UK model of transformational leadership. Paper presented at the British Academy of Management Conference, September 13th, Belfast.

Kenny, D.A. & Zaccaro, S.J. (1983). An estimate of variance due to traits in leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 678–685.

Kidwell, J., Stevens, R., & Bechke, A. (1987). Differences in ethical perceptions between male and female managers: myth or reality? Journal of Business Ethics, 6, 451–457.

Klein, K.J. & House, R.J. (1995). On fire: charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 183–198.

Klein, H.A., Levenburg, N.M., McKendall, M., & Mothersell, W. (2007). Cheating during the college years: how do business school students compare? Journal of Business Ethics, 72, 197–206.

Koene, B.A.S., Vogelaar, A.L.W., & Soeters, J.L. (2002). Leadership effects on organizational climate & financial performance: local leadership effect in chain organizations. Leadership Quarterly, 13, 193–215.

Kohlberg, L. (1958). The Development of Modes of Thinking and Choices in Years 10 to 16. PhD Dissertation, University of Chicago.

Kohlberg, L. (1973). The claim to moral adequacy of a highest stage of moral judgment. Journal of Philosophy, 70(18), 630–646.

Kohlberg, L. & Turiel, E. (1971). Moral development and moral education. In G. Lesser, editor. Psychology and Educational Practice. Scott Foresman.

Larson, L.L., Hunt, J.G., & Osbom, R.N. (1974). Correlates of leadership and demographic variables in three organizational settings. Journal of Business Research, 2, 335–347.

Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). Successful School Leadership: What it is and How Much it Influences Pupil Learning. Nottingham: DfES Publications.

Leadership Quarterly (2005). Special Issue: Towards a Paradigm of Spiritual Leadership, 16, 5.

Leadership Quarterly (2010). Special Issue: Public Integrative Leadership, 21, 2.

Liden, R.C. & Antonakis, J. (2009). Considering context in psychological research. Human Relations, 62(11), 1587–1605.

Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. Leadership Quarterly, 19, 161–177.

Likert, R. (1961). New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lim, B.C. & Ployhart, R.E. (2004). Transformational leadership: relations to the five-factor model and team performance in typical and maximum contexts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89, 610–621.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2004). The Allure of Toxic Leaders: Why We Follow Destructive Bosses and Corrupt Politicians—And How We Can Survive Them. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lord, R.G., De Vader, C.L., & Allinger, G.M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relationship between personality traits and leadership perceptions: an application of validity generalization procedures. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 402–410.

Lord, R.G., Foti, R.J., & DeVader, C.L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34, 343–378.

Lord, R.G., Foti, R.J., & Phillips, J.S. (1982). A theory of leadership categorization. In: J.G. Hunt, U. Sekaran, & C.A. Schriesheim, editors. Leadership: Beyond Establishment Views. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 104–121.

Lowe, K.B. & Gardner, W.L. (2000). Ten years of leadership quarterly: contributions and challenges for the future. Leadership Quarterly, 11, 459–514.

Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K.G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996) Effectiveness of correlates of transformational & transactional leadership: a meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. Leadership Quarterly, 7, 385–425.

Luthans, F. & Avolio, B. J. 2003. Authentic leadership development. In K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, & R.E. Quinn, editors. Positive Organizational Scholarship. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler. pp. 241–258.

Lyness, K.S. & Heilman, M.E. (2006). When fit is fundamental: performance evaluations & promotions of upper-level female & male managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(4), 777–785.

Mabe, P. & West, J. (1982). Validity of self-evaluation of ability: a review and meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 280–296.

McCabe, D.L., Butterfield, K.D., & Trevino, L.K. (2006). Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: prevalence, causes, and proposed action. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 5(3), 294–305.

McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., and Butterfield, K.D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: a decade of research. Ethics and Behavior, 11(3), 219–232.

McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 38, 24–59.

Mangham, I. (2011). Leadership, ethics and integrity. In J. Storey, editor. Leadership in Organizations: Current Issues & Key Trends. London: Routledge.

Mann, F.C. (1965). Toward an understanding of the leadership role in formal organization. In R. Dublin, editor. Leadership and Productivity. San Francisco: Chandler. pp. 68–103.

Mann, R.D. (1959). A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 241–270.

May, D.R., Chan, A., Hodges, T., & Avolio, B.J. (2003). Developing the moral component of authentic leadership. Organizational Dynamics, 32, 247–260.

Meindl, J.R., Ehrlich, S.B., & Dukerich, J.M. (1985). The romance of leadership. Administrative Science Quarterly, 30, 78–102.

Meyerson, D. (2000). Tempered Radicals. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Mintzberg, H. (1999). Managing quietly. Leader to Leader, Spring, http://www.pfdf.org/knowledgecenter/journal.aspx?ArticleID=54. Accessed 06/12.

Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., & Porter, L.W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 224–247.

Naidoo, L.J., Scherbaum, C.A., & Goldstein, H.W. (2008). Examining the relative importance of leader-member exchange on group performance over time. In G.B. Graen and J.A. Graen, editors. Knowledge Driven Corporation: A Discontinuous Model. LMX leadership: The Series, volume 5. Charlotte, NC: Information Age. pp. 211–230.

Northouse, P.G. (2010). Leadership: Theory and Practice, 5th edition. London: Sage.
O'Connor, J., Mumford, M.D., Clifton, T.C., Gessner, T.L., & Connelly, M.S. (1995). Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: an historiometric study. Leadership Quarterly, 6(4), 529–555.
Parker, S.K. (2000). From passive to proactive motivation: the importance of flexible role orientations and role breadth self-efficacy. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49, 447–469.
Parry, K.W. (1998). Grounded theory and social process: a new direction in leadership research. Leadership Quarterly, 9(1), 85–105.
Pazy, A. & Oron, I. (2001). Sex proportion and performance evaluation among high-ranking military officers. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22, 689–702.
Pearce, C.L. & Conger, J.A. (2003). Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
Peters, L.H., Hartke, D.D., & Pohlman, J.T. (1985). Fiedler's contingency model of leadership: an application of the meta-analysis procedure of Schmidt and Hunter. Psychological Bulletin, 97, 274–285.
Pillai, R. & Williams, E.A. (2004). Transformational leadership, self-efficacy, group cohesiveness, commitment, and performance. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17(2), 144–159.
Platow, M.J. & van Knippenberg, D. (2001). A social identity analysis of leadership endorsement: the effects of leader in-group prototypicality and distributive intergroup fairness. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27, 1508–1519.
Raelin, J. (2006). Does action learning promote collaborative leadership? Academy of Management Learning & Education, 5(2), 152–168.
Ricklets, R. (1983). Executives and general public say ethical behaviour is declining in US. The Wall Street Journal, October 31st, 33.
Rowe, W.G., Cannella A.A. Jr., Rankin, D., & Gorman, D. (2005). Leader succession & organizational performance: integrating the common-sense, ritual scapegoating & vicious-circle succession theories. Leadership Quarterly, 16(2), 197–219.
Rueb, J.D. & Foti, R.J. (1990). Traits, self-monitoring, and leadership emergence. Paper presented at the Fifth Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Miami, FL.
Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2001). On happiness and human potential: a review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well being. Annual Review of Psychology, 52: 141–166.
Salaman, G. (2011). The crises of leadership. In J. Storey, editor. Leadership in Organizations: Current Issues & Key Trends. London: Routledge.
Sashkin, M. (1988). The visionary leader. In J.A. Conger & R.N. Kanungo, editors. Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. pp. 122–160.
Scandura, T.A. (1999). Rethinking leader-member exchange: an organizational justice perspective. Leadership Quarterly, 10, 25–40.
Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S.K., and Cha, S.A. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(4), 1020–1030.
Schaufeli, W.B. & Bakker, A.B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25, 293–315.
Schaufeli, W., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma , V., & Bakker, A.B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: a two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. Journal of Happiness Studies, 3, 71–92.
Schriesheim, C., Castro, S., & Cogliser, C. (1999). Leader-member exchange (LMX) research: a comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic procedures. Leadership Quarterly, 10, 63–113.

Schriesheim, C.A., Castro, S.L., Zhou, X.T., & Yammarino, F.J. (2001). The folly of theorizing "A" while testing "B": a selective level-of-analysis review of the field and a detailed Leader-Member-Exchange illustration. Leadership Quarterly, 12, 515–551.

Schriesheim, C., House, R.J., & Kerr, S. (1976). Leader initiating structure: a reconciliation of discrepant research results and some empirical tests. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15(2), 297–321.

Schriesheim, C. & Kerr, S. (1977). Theories and measures of leadership: a critical appraisal of present and future directions". In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson, editors. Leadership: The Cutting Edge. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 9–44.

Schein, V. (1994). Managerial sex typing: a persistent and persuasive barrier to women's opportunities. In M.J. Davidson & R.J. Burke, editors. Women in Management: Current Research Issues. London: Sage.

Schein, V. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. Journal of Social Issues, 57(4), 675–688.

Schein, V.E. (2006). Women in management: reflections & projections. Paper presented at The 26th International Congress of Applied Psychology, July 16th–21st, Athens, Greece.

Scherbaum, C.A., Finlinson, S., Barden, K., & Tamanini, K. (2006). Applications of item response theory to measurement issues in leadership research. Leadership Quarterly, 17(4), 366–386.

Schyns, B. & Day, D. (2010). Critique and review of leader-member exchange theory: issues of agreement, consensus, and excellence. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 19(1), 1–29.

Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: theoretical notes and an exploratory study. Leadership Quarterly, 6, 19–47.

Shamir, B. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 285–305.

Singhapakdi, A. & Vitell, S.J. (1990), Marketing ethics: factors influencing perceptions of ethical problems and alternatives. Journal of Macromarketing, 10, 4–18.

Skakon, J., Nielsen, K., Borg, V., & Guzman, J. (2010). Are leaders' well-being, behaviours and style associated with the affective well-being of their employees? A systematic review of three decades of research. Work & Stress, 24, 107–139.

Smith, P.B. & Bond, M.H. (1993) Social Psychology across Cultures: Analysis and Perspectives. Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. (1969). The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: a new look at the interface between non-work and work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88, 518–528.

Spector, P.E. (2006). Method variance in organizational research: truth or urban legend? Organizational Research Methods, 9(2), 221–232.

Spector, P.E. & Brannick, M.T. (1995). The nature and effects of method variance in organizational research. In C.L. Cooper & I.T. Robertson, editors. International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, volume 10. New York: John Wiley. pp. 249–274.

Spillane, J.P. (2006). Distributed Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J.P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J.B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: a distributed perspective. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36(1), 3–34.

Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: a survey of the literature. Journal of Psychology, 25, 35–71.

Stogdill, R.M. & Coons, A.E. (1957). Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press for Bureau of Business Research.

Stone, G.A., Russell, R.F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: a difference in leader focus. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 25(4), 349–361.

Strauss, K., Griffin, M., & Rafferty, A.E. (2009). Proactivity directed toward the team and organization: the role of leadership, commitment and role-breadth self-efficacy. British Journal of Management, 20, 279–291.

Strube, M.J. & Garcia, J.E. (1981). A meta-analytical investigation of Fiedler's contingency model of leadership effectiveness. Psychological Bulletin, 90, 307–321.

Tejeda, M.J., Scandura, T.A., & Pillai, R. (2001). The MLQ revisited—psychometric properties and recommendations. Leadership Quarterly, 12, 31–52.

Thomas, J.P., Whitman, D.S., & Viswesaran, C. (2010). Employee proactivity in organizations: a comparative meta-analysis of emergent proactive constructs. Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 83, 275–300.

Thorpe, R., Gold, J., & Lawler, J. (2011). Special issue: Distributed Leadership, International Journal of Management Reviews, 13.

Tichy, N. & Devanna, M. (1986). Transformational Leadership. New York: Wiley.

Timiraos, N. (2002). Professor discusses research, trends in cheating on college campuses. The Hoya, November 15: 1.

Tims, M., Bakker, A.B., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2011). Do transformational leaders enhance their followers' daily work engagement? Leadership Quarterly, 22, 121–131.

Thorpe, R., Gold, J., & Lawler, J. (2011). Locating distributed leadership. International Journal of Management Reviews, 13(3), 239–250.

Tonn, J. (2003). Mary P. Follett: Creating Democracy, Transforming Management. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Tosi, H., Misangyi, V., Fanelli, A., Waldman, D., & Yammarino, F. (2004). CEO charisma, compensation, and firm performance. Leadership Quarterly, 15, 405–420.

Tourish, D., Craig, R., & Amernic, J. (2010). Transformational leadership education and agency perspectives in business school pedagogy: a marriage of inconvenience? British Journal of Management, 21, S40–S59.

Tourish, D. & Vatcha, N. (2005). Charismatic leadership and corporate cultism at Enron: the elimination of dissent, the promotion of conformity and organizational collapse. Leadership, 1(4), 455–480.

Treviño, L.K., Brown, M., & Hartman, L.P. (2003). A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. Human Relations, 56, 5–37.

Treviño, L.K., Butterfield, K.D., & Mcabe, D.M. (1998). The ethical context in organizations: Influences on employee attitudes and behaviors. Business Ethics Quarterly, 8, 447 – 476.

Treviño, L.K., Hartman, L.P., & Brown, M. (2000). Moral person and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership. California Management Review, 42, 128 – 142.

Triandis, H.C. (1993). The contingency model in cross-cultural perspective. In M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman, editors. Leadership Theory & Research: Perspectives & Directions, London: Academic Press.

van der Kleij, J.F.M. (2011). Engaging leadership in healthcare organizations: the mediating role of work engagement. Unpublished masters thesis. University of Groningen, The Netherlands.

Vroom, V.H. & Jago, A.G. (1988). The New Leadership: Managing Participation in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Vroom, V.H. & Yetton, P.N. (1973). Leadership and Decision Making. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Waldman, D.A., Ramirez, G.C., House, R.J., & Puranam, P. (2001). Does leadership matter? CEO leadership attributes and profitability under conditions of perceived environmental uncertainty. Academy of Management Journal, 44(1), 134–143.

Waldman, D.A. & Yammarino, F.J. (1999). CEO charismatic leadership: levels-of-management and levels-of-analysis effects. Academy of Management Review, 24, 266–285.

Walumbwa, F.O., Wang, P., Lawler, J.J., & Shi, K. (2004). The role of collective efficacy in the relations between transformational leadership and work outcomes. Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 77(4), 515–530.

Walumbwa, F.O., Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Wernsing, T.S., & Peterson, S.J. (2008). Authentic leadership: development and validation of a theory-based measure. Journal of Management, 34(1), 89–126.

Watters, B.S.C. (2008). Contemporary British military leadership in the early twenty first century. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Leeds, UK.

Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M., & Liden, R.C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: a social exchange perspective. Academy of Management Journal, 40, 82–111.

Wellins, R. & Concelman, J. (2005). Creating a culture for engagement. Workforce Performance Solutions (www.wpsmag.com). Retrieved July 19th, 2005, from http://www.ddiworld.com/pdf/wps_engagement_ar.pdf.

Wheatley, M. (2001). The real work of knowledge management. International Association for Human Resource Information Management, 5, 29–33. http://www.margaretwheatley.com/articles/management.html.

Wright, L. (2008). Merits and limitations of distributed leadership: experiences and understandings of school principals. Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 69. (no page refs) Accessed 08/12/11 from http://umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/wright.html.

Wright, P.L. (1996). Managerial Leadership. London: Routledge.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2009). Work engagement and financial returns: a diary study on the role of job and personal resources. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 82, 183–200.

Yammarino, F.J. & Atwater, L.E. (1993). Understanding self-perception accuracy: implications for human resource management. Human Resource Management, 32, 231 – 247.

Yammarino, F.J. & Atwater, L.E. (2001). Understanding agreement in multisource feedback. In D. Bracken, C. Timmreck, & A. Church, editors. The Handbook of Multisource Feedback. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. pp. 204–220.

Yammarino, F.J. & Dansereau, F., editors. (2009). Multi-level Issues in Organizational Behavior and Leadership, volume 8 of Research in Multi-Level Issues. Bingley, UK: Emerald.

Yammarino, F.J., Dionne, S.D., Chun, J.U., & Dansereau, F. (2005). Leadership and levels of analysis: a state-of-the-science review. Leadership Quarterly, 16, 879–919.

Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weakness in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. Leadership Quarterly, 10, 285–307.

Yukl, G. (2010). Leadership in Organizations, 7th edition. London: Prentice-Hall.