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Abstract

Leadership affects all of us in some fashion at some point in our lives. Most people have encountered leaders of all sorts: inspirational, patronizing, oppressive, absent, manipulative, engaging, forgettable and devoted. Most people will also experience various leadership styles, actions and techniques which produce a variety of results: innovation, creativity, stagnation, chaos, conflict, growth, revolution and submission. Clearly not all leaders are the same, so what constitutes a leader? Is it their unique personality traits; specific skills that are learned; or a combination of both of these factors? Does it depend upon the situation a leader encounters? Why do some leaders embody positive moral, ethical and empowering behaviour while others do not? What constitutes functional leadership and high quality leader-member (or follower) relationships? What is the role of the leader, the follower and the organization to ensure effective and successful leadership? What makes the difference to poor, good or great leadership?

In seeking to answer these questions, I will examine the current foundation of leadership theories, describe the role of followers in the leadership process and briefly explore the impact of the organization on this relationship. I will then explain how I believe there is a new paradigm of leadership which is replacing an out-dated, autocratic, hierarchical model which no longer serves to allow for effective leadership. The old paradigm of authoritative bosses wielding absolute power to groups of clone-like followers in identical organizational structures will no longer suffice to provide effective leadership and successful organizations. I will describe how leaders, followers and organizations form an interdependent relationship which is critical to the leadership process and which involves the necessity to reflect, reinvent and take responsibility for a new vision of leadership.
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INTRODUCTION

Leadership affects all of us in some fashion at some point in our lives: when receiving direction from our parents; the peer pressure and social status concerns we have as youth; instructions from teachers, coaches, and adults; interactions with community members and authority figures (police, judges, social workers); experiences with partners; and perhaps the most influential leaders for the largest duration of our time, bosses. It has been found that leaders in an organization can make the difference between success and failure (Lussier, R. et al, 2004). Leadership does make a difference to organizational effectiveness as the number one reason people leave their jobs is because they feel they are being treated poorly by their bosses (ibid). For those employees who stayed with supervisors they perceived as abusive, there was a higher association of "...lower job and life satisfaction, lower commitment, higher conflict between work and family, and psychological distress" (Ibid). According to a poll, up to 77% of people hate their jobs (PR Newswire, Jan.18) which can cost an organization in "...stress related claims...absenteeism, turnover, and the loss of creativity and productivity (ibid)." It is estimated the cost for companies could be in the trillions (ibid). Given the potential costs to both the employer and the employee of effective leadership, it is no wonder there is such an abundance of leadership development literature.

In an internet search on Google, the topic of leadership produces about 126 million results. In searching the Athabasca University Library site, the term 'leadership' produces 2507 results, not including the 28 journal publications with the word leader or leadership in the title. The study of leadership has been a prolific and enduring exercise due to the “...very common assumption that leaders, through their personal qualities, influence and actions, profoundly shape events in society” (Mills, A. et al, p.486). There have been many examples of this influence on society.
throughout our human history (Caesar, Napoleon, Hitler, Ghandi, Churchill, Obama) yet perhaps the most prevailing influence in most of our lives will be that of the actions of our bosses. Most people have encountered leaders of all sorts: inspirational, patronizing, oppressive, absent, manipulative, engaging, forgettable and devoted. Most experience various leadership styles, actions and techniques which produce a variety of results: innovation, creativity, stagnation, chaos, conflict, growth, revolution and submission. "A leader’s ability to interact effectively with subordinates is generally held to be crucial in creating or maintaining an effective organization" (Harvey, P., 2006). Research indicates that "...functional leadership and high quality leader-member relationships result in desirable outcomes such as citizenship behaviours, heightened organizational commitment, and decreased turnover on the part of subordinates" (ibid).

My interest in the topic of leadership stems from my own experiences as a leader and as a follower. Recently, I encountered a leader whose leadership style and behaviour had a profound impact on my work, my sense of self-efficacy, and my relationships at work. It was a shocking realization for me that perhaps this was a more common experience than I had ever known as research suggests "... most people can recall at least one instance in which they were the targets of nonphysical abuse at work" (Tepper, B., 2000), and that leaders could so drastically impact the organizational culture. My revelation should be considered within my context. I live in a Western, capitalistic, consumer-driven, media-frenzied, individualistic culture. I was socialized to respect authority (and as a woman, that usually meant men), abide by the rules, work hard and do my best work to achieve success. This was envisioned in organizational institutions: school, university, and work which followed distinct routines. I am a competitive person who is intrinsically motivated to accomplish my goals. As a leader, I am task and goal oriented,
empathetic, solution-focused and concerned with developing relationships. My frame of reference would include: white, female, Christian, middle-class, middle-aged, and well-educated.

After working several years in a small non-profit organization, we had a leadership change which drastically altered the organizational culture. The previous leader was task-oriented, communicated openly, included staff in decision-making and was an approachable figure in the office. She was motivational and a very hands-on leader. She facilitated large, agency-wide meetings and welcomed innovation and initiative. She was trusting and a good delegator which promoted a sense of pride and accomplishment in agency successes at all levels.

The new leader was secretive, unapproachable, and authoritative. She had a closed communication and planning strategy which left a lot of confusion in its wake. She stayed in her office or was often absent. She placed friends and relatives in invented leadership roles, and delegated authority and power to this close, inner circle. She dismissed any objections and micromanaged all ongoing tasks.

This created sub-cultures within the organization: the resistors, the avoiders and the inner circle which yielded higher power and status. It did not take long for the resistors to be dismissed and the avoiders to become conformists. Eventually, the "...organization develops a kind of tone, or "personality," reflective of the leader's personality and consistent with the character of the metapatterns that arise, which may be constructive, benign, or dysfunctional, [h]owever, the leader's behaviour itself does not occur in a vacuum" (Adams, G., 1996). The new organizational culture, from my perspective, became represented by a powerful core, fearful and obedient staff and little transparency or accountability. This conflicted with my work values which had been positively reinforced previously and which included my socialization to believe, "...the
fundamental task facing leaders and managers rests in creating appropriate systems of shared meaning that can mobilize the efforts of people in pursuit of desired aims and objectives” (Morgan, G., 2006). I left involuntarily and have had time to reflect on the impact of this leadership change which resulted in such a profound questioning of my values, identity and beliefs about leaders, followers and organizations. This reflection included the attempt to answer various questions which resulted in this examination of leadership.

Clearly not all leaders are the same, so what constitutes a leader? Is it their unique personality traits; specific skills that are learned; or a combination of both of these factors? Does it depend upon the situation a leader encounters? Why do some leaders embody positive moral, ethical and empowering behaviour while others do not? What constitutes functional leadership and high quality leader-member (or follower) relationships? What is the role of the leader, the follower and the organization to ensure effective and successful leadership? What makes the difference to poor, good or great leadership?

In seeking to answer these questions, I will examine the current foundation of leadership theories, describe the role of followers in the leadership process and briefly explore the impact of the organization on this relationship. I will then explain how I believe there is a new paradigm of leadership which is replacing an out-dated, autocratic, hierarchical model which no longer serves to allow for effective leadership. The old paradigm of authoritative bosses wielding absolute power to groups of clone-like followers in identical organizational structures will no longer suffice to provide effective leadership and successful organizations. I will describe how leaders, followers and organizations form an interdependent relationship which is critical to the leadership process and which involves the necessity to reflect, reinvent and take responsibility for a new vision of leadership.
LEADERSHIP DEFINED

What is leadership?

In defining leadership, theorists have described leadership as a set of particular traits or personality characteristics which allow leaders to "induce others to accomplish tasks" (Northouse, P., 1997, p.2). It has also been defined as an act or behaviour and still others view it as "...the focus of group processes" (ibid).

Peter Northouse (1997) has identified some components he describes as central to the phenomenon of leadership.

- Leadership is a process
- Leadership involves influence
- Leadership occurs within a group context
- Leadership involves goal attainment (ibid, p.3).

Leadership can thus be seen as a dynamic, interdependent process where influence is exerted to attain goals. Some leaders achieve this through their role as "assigned leaders" and others through "emergent leadership" (ibid). Assigned leadership refers to the role of the leader within an organization, and emergent refers to the influence leaders can exert over others regardless of their position within an organization. Assigned leadership roles may are also be considered management positions.
Management emerged as a necessary strategy to control employees and processes in an industrialized environment while leaders are responsible for "...seeking adaptive and constructive change" (Ibid, p.9). While leaders may be seen as providing “...vision and strategy, motivation and inspiration...” (Mills, A., 2007, p.488), and managers may “...implement that vision and strategy, steward resources and handle the day-to-day operational problems[,]” it is important to recognize that “...successful managers [can] be good leaders and successful leaders [can] be good managers” (Ibid). Although differences have been noted, (see chart in Lussier, R., 2004, p.9) this paper will examine the notion of leadership as inclusive of management tasks.

LEADERSHIP THEORIES

TRAIT THEORY

What makes a leader effective? Is it their unique personality traits? Some theorists believe that leaders are born with traits which enable them to become better leaders (Lussier, R., 2004). Researchers have attempted to study individual leaders to define which specific characteristics and traits are common amongst successful leaders. Trait theorists attempt to identify "...personality, physical abilities, and social and work-related characteristics..." (Ibid), to determine these unique traits. A popular model for classifying personalities is the "Big Five Model of Personality" (Ibid, p.30) which categorizes personality into five dimensions: surgency (also called dominance), agreeableness, adjustment, conscientiousness, and openness to experience.

Surgency is the dimension which measures leadership and extraversion traits and is also known as a dominance trait. Agreeableness measures people's ability to get along with others. The
adjustment dimension includes traits related to emotional stability. Leaders with a high degree of conscientiousness are dependable, organized and credible. Those willing to change and try new things are high in the openness to experience dimension (ibid, p.31). Stogdill (as cited in Northouse, P., 1997), analyzed several trait research studies and found 10 common characteristics in leaders:

1), drive for responsibility and task completion; 2), vigour and persistence in pursuit of goals; 3), venturesomeness and originality in problem solving; 4), drive to exercise initiative in social situations; 5), self confidence and sense of personal identity; 6), willingness to accept consequences of decisions and actions; 7), readiness to absorb interpersonal stress; 8), willingness to tolerate frustration and delay; 9), ability to influence other people's behaviour; and 10), the capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at hand. (Ibid, p.15) Other researchers (see comparison chart, Northouse, P., 1997, p.16) would add intelligence, integrity, extroversion and determination as common leadership characteristics.

The Trait theory suggest that "...selecting the 'right' people will increase organizational effectiveness" (Ibid, p.18). Companies have been known to give personality tests (such as the Myer's-Briggs Type Indicator) to prospective candidates to match desired traits with the position or company. It has been stated that 40 percent of companies use personality tests to match candidates for job success (ibid). Many organizations also use personality tests to increase awareness of differing communication skills amongst employees to reduce conflict and to promote professional development in perceived weaker areas.

Strengths of the Trait theory include: it fulfills the followers' need to identify with leaders as people with special abilities and unique traits; it has an abundance of research to back it up; it
focuses solely on the leader; and it allows for an in depth examination of how personality and leadership are related which may offer information to employers to assess strengths and weaknesses in potential leaders (Ibid, p.20). While the Trait theory has provided some valuable research on leadership, it has its limitations.

Although this approach has been studied for over 100 years (ibid), it has failed to identify a definitive list of common traits agreeable to all researchers which makes it subjective to each particular author. Another limitation is that this theory focuses solely on the leader and their specific traits and does not address the situational factors (including relationships, support, culture, environment, and performance stress) which may influence leaders. As it is difficult to change a person's personality traits, it isn't probable that a leader will become more agreeable or conscientious by attending a leadership workshop (ibid). Certainly not all leaders have the same personality and organizations may require different concoctions of these traits which may increase the difficulty of finding a perfect match. A related theory to Trait theory which focuses on the personality of leaders as perceived by followers is charismatic leadership.

**CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP**

Max Weber saw in a charismatic leader, "...someone who single-handedly visualizes a transcendent mission or course of action which is not only appealing to potential followers, but compels them to act on it because they believe the leader is extraordinarily gifted" (Lussier, R., 1997, p.341). There is some debate amongst scholars on the locus of charismatic leadership which falls into 3 categories: 1) charismatic leadership is the result of the situation or social climate facing the leader, 2) is a result of the leader's extraordinary qualities, and 3), the result of the interaction between the situation and the leader's qualities (Ibid). Weber supported the idea...
that charismatic leadership could not take place without a social need; a crisis or stressful situation which would require the perceived need of someone with extraordinary qualities. Others argue that it is the qualities of "...a strong sense of vision, exceptional communication skills, strong conviction, trustworthiness, high self-confidence and intelligence, and high energy and action-oriented" (Ibid, p.342). Still others believe it is a combination of both which influence followers' perceptions of leaders as charismatic (ibid). Conger and Kanungo, 1987, found that the attribution of charisma to leaders depends upon 4 variables:

1. Discrepancy gap between status quo and future vision; the greater the gap from the status quo to the leader's vision, the more likely followers will attribute extraordinary vision to the leader,

2. Vision articulation and role modeling; the leader is able to communicate effectively the greater advantages of the future situation and the negative images of the status quo, or present situation. The leader is able to demonstrate this through their behaviour and role modeling,

3. Use of unconventional behaviour; leaders that use unconventional means, particularly self-sacrifice or heroic acts to achieve change are seen as charismatic,

4. Realistic assessment of resource needs for goal achievement; an ability to align the constraints of the political, physical and social environment to the desired outcomes to achieve success (Ibid, p.347).

If followers attribute charisma to leaders it can lead to "...unconditional loyalty, devotion, self-sacrifice, obedience and commitment to the leader and to the cause the leader represents (Lussier, R., 2004, p.349). These causes can have positive or negative social impacts. Leaders
such as Hitler, David Koresh and Jim Jones managed to convince followers of the desirable outcomes of their respective causes. Charismatic leaders with causes perceived as positive are identified as social charismatic leaders and those who possess "...dominant, Machiavellian, and narcissistic..." (Ibid, p.354) qualities are considered personal charismatic leaders. The social charismatic leaders use rewards to reinforce behaviour and the personal charismatic leader uses punishment to control the behaviour of followers (Ibid). Charismatic leadership focuses on the perception and attribution of characteristics by followers unto leaders that creates a relationship of influence and adulation. The following theory examines how these traits manifest in the behaviours of leaders.

**LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR THEORY**

When considering the Leadership Behaviour, or Style theories, the "...shift in emphasis ...was from thinking about leadership in terms of traits that someone has, to the conceptualization of leadership as a form of activity" (Northouse, P., 1997, p.32). This includes leaders' behaviours in various situations and with followers.

Leadership behaviour has been shown to have a causal effect on employee performance (Lussier, R., 2004, p.64). Leadership Behaviour theorists attempted to find the one best style of leadership and identify differences in effective and ineffective leadership behaviours. Perhaps because leadership is a dynamic, interdependent process, as defined earlier, no one best style could be defined. A leader's traits and attitudes affect their behaviour towards their employees which in turn affects the employee's motivation and performance. This is an important consideration for leaders as research shows that a "...good predictor of employee retention is the relationship between manager and employee" (ibid, p.64).
Most leadership styles will fall somewhere on a continuum between autocratic and democratic styles. Autocratic leaders make all decisions, micro-manage and have a high control and command strategy. Democratic leaders allow for participation in decision-making, do not micro-manage, and have a high interactive strategy with their employees. These polar styles can also be seen in other leadership styles which researchers have identified: job-centered (emphasis on goal achievement and work facilitation), employee-centered (emphasis on supportive leadership and interaction facilitation), (Lussier, R., 2004, p.71) or "task behaviours and relationship behaviours" (Northouse, P., 1997, p.32). Four combinations of structure/consideration dimensions have also been identified as leadership styles. A high structure (task focused), low consideration (relationship focused) style is similar to an autocratic, job-centered style while a high consideration/low structure style would correspond to an employee-centered and democratic style of leadership. Similarly, the Leadership Grid, (Blake and Mouton, 1991, as cited in Lussier, R., 2004, p.71) identifies the concern for people and the concern for production dimensions on a grid with a possible 81 combinations of degrees of concern. The grid identifies 5 leadership styles:

Impoverished Leader: this leader has low concern for production and people and does minimum requirements for employment,

Authority/Compliance Leader: this leader has high concern for production and low concern for people and focuses on getting the job done without regard for employee well-being,

Country Club Leader: this leader has a high concern for people and low concern for production and focuses on creating an amiable atmosphere without regard for production,
Middle-of-the Road Leader: this leader has balanced, medium concern for production and people and strives to maintain morale and performance,

Team Leader: this leader has high concern for both people and production and strives for maximum performance and employee satisfaction (ibid).

The researchers found the Team Leader to be the most effective style resulting in "...improved performance, low absenteeism and turnover and high employee satisfaction" (Ibid, p.72) while other researchers felt that a one-style-fits-all wasn't the best definition of effective leadership and that the situation demanded which style was appropriate (ibid).

The Leadership Behaviour theory which developed from studies in the 1950's and 1960's provides some information in identifying what leaders do and it also includes the important contribution of both task and relationship-based behaviours to the leadership process. Revelations of leadership styles and behaviours can provide developmental opportunities for leaders (Northouse, P., 1997, p.42) which extend beyond a list of personality traits. It also requires that some consideration be paid to leaders' actions and the corresponding effects on followers.

While this theory builds upon the knowledge on the study of leadership, it has failed to identify one leadership style which corresponds to the most effective outcomes. "Certain situations may require different leadership styles; some may be complicated and require high task behaviour and others may be simple and require supportive behaviours" (ibid, p.42). Leaders may not be strong in all leadership styles and be challenged by certain situations which require a task or relationship-based behaviour if that is not their strength. Can these skills be taught?

SITUATIONAL THEORIES
Situational leadership is an approach widely used for training leaders in organizations because of its simplicity, practicality and prescriptive value. It is also valuable to the understanding of the leadership process because it requires flexibility in leadership traits, styles and behaviours to accommodate dynamic situations and follower needs and relationships (Northouse, P., 1997).

Originally developed in 1969 by Hersey and Blanchard (ibid) and revised more recently (1993), the basic premise of this theory is that leaders must adapt their leadership style to the current situation to determine if task (directive) or relationship-based (supportive) behaviours are required. A leader must assess a situation based on followers’ competencies and commitment to perform given tasks and adjust their style according to the needs of the followers at that time (Ibid, p.54).

Directive behaviours assist in goal achievement by "...giving directions, establishing goals and methods of evaluation, setting time lines, defining roles, and showing how the goals are to be achieved "(ibid). Directive behaviour usually involves one-way communication about what is to be done, how it shall be done and who is doing it.

Supportive behaviours include asking "...for input, problem solving, praising, sharing information about self, and listening" (ibid). It involves two-way communication and shows support and consideration for others. Leaders can assess the situation and choose to use a high-directive, low-supportive; high-directive, high supportive; high-supportive, low-directive; or low-directive, low-supportive approach to leadership. They may also consider the development level of followers (from low to high) to assess which style is appropriate at that time for that task (ibid).
There is a lack of clear evidence that this theoretical approach produces the most effective outcomes. The assessment of the situation and followers' developmental levels are subjective and without empirical validity. There are no studies which conclusively show these approaches to be the only viable or the most effective in these situations. There is also difficulty in assessing for individual levels and needs during group projects or work (ibid). While this theory requires leaders to assess the situation to adapt their style to produce positive outcomes, contingency theories encourage the leader to actually change the situation.

**CONTINGENCY THEORY**

Similar to Situational Leadership, Contingency Theory considers the contextual variables that affect a leader's style. Whereas in situational leadership theory leaders change their style to suit the situation, in contingency theory, leaders change the situation to suit their style by assessing the contextual variables. These variables include: leader's traits, behaviours, and experiences; followers' capabilities and motivation; and the situation's environment, structure and tasks (Lussier, R., 1997). Leaders can determine if the situation (including relationship with employees and situational favourableness) requires a task-oriented or relationship-oriented style of leadership and can change the situation to suit their preferred style (ibid).

Contingency theory identifies 4 styles: directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented which the leader chooses after consideration of the situational factors. These factors include subordinate and environmental concerns. Subordinate situational characteristics include:

- Authoritarianism-the degree to which the employee wishes to be told what to do and how to do it,
• Locus of control—extent to which employees believe they can control their goal-achievement (internal), or that it is controlled by others (external),

• Ability—extent of the capability of employees to perform tasks.

Environmental situational considerations include:

• Task structure—the extent of repetitiveness of the job,

• Formal authority—extent of the leader’s positional power,

• Work group—extent to which co-workers contribute to job satisfaction and the relationship between followers. (Ibid, p.150)

Contingency theory can be predictive in determining which style fits which situation. It also considers the link between leaders and situations in determining leader effectiveness. It works to better fit leadership styles with situations for better outcomes. "Whole managers are flexible and able to adapt their leadership style to the situation" (Blanchard, K., et al, 2007, p.87).

The standard assessment tool for this approach is the Least Preferred Co-worker Scale (Fiedler, 1987, as cited in Northouse, P., 1997, p.80). The LPC has been criticized for its lack of face validity and clear instructions which has produced inconsistent results. This theory also does not clearly identify how "situational engineering' should take place. It is not always possible to change a situation from a high task to a high relationship situation (ibid) and many situational changes are beyond the control of leaders. Promotions which require new roles and skills, changes in organizational structures and processes and market trends and fluctuations may change the situational factors for leaders regardless of the contingency factors. We’ve examined the possibilities of leaders being born with certain desirable traits, learning new leadership skills
and styles, having the ability to assess situations and adapt their behaviour according to certain contingency factors, but how does this affect leader-follower relationships?

**LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE THEORY**

The Leader-Member Exchange theory (LMX), first described in 1975, "...makes the dyadic relationship between leaders and followers the focal point of the leadership process" (Northouse, P., 1997, p.109). The leader is required to build effective working dyads with each follower to ensure optimal performance from high quality leader-member exchanges. This is accomplished in 3 stages. The initial stage, the stranger phase, involves rigid, rule-bound interactions that are of low quality. The acquaintance phase is second and involves more focus on group goals and accomplishments and on increasing trust and shared responsibilities. In the final phase, mature partnership, the dyad has evolved to include more trust, respect and mutual obligations in interactions. In this phase, "...partnerships are transformational in that they assist leaders and followers in moving beyond their own self-interests to accomplish the greater good of the team and organization" (Ibid, p.115).

Leaders who develop high quality exchanges with followers receive more commitment and dedication than with low quality exchange relationships. "From a leader-member exchange (LMX) perspective, research indicates that factors such as members’ levels of effort and their attitudes toward their job and their leader can promote functional leadership behaviour that help foster high quality relationships" (Harvey, P., et al, 2006). LMX theory focuses on the dyadic relationship of the leader-follower and its positive correlation between high member exchanges and organizational outcomes. It illuminates the need for leaders to familiarize themselves with
diverse personalities, communicate effectively and pay attention to working relationships for best results (Northouse, P., 1997, p.117).

Due to the challenges of working with diverse personalities, it is potentially harder for leaders to develop mature partnerships with every follower and this may cause inequalities in treatment of individuals and groups. This has the potential to divide working groups into two groups; in-groups are those with high quality exchanges and out-groups are those with low-quality exchanges. In-groups are often treated better, given more responsibility and have higher job satisfaction. Leaders are challenged to ensure all followers are part of the in-group (ibid). As leaders are unique, some may have greater skills at developing reciprocal relationships with followers which makes this theory not universally effective. It is also difficult to measure the quality of exchanges and the actual results of them (ibid, p.118). The Team Leadership theory attempts to categorize the effectiveness of these exchanges.

**TEAM LEADERSHIP**

One way in which organizations have met the challenges of a changing, dynamic, global market is to change their structure to include a higher frequency of exchanges among members. Increasingly, organizations are using teams as an alternative to the traditional hierarchical, authoritative structure. Using a team approach has been shown to achieve outcomes such as "...improved productivity, quality, efficiency, employee satisfaction, customer satisfaction, and overall operating performance", because performance is enhanced "...when people with a vested interest take ownership of an issue or process in a cooperative fashion" (Lussier, R., 2004, p.260).
Team leadership has the benefit of utilizing a variety of skills, experiences and ideas within a collaborative environment. It can increase productivity, creativity and innovation in a combined effort for success. It also has its challenges which can include, "...the need for effective communication; resolving personality conflicts and egos; establishing unifying goals, direction and focus; establishing appropriate rewards and incentives; clarity about team structure; effective leadership; and organizing the team's work to ensure timely decisions" (Ibid, p.262). Although team work has been shown to increase employee morale, it also can create interpersonal problems within the group. Members may be criticized for out-performing their peers, shirk their individual responsibilities in lieu of the group's work (social loafing), or engage in groupthink (going along with the group to avoid conflict). (ibid)

Six factors have been identified which are critical to team effectiveness:

1. Team Norms

Team norms help guide members' behaviours by defining what are "...acceptable standards of behaviour ...shared by team members" (ibid, p.265). Norms are tacit agreements of acceptable behaviour within the team.

2. Team Leadership

Although a benefit of team work is shared leadership, it is important for leaders to be accountable for outcomes of the group process. Team leaders must "...make contributions when necessary, encourage a climate of dialogue, turn obstacles into opportunities, and see themselves and others as part of the team's pool of knowledge, skills and ideas" (ibid, p.266).

3. Team Cohesiveness and Interdependence
Teams which have a high degree of cohesion and interdependence have also been found to have a high degree of success and employee satisfaction. Cohesiveness is high when:

- Team members agree on a common purpose and direction,
- There is high praise and recognition by external parties for the team's success,
- The organization encourages and motivates teams to compete with each other for rewards,
- Members find they have common ground, similar attitudes and values and enjoy being on the team.

4. Team Composition

The right mix of skills, abilities and knowledge are necessary for teams to be effective. Heterogeneous teams outperform homogeneous teams due to increased diversity; however there is also a greater risk of conflict within heterogeneous teams. Conflict is managed more easily in smaller teams (< 25) yet the size should be determined by the task.

5. Team Structure

The structure determines the allocation of tasks, responsibilities, authority, and the level of autonomy and interdependence within the team. It also includes the relational components of team members which may determine its effectiveness.

6. Organizational Support

Teams can have increased effectiveness when there is adequate support from the organization with "...training, rewards, information and material resources..." (Lussier, R., 2004, p.266-9).
There must be a culture within the organizational environment which supports teamwork and is willing to measure their success. Team leadership shifts the focus to a collaborative approach among leaders and followers yet still requires leaders to inspire, motivate and support followers. To accomplish this, leaders require an effective organizational environment.

**TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

Transformational Leadership Theory focuses on the ability of a leader to transform an organization rather than on individual characteristics of the leader or on leader/follower relations. Part of the "...New Leadership paradigm..." (Northouse, P., 1997, p.130) of the 1980's, transformational leaders are able to articulate a vision so effectively that followers are eager to "...expend exceptional effort in achieving organizational goals" (Lussier, R., 2004, p.355). It moves from a focus on the self-strategy of a charismatic leader to a collective strategy towards a shared vision and goal. Transformational leadership describes a process of positive influence that changes and transforms individuals, organizations and communities.

The powerful impact of transformational leadership includes a focus on ethics, values, standards and long-term goals supported by clearly defined practices " (Hines, C., 2002). This type of leader is aware of the needs and motives of followers and strives to help followers reach their greatest potential (Northouse, P., 1997). Some common characteristics of transformational leaders are: they see themselves as change agents; are visionaries who have a high level of trust in their intuition; are risk-takers but not reckless; can articulate core values which guide their own behaviour; have exceptional cognitive skills and deliberate before taking action; believe in people and show sensitivity to their needs; and, show flexibility and an openness to learning from experience (Lussier, R., 2004). Transformational leaders are usually charismatic; have
articulate visions; are considerate and attentive to followers' needs and motivations; and have skills and abilities that influence followers to share their vision. There is a lot of research behind this popular leadership theory (Northouse, P., 1997, p.144).

Some limitations include the tendency for supporters of this theory to see the leader as the focus of all exchanges rather than in an interdependent process with followers. It is a difficult challenge to train leaders to be transformational and visionary. It can also be seen as autocratic in that one person's vision becomes the standard for the organization. There is also a strong attachment to charismatic leadership which highlights trait theory components and focuses on the leader more than the exchanges with followers or the organizational vision.

Leadership, according to these various theories, may include influences such as personality traits, situational variables, organizational contexts or a desire to reach specific outcomes using a variety of means. It is clear that leadership contains a diverse set of behaviours to attain successful outcomes. We've examined some behaviours which make the difference between successful and unsuccessful leaders so why do leaders choose certain behaviours in their role? Why do some leaders embody positive moral, ethical and empowering behaviour while others do not? Leaders are individuals with unique values, attitudes, goals and motivations. Achievement Motivation Theory and the Leader Motive Profile attempt to describe the motivations behind leaders' behaviours.

**LEADER MOTIVATIONS**

The Achievement Motivation theory attempts "...to explain and predict behaviour and performance based on a person's need for achievement, power and affiliation" (Lussier, R., 2004, p.38). Introduced by David McClelland in the 1940's, this theory proposes that our behaviour is
motivated by our needs which are based on our personality and developed as we interact within our environment. We all possess these needs to varying degrees however one tends to be more dominant in us and will motivate our behaviour (ibid).

People with a high need for achievement (n Ach) strive for "...excellence in accomplishments through individual effort" (ibid). These people are concerned with goal attainment, career advancement and putting forth their best effort. McClelland's research found that only about 10 percent of the U.S. population had a dominant need for achievement and although there was a correlation between high nAch and performance, it did not translate to leader effectiveness (ibid).

The need for power (n Pow) is dominant in people who are competitive, like to control situations and are ambitious. They tend to have less regard for how others see them than for their power to influence people and situations.

The need for affiliation (n Aff) is seen in people with a strong desire to build relationships with others. They are sensitive to others' needs and seek to belong and be liked by people. They are generally low in n Pow and would prefer to be part of the group rather than perform as leaders (Ibid, p.39).

The Leader Motive Profile theory (LMP) has been shown to be reliable in predicting leader effectiveness based on a person's needs. The LMP according to McClelland, can assess the right combination of needs to predict successful leaders. These include a "...high need for power, which is socialized [used for the greater good]; that is greater than the need for affiliation and with a moderate need for achievement" (ibid, p.40). This, according to the LMP theory is the recipe for success in leaders. Attitudes have also been shown to influence leaders' behaviours.
Douglas McGregor (Kopelman, R., et al, 2008) classified leadership attitudes as either Theory X or Theory Y. Those with Theory X attitudes tend to believe that most workers are lazy, dislike work and require close monitoring to ensure the work is being performed. Theory Y people tend to believe people like to work and require little supervision. Leaders with an X attitude are more negative, coercive and autocratic and those with Y attitudes are more positive, democratic, participative and use internal motivations and rewards as opposed to threats and punishment (ibid, p.45).

Leaders' attitudes can affect their behaviours which in turn can affect followers' behaviours, also called the Pygmalion Effect. Leaders who have high expectations of their employees usually get high performance results and those expect less, will get less. Leaders with high expectations and good motivational skills can achieve greater success with the performance of their followers than those who do not. "The goal of leaders and the organization should be "... to energize, direct, and sustain particular work-related behaviours in their followers..." (Ellemers, N., et al, 2004). As leaders' attitudes towards others and their followers can affect their behaviour, so too does their own self-concept. Leaders with high self-confidence tend to have a high sense of self-efficacy which relates to a positive self-concept (Lussier, 2004, p.46). This attitude can have a parallel effect; positive, optimistic leaders can have more positive followers which produces better performance and positive customers. The ability of leaders to positively motivate themselves and others is important to achieve organizational objectives and have high performing employees. While leaders are motivated by their needs, attitudes and self-concept to behave in certain ways, they also have needs which are congruent with those of the followers they must motivate to perform well.

FOLLOWER MOTIVATIONS
To increase an employee's satisfaction, leaders must determine what their needs are and how to satisfy them within the work context. Motivation can be triggered by needs external (outside) or internal (inside) to our perceived satisfaction. External motivation includes: praise, status and income; and internal motivation may include personal satisfaction of achievements, contributing one's time and talent or job satisfaction. There are several motivation theories which will be briefly examined here to determine possible reasons for behaviour.

Content motivation theories attempt to explain and predict behaviour based on people's needs. Abraham Maslow (1940's) based his hierarchy of needs theory on 4 assumptions:

1. Only unmet needs motivate,

2. People's needs are arranged in order of importance (hierarchy) going from basic to complex,

3. People will not be motivated to meet higher-level needs until lower level needs have been minimally satisfied, and

4. There are 5 classifications of needs in the hierarchy:
   - Physiological-air, food, shelter, sex and relief or avoidance of pain
   - Safety-security and protection of physiological needs
   - Social-belonging, love, friendship, acceptance and affection
   - Esteem-ego, self-respect, status, and recognition
   - Self-actualization-growth, achievement, and development
Unfortunately it is often difficult to distinguish what a person's needs are and how they can be determined as motivating factors. Individuals are unique in their perception of needs, wants and desires and may not fall neatly into Maslow's hierarchy. Cultural differences are not taken into account and there is no consideration of contextual or unknown factors (environment). It may be difficult for organizations to offer incentives to motivate employees at the high-level needs classification if their task is repetitive, as in low-paying jobs. (Mills, A., 2007)

Herzberg (1950-60's), distinguished between those factors which caused work dissatisfaction and those which caused motivation, in his Motivator-Hygiene theory. He proposed that if hygiene factors were not present, employees would be dissatisfied with their job. These factors were external, did not motivate employees and included: the work environment, characteristics of the supervisor, and salary. Motivating factors, on the other hand, were intrinsic and included: the challenge of the work, one's contributions, and the amount of personal growth one achieved through work. While it may be impossible to satisfy all individual motivators, this theory attempted to focus on areas that organizations could more easily address (Ibid, p.220).

Process theories went a step further in trying to determine what organizations could do to promote hard work and optimal performance. The Expectancy theory assumes that "...people will work hard to achieve good work performance if they are subsequently rewarded with rewards that are meaningful to them" (Ibid, p.223). This allows for flexibility and a focus on individual needs in the allocation of rewards. It is important, however that the employee feels capable of completing the task or they may not be motivated to try if they expect failure. It may also result in an attitude of completing just enough to earn the reward and offering no further initiative or
effort in their performance. As an extrinsic reward, it is often effective only in the short-term as people's priorities change over time which requires a lot of flexibility in organizations (ibid).

Goal-setting theory states that "...people will work harder when they have clear goals that are agreed upon" (Ibid, p.224). To be effective, goals should be specific, challenging, measurable and achievable. People are motivated to achieve results which provide them with a sense of purpose in their work (Lussier, R., 2004, p.84).

Equity theory proposes that employees will seek "...social equity in the rewards they receive (output) for their performance (input)" (Ibid, p.82). This theory is based on peoples' perceptions of others' salaries and rewards for similar work. It relates more to job dissatisfaction (if employees feel there is inequity) than to actual motivation (Mills, A., 2007, p.225).

New and emerging motivational theories are providing some exciting discussions on the motivational process and peoples' behaviours. The self-concept theory of motivation connects the employee's self-esteem and sense of self-worth with their work duties. The four areas of self-concept can help us understand behaviours which can increase understanding of intrinsic motivation. The perceived self (how one sees oneself), the ideal self (the skills and trait one wishes to have), self-esteem (the gap between the perceived and ideal selves), and a set of social identities (how one sees oneself in relation to others). If the work increases esteem, motivation will increase, however it will decrease as esteem diminishes. This theory focuses on intrinsic motivation and has 5 assumptions:

1. Humans are not only goal-oriented but also self-expressive,

2. People are motivated to enhance their self-esteem and sense of self-worth,
3. People are also motivated to retain and increase their sense of self-consistency,

4. Self-concepts are composed, in part, of identities, and,

5. Self-concept based behaviour is not always related to expectations or specific goals (Mills, A., 2007, p.229).

The implication for this theory is that social values and judgements (largely originating outside of the organization) comprise the meanings we place on jobs, organizations, employees, managers and clients which are largely out of a leader's control. This may make it extremely challenging for leaders to find ways to motivate followers.

We've considered leaders traits, behaviours and motivations as well as possible motivators to explain the behaviour of followers. When considering the behaviour of followers it is necessary to examine their relationship to leaders to better understand their motivations and behaviours.

FOLLOWERS

"The words “leader” and “follower” bring to mind a common script in which the leader is in charge, saying, “You do this, and you do that.” Meanwhile, followers are imagined as inferior beings in need of the leader’s direction, motivation, and protection" (Riggio, R. et al, 2008, p.14). Some factors which require people to assume a followership role may be to complete exchanges with the leader or organization (loyalty for security, performance for rewards), or a lack of "...willingness or capability to assume a leadership role" (ibid, P.25). The effectiveness of a leader is dependent upon the attributions placed upon them by the followers. Followers' motivation may be influenced by the attributions they believe underlie the leader's behaviours. "When subordinates form negative attributions concerning the intent of leader behaviour, their
belief in the leader’s effectiveness and the quality of the leader-subordinate relationships
decreases” (Harvey, P., et al, 2006).

There have been few studies in the field of leadership that focus on the follower, however,
Robert E. Kelley in his research found there were two dimensions in the way people follow: " 1.
Do they think for themselves? Are they independent critical thinkers? Or do they look to the
leader to do the thinking for them? 2. Are they actively engaged in creating positive energy for
the organization? Or is there negative energy or passive involvement?” (Riggio, R. Et al, 2008,
p.6).

From these dimensions he found five basic styles of followership:

1. The Sheep-are passive and look to the leader to do their thinking for them and to motivate
them to do their work.

2. The "Yes" people-are positive and always on the leader's side yet still look to the leader
to do their thinking and provide direction and motivation. They are energetic and will
complete tasks when directed then will come back to the leader for further direction.

3. The Alienated- are people who think for themselves but have a negative energy. They are
sceptical, cynical and always think of reasons for opposing ideas presented by the leader.
They may consider themselves as mavericks who stand up to the boss.

4. The Pragmatics-are people who sit on the fence and wait to see which way the wind
blows. Once a direction is decided they will be on board but they will never be the first.
They may see themselves as preserving the status quo.
5. The Star Follower—are people who think for themselves, have positive energy and will carefully consider leaders' decisions for their soundness. If they disagree with decisions, they will challenge them by offering alternatives. (ibid, p.8)

There are many influencing factors which may determine the behaviours of followers including cultural belief systems and values. It is likely that a Japanese, Canadian or African person may have unique beliefs about followership which manifests in different behaviours. Religious beliefs can also influence followers' beliefs and behaviours regarding follower behaviour. Early childhood experiences, parenting styles and involvement with authority figures will also shape followers' beliefs about their role in relationship with leaders. Even these interactions between leaders and followers may influence their behaviour as followers may react differently to diverse leadership styles, attitudes and behaviours. The organizational culture, structure and tasks may also determine followers' beliefs and behaviours (ibid, p.10). All of these factors may influence the self-concept of followers and influence their beliefs about their role orientation.

Followers bring with them to their work, their role orientations. "Individuals’ role orientations refer to how they conceptualize their duties and responsibilities in their organizational positions" (Riggio, R., 2008, p.26). The role orientation is influenced by the individual's self-expectations as well as those communicated and perceived by others. This orientation will determine"... how they spend their time and effort as well as the form of their interactions with others..."as most adults have"... an extended period of training and socialization in assuming organizational roles, resulting in specific perceptions and cognitions regarding their position" (ibid).

Jon P. Howell and María J. Méndez, describe three orientations of followership which can affect the relationship with the leader and determine successful or unsuccessful outcomes. Each
of the orientations describes followers' behaviours which are effective, ineffective and the organizational influences on the orientation. The first, **Followership as an Interactive Role** would describe effective behaviours as "... followers who are engaged with their leaders to actively cooperate in achieving organizational goals" (ibid). Ineffective behaviours in this orientation would include the sheep or yes people in the previous example. Other ineffective Interactive Follower behaviours include "the political gamesman" who is self-serving and changes his behaviour to suit the dominant mood and the person who seeks identification with a person or group, often the leader, and in extreme cases, can become fanatic (ibid, p.29).

Characteristics of Interactive Followers include a strong sense of identification with the leader and the relationship for mutual rewards and benefit if effective, and if ineffective, a self-serving identification with the leader or group which may be at the expense of the organization or a blind allegiance to the leader. Leaders can also exhibit these interactive behaviours with their own superiors and role model them for followers. Organizational requirements may also elicit this orientation from followers and/or leaders through structures and processes (ibid, p.30).

The second orientation, **Follower as an Independent Role**, is a leader-substitute role which may have been traditionally carried out by leaders but which now frees leaders up to do other things while allowing followers to take on the tasks. Effective behaviours include a high degree of self-direction and competence. Ineffective behaviours include neutralizing the potential influence of leaders in an erroneous belief that they are more competent to make decisions (ibid, p.33).

Characteristics of Independent Followers include a strong individualized self-concept. They may be high performers with professional skills. They may also consider themselves alienated from the leader and organization and see themselves as rebels. Organizations can provide
training in self-management and provide opportunities; however the leaders must also have this orientation for followers to be successful Independent Followers (ibid, p.34).

The third orientation, Follower as a Shifting Role, is often seen in a team-based work structure where "...[i]ndividuals are expected to adapt themselves to the team leadership structure by leading or following, and their role is often temporal and dependent on the requirements of a particular project or task" (ibid, p.35). Followers must be able to shift fluidly from leader or follower roles depending upon the need. Effective behaviours include skilled communication and organization skills and a sense of collaborative purpose. Ineffective behaviours can include groupthink, social loafing and a self-serving interest rather than having a goal of group success (ibid, p.36).

Characteristics of the Shifting Role orientation follower include: a strong social identity or collective self-concept. Team expectations and external norms may also influence behaviours. More organizations are shifting towards team structures which can produce quick decision-making and problem solving results and both leaders and followers may require this orientation at some point (ibid, p.37).

Perhaps followers and leaders are motivated by more than their needs, beliefs, orientation and organizational goals. We need to learn what life events produce followers who can think for themselves; exercise their own independent, critical judgment; and act in the best interests of society or the organization even if it means needing to go against the leader or a group (Ibid, p.12). This may increase the responsibility of followers and the understanding of the necessity and value of their contributions within organizations. We tend to believe that the leaders are in
charge, directing and shaping followership behaviour. Yet maybe leaders are malleable products of cumulative followership actions (Riggio, R., 2008, P.11).

LEADER/FOLLOWER RELATIONSHIP

As mentioned earlier, the leader/follower relationship is dyadic and each influences the behaviour of the other. Research suggests that the behaviours of leaders are often driven by biased causal perceptions which can create a situation where conflict, negative emotions and unproductive behaviours are possible (see McGregor's Theory X and Y, as an example). When leaders attribute erroneous causal factors to subordinates' performance, it can produce an emotional reaction which influences the leader-follower relationship. This in turn causes subordinates to react less favourably to leaders' motivational behaviours. Two attributional tendencies are particularly problematic; the actor-observer bias and the self-serving bias (Harvey, P., 2006). The leader who uses the actor-observer bias attributes the behaviours and outcomes of followers to be internal and stable factors (effort), rather than external, unstable factors (resources). Leaders who use the self-serving bias have a "...tendency to attribute positive outcomes to internal, stable, and possibly controllable aspects of one’s self while attributing negative outcomes to external factors beyond one’s personal control" (Ibid). If something goes wrong, it wasn't the leader's fault but a lack of resources, support, etc. It is the leader's appraisal of these causal factors which will determine their reaction as functional or dysfunctional and impact the leader-follower relationship (ibid). However, when these attributions are minimized, it can lead to increased motivation and congruent expectations (ibid). The leader generally has the power to behave in ways which effect follower's motivation, positively or negatively by controlling access to their needs at work.
"The element of fear is often introduced when the opportunity to reach any of the levels in our hierarchy of needs is withheld or threatened" (Seperich, G., 2006, P.7). Job security, a sense of belongingness and self-esteem based on performance can all be manipulated by dysfunctional leaders, however this is not the only type of dysfunctional leadership behaviour. "Unfortunately, the use of power for personal aggrandizement and pleasure is universal" (Seperich, G., p.11). Often followers have no control over the power of leaders to determine their work tasks, opportunities, salary, and status in an organization. "Some of the most destructive corporate environments are those in which the abuse of alcohol and drugs, sexual favours, and discrimination garner preferential treatment for those who are willing to participate in these activities" (ibid). There is anecdotal evidence to suggest the misuse of power and abusive supervision impacts employees' performance, attitudes and psychological health (Tepper, B., 2000). When leaders use erroneous causal perceptions for employee performance, it can create a dysfunctional use of power to control resources and rewards.

POWER

In any organization, large or small, there must be someone who has the authority to give directions and maintain control over the functions of the organization and its employees. "The power centered in an organization’s structure and functions must be controlled, directed, and applied to managing the actions of the people who perform the work of the organization" (Seperich, G., 2006, p.3). When discussing leaders, and the influence they exert, it is impossible not to consider power.

There are several perspectives and models on the topic of power in organizations. French and Raven (see Mills, A., 2007) identified 5 sources of power (the resources available to individuals
Coercive power is dependent upon fear and is used in the application of real or perceived threats of negative sanctions. Reward power refers to the control of the distribution of resources deemed valuable to others. Expert power refers to an individual’s special skills or knowledge which is deemed valuable by others which if withheld, could diminish the performance level of others. Legitimate or positional power refers to the authority one has in an organization and is generally based on hierarchical, senior-level positions. Referent power refers to the influence one can exert based on their personality or characteristics (Mills. A., 2007, p.413).

George Seperich and Russell McCalley, in their book, *Managing Power and People*, (2006), found five types of power in a hierarchy:

1. Entitled power — the rank of one’s position in relationship to others.

2. Resource power — established by the authority of those who provide services or tangible resources such as money, materials, personnel, information, or time.

3. Persuasion power — convincing others to agree or follow one’s leadership.

4. Group power — formal groups, like unions and committees, or informal groups representing like-minded individuals.

5. Assumed power — the power established by those without entitled power or authority (Seperich, G. et al, 2006, p.23).

Occasionally power is assigned to a position in which the manager responsible lacks the management skill to take necessary actions. This will create a power void and will usually result in someone assuming the leadership position and power. When assumed power is allowed
unchecked, the organization can lose its ability to direct action (ibid). It is recognized that there must be organization in place to "...plan activities, assign responsibilities, and identify a common goal to be reached. Once everything is in place, power must be used to give direction and control the process" (ibid, p.14).

Although power is generally associated with a position, individuals perceive and use their power differently. This use of power can either be used for the benefit or detriment of organizations. It can determine whether followers will be productive, complacent or mistrustful. "Gaining the cooperation of subordinates is usually more important than having orders followed without question" (Seperich, G., 2006, p.24).

Another form of power in an organization is functional power which is structured according to available services and resources. These include: money, materials, personnel, time, and information. How these power bases are created and used is found within the authority of those who manage various functions and can provide other sources of power (knowledge, trust, emotional and economic) and which may reside in various positions (Ibid). Power is a universal management tool that can be used in many ways for many different purposes and it is essential for managers to use in the "... act of accomplishing specific objectives" (ibid, p.30). Followers can also use power in some circumstances where their position does not provide them with any authority. Some will use this for the detriment of the organization however sometimes it may have a positive outcome. "When power is urgently needed to accomplish a task, and the one who is entitled to use it is hesitant; someone else may take the initiative and get the job done" (ibid), by usurping that power.
The use (or misuse) of power can also be part of the organizational culture." Leaders, however, are perhaps the most powerful determinant of organization culture...[as] leaders are the ones who set the tone of the organization, define its values and norms, and create and maintain a persona of what the organization is like" (Van Fleet, D., 2006). Why, then do some leaders abuse their power and create dysfunctional organizations while others do not?

Our first encounter with authority is with our parents. The specific type of relationship pattern that is developed during these early years may determine how leadership is manifested. If there is some perception of ill-treatment, people may feel a sense of entitlement to seek compensation and believe that "... the ordinary rules of conduct don't apply to them" (Kets de Vries, M., 1991). In normal development, the idealized parental image becomes the model for one's own behaviour. Often leaders are idolized as the embodiment of this idealized image. When followers project an illusion of the leader as all–powerful, there is the danger of the leader believing in the delusion of their own omnipotence and developing narcissistic tendencies. It may also be attributable to a selfish orientation which "...focuses on a leader's objectives and goals, as opposed to the needs of constituents and the larger social organization" (Padilla, A., 2007).

Stress and anxiety related to pressure to conform or taking orders from a higher authority (Batson, C., et al, 2001) can also influence leaders to use their power ineffectively and inappropriately. There may also be a social learning deficit (ibid) and moral or ethical norms were not taught or modeled properly, however, "[t]he way an individual handles power is what characterizes true leadership" (Kets de Vries, M., 1991). We've examined how leaders and followers interact in a dyadic relationship within organizations, however these interactions must be situated with a context. The environment and culture of an organization is the third part of the interdependent process of leadership and exerts its own influence.
ORGANIZATION

Organizational theory has been concerned with the study of organizations as a place "...of imperative control (or imperative coordination) that is cohesive as well as enduring totalities that resist change, have a dominant culture and a hierarchical power structure that ensures conformity and control so that certain behavioural regularities are more probable to occur than others" (Tsoukas, H. Et al, 2003, p.608). There are many different structures which can produce these results with two models describing most designs. The mechanistic model is comparable to a machine and has "...high complexity, high formalization, and high centralization" (Mills, p.463). It is described as a bureaucracy with rigidly defined roles, specialized tasks and a top-down, hierarchical communication process. Conversely, organic organizations are informal, decentralized, flexible and rely on a vertical and horizontal communication process. Either model will be chosen based on contextual considerations of the organization; strategy, environment, and technology (ibid).

Organizations can also be viewed metaphorically as machines (with separate parts working within a whole), as an organism (different species requiring different environments to evolve), or as instruments of domination (employees and resources are used and manipulated to achieve desired ends). Viewing organizations as metaphors is helpful in allowing us to "...find fresh ways of seeing, understanding and shaping the situations that we want to organize and manage" (Morgan, G., p.5-7). In considering the organization and its role in the relationship between leaders and followers, it is impossible to create universal generalizations, however it does allow for dialogue which creates links and reflects others' experiences which can be helpful for practitioners. (Tsoukas, H., 2003, p.15). Sharing experiences can also help us understand our
own behaviour within the organizational culture which becomes our 'constructed reality' and allows us "...to see and understand particular events, actions, objects, utterances or situations in distinctive ways" (Morgan, G., 2006, p.135).

The organization's culture has an impact on its performance and success as"...an organization’s culture has been shown to be an important influence on both positive and negative consequences within organizations" (Van Fleet, D., 2006). There are many factors which help create the culture of an organization and may include: its history; the values and vision of its leaders; the shared experiences, beliefs, stories, and rituals of its employees; the reward and incentive system; and organizational norms about performance and behaviour (ibid). Leadership is important to the culture of an organization because, according to the Social Information Processing approach, "...an individual’s behaviour in a social environment is guided by the displays of behaviour from others within their environment on information about values, norms, expectations, and behaviour outcomes" (ibid). Leaders demonstrate behavioural expectations through their actions which helps create the culture of an organization. "Characteristics of organizations have been shown to influence the ethics or integrity of executives, and qualities of leaders have been shown to be critical in the development of an organization’s culture" (ibid). When there are dysfunctions in top management, it prevents people from effectively performing and the organization can become dysfunctional because its culture reflects the dysfunctions of top managers "(Van Fleet, D, 2006). Once destructive administrations achieve power, "...they will consolidate their control by undermining existing institutions and laws...by replacing constructive institutions with those designed to enhance central control; by eliminating rivals and dissidents; by manipulating the media and exploiting educational systems,[and] using propaganda to legitimate the process"
The New Paradigm of Leadership

(Padilla, A., 2007). Soon the new policies become ingrained in the organizational culture and people will carry out even unconscionable orders and accept the situation as normal (ibid).

Dysfunctional organizations can have profoundly negative effects on the people working within them. Employees who perceive there are work-related sources of injustice can feel their sense of self-worth is undermined and may engender feelings of helplessness or psychological distress (Tepper, B, 2000). If their perceptions of injustice at work are so prevalent that they spend a majority of their time so pre-occupied with work-related matters, it may adversely affect their time at home with their families and cause work-family conflict. As well, the consequences of poor morale can cost the organization in social and added financial health costs due to "... absenteeism, turnover, and reduced performance of extrarole behaviours" (ibid).

On the other hand, employees who feel strongly connected to and identify with their organizations will deliver consistently strong performances (Mills, A., 2007, p.115). In a study on job satisfaction, researchers found that employees related their ideal work environment to factors which involved their sense of self-worth: the contributions they make to the organization (results), the quality of the relationships at work (people), and the level of stimulation, enjoyment and stress (rewards and energy) in the work environment (Mills, A., 2007, p.115). The organizational culture has a real impact on leaders and followers which can influence the motivations and behaviours of leaders and followers, help create functional leader-member exchanges and impact its success or failure. There is an interdependent relationship between leaders, followers and organizations which influences behaviours, health and wellness, relationships, and success.

THE NEW PARADIGM OF LEADERSHIP
Why a new paradigm of leadership? Organizations have been molded to fit the seventeenth-century, Newtonian mechanistic model (Wheatley, M., 1994, p.26) which no longer fits with our diverse, interconnected, global community. It is time to reflect, reinvent and take responsibility for a new vision of leadership.

In this examination of leadership, I have looked at: leadership qualities, behaviours, motivations and needs; followers' qualities, behaviours motivations and needs; the interaction between leaders and followers; and the influence of the organizational culture. It appears that although leaders may share some common personality traits, their behaviours may also be influenced by contextual and situational factors. Leaders bring with them their unique personality traits, frames of reference and their own experiences with leaders which help shape their interactions within an organization. Psychological (early experiences with authority, needs), social (identity and motivation), and environmental (organizational structure and processes), factors can influence how leaders perceive their own positional power. The use of this power may determine the relationship with followers and the influence they can exert within the organization. The relationship between leaders and followers is dyadic and interdependent and can determine yet also be influenced by, the organizational culture and structure which becomes, for a moment in time, our constructed reality.

From this examination and my own reflection, I believe there is a new paradigm in leadership which is influencing the way in which we perceive organizations and the leaders and followers who populate them. People are more aware of their needs, their rights and the opportunities that are present in places that were unreachable before organizations became boundaryless. This new
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paradigm requires a connection of interdependence amongst three factors: the leader, the follower and the organization.

Future leaders will be part of a web of relationships, influences and collaborations which will determine new fluid, dynamic structures of organizations. It will be necessary for these leaders to reflect upon and learn their own belief systems, values and other influences on their behaviour. It will require an in depth study of biases, old and erroneous views, ethnocentrism, egocentrism and worn out frames of reference which affect their thoughts, feelings and behaviours. This reflection is necessary to avoid self-serving leadership which occurs when "...leaders think that leadership is all about them and not about the best interests of those they serve" (Blanchard, K., 2007, p. xx). It will require an abandonment of the old controls of "...fear, scarcity and self-interest..." (Wheatley, M., 2005, p.2). Leaders will see the value of recognizing that people are not cogs in a machine but bring the unique qualities of their human existence with them to work: the need for love and acknowledgement, health and wellness concerns, familial obligations and occasional crises. "The freedom to experiment, to tinker oneself into a form of being that can live and reproduce, leads to diversity that has no bounds" (ibid,p.25). This diversity and constant reflection and renewal will be necessary in the ever-changing global future world of work where simply in the time it takes to write the word technology, several applications have become obsolete.

With this increasingly complex technological change comes the possibility of more transparency, accountability and responsibility. Gone will be the days of leadership which "...involves control and coercion rather than persuasion and commitment" (Padilla, A., 2007) particularly in organizational situations where the leader is not present to exert any influence or control over others. As more organizations "...embrace flatter structures, lateral as opposed to
vertical decision flows, and knowledge-intensive, non-routine technologies that require teamwork and self-management[.]" (Tepper, B., 2000) leaders will become more reliant on the expertise of others to accomplish tasks, even if they work across the ocean.

Given the greater emphasis on collaborative leadership, future leaders will need to embrace the responsibility of: engaging people and assisting in their skill development; have a future vision; continuously reinvent themselves, their strategies and processes; value results and relationships; and embody the organizational values (Blanchard, K., 2007, p.265). Given the interdependent nature of the future work experience, they will not be alone in these endeavours.

Followers will have an increased role, value and responsibility for successful organizations in the future. "In this service-intensive, information-intensive age, every organization’s primary resource is its people, and yet too often they’re seen not as assets, but as liabilities" (Bennis, W. 1994, ch.9, overview). This archaic attitude will vanish as followers will become empowered in a climate which values their contributions and understands the power of their knowledge, experience and motivation (Blanchard, K., 2007, p.69). In an interdependent environment and an increased frequency of collaborative leadership, followers will have better prospects of becoming engaged in their work, influencing leaders and creating an organizational culture which creates "...cohesive, trusting relationships and interagency cooperation" (Wheatley, M., 2005, p.118).

Followers may have the largest responsibility in the new leadership paradigm as it is their voice which will promote and encourage change. Given the variety of leadership traits, styles and behaviours, it is essential for followers to use their voice to challenge toxic leaders and environments. "Followers must consent to, or be unable to resist, a destructive leader" (Padilla, A., 2007). Followers must also be prepared to reflect upon and reinvent old belief systems that
influence their thoughts, feelings and behaviours. Followers will need the strength and courage to discover the reasons they are not willing to voice their concerns. "Can followership help us unravel the big issues happening in the world, issues that affect many people’s lives—suicide bombers; the rise of religious fundamentalism and its corresponding lack of tolerance; democratically elected dictators and corrupt government officials of any kind who harm their followers and the larger society; or corporate abuses of power that cheat employees, customers, suppliers, investors, and in some cases the larger society?" (Riggio, R., 2008). Yes! If followers are supported, empowered and protected, then abuses by leaders can be reduced (ibid). It is difficult and the results may be damaging in the short term, however, although "...employees may not be in a position to stop the misuse of power,... they can choose to avoid being a part of it" (ibid). It is a choice to speak out and risk adverse consequences to prevent toxic leadership and dysfunctional organizations. Followers will have increased responsibility to reinvent a new collaborative vision of leadership.

As leaders and followers are encouraged to reflect and reinvent, so too must organizations have some means of reflecting upon "...stability and change, tradition and revision" (Bennis, W., 2008, ch.9, opportunity=empowerment). Organizations themselves influence leaders and followers and can also serve as mentors. "Its behaviour, its tone, and its pace instruct, positively or negatively, and its values, both human and managerial, prevail. If its meaning, its vision, its purposes, its reason for being, is not clear, if it does not reward its employees in tangible and symbolic ways for work well done, then its reflective structures are inadequate, and in effect it’s flying blind" (Ibid, ch.9, management =engagement). Again, this is an interdependent relationship amongst leaders, followers and organizations requiring attention by all factors to ensure a fluid, dynamic, reflexive approach to production of goods or services. "The successful
twenty-first century company will empower people to innovate...leverage relationships inside and outside of its boundaries...as the corporate version of the extended family” (Kanter, R.M., 1999). Organizational structures and processes are responsible for the ethical and moral values which guide behaviour. It is the primary shaper of the culture and can provide the support and protection necessary to avoid dysfunction. "At the top of organizations, strong oversight by a board of directors is necessary. For boards to govern effectively, certain conditions are essential. They include board independence, with a critical mass of outside members not hand-picked by the CEO; policy-level oversight by the board in company affairs, including performance reviews and succession processes; and board accountability, where the board is responsible for executive and organizational performance and also has the power to sanction executives” (Padilla, A, 2007). Its responsibilities also include the provision of opportunities for the growth and development of its members since "the release and full use of the individual’s potential is the organization’s true task...[and]...the one true mission of all organizations and the principal challenge to today’s organizations" (Bennis, W., 2008, ch.9, Learning=leading). Leaders, followers and organizations are responsible for redesigning the paradigm of leadership and in the process "...they must redesign their organizations in order to redesign society along more humane and functional lines" (Bennis, W., 2008, chapter nine, overview). With this new paradigm of leadership, "...[i]f we can mobilize the spectrum of human abilities, not only will people feel better about themselves and more competent; it is even possible that they will also feel more engaged and better able to join the rest of the world community in working for the broader good" (Gardner, H., 2008). It is the responsibility of leaders, followers and organizations to reflect and reinvent the new paradigm of leadership.

- CONCLUSION
There are many pioneers who will struggle through the crucible that will become creation. The creation of a new and evolving approach to leadership. Whether one considers leadership as a science (Quantum Mechanics, see Margaret Wheatley, 1994), as servants to followers, (see Ken Blanchard, 2007), as metaphorical reflections of our constructed reality (see Gareth Morgan, 2006) or as a civic responsibility (see Warren Bennis, 1994), it is no longer necessary to constrain our ideas to neat little boxes. "I also believe, however, that anyone, of any age and in any circumstances, can transform himself if he wants to. Becoming the kind of person who is a leader is the ultimate act of free will, and if you have the will, [there] is [a] way" (Bennis, W. 1994, introduction).

Through this examination and my own reflections on leadership, I know that a new paradigm of leadership is possible and that it starts with one raised voice. You have heard mine clearly here and I know that with that one niggling thought, that one courageous effort, and a belief in the necessary and brilliant interdependence we all share, we will eventually produce raised voices which will echo around the globe.
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