

LEAD: Final Exam

Dannetta B. Sparks

Beulah Heights University

LEAD 701 FINAL EXAM

1. In what ways do management and leadership differ? Are they distinct and separate roles, or do they overlap? Be thorough and specific in your response.

The definitions of leadership and management are the keys to answering the questions, in what ways are management and leadership different, and are they distinct and separate roles, or do they overlap? Kotter (1987) opines that leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes. The leadership process involves (a) developing a vision for the organization; (b) aligning people with that vision through communication; and (c) motivating people to action through empowerment and through basic need fulfillment. Yukl (2013) posits that leadership has been defined in many different ways, but most definitions share the assumption that it involves an influence process for facilitating the performance of a collective task. Further, the definitions differ in many respects, such as who exerts the influence, the intended beneficiary of the influence, the manner in which the influence is exerted, and the outcome of the influence attempt. Yukl (2013) summarizes that another way to view leadership is in terms of an influence process that occurs naturally within a social system and is diffused among the members therefore, a working definition considers that leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives.

The definition of management varies among theorists. Rost (1991) defined management as an authority relationship that exists between a manager and subordinates to produce and sell goods and services. For practical purposes, Fleet and Peterson (1994) suggest that management involves three sets of skills, namely; conceptual, technical, and human. They further explain the

three sets of skills in the following way: (1). Conceptual skills allow the manager to develop relationships between factors that other people may not see therefore managers who have well-developed conceptual skills are able to apply different management theories to the same situation. (2). For a manager to be technical implies that he or she should act professionally. Professionalism demands that the manager performs his or her duties within established procedures, rules and regulations. Any behavior that compromises the manager's professional etiquette is bound to interfere adversely with the organization's productivity. (3). Lastly, a manager should be able to see members of the organization as human beings who have needs and psychological feelings and emotions. These needs and feelings must be positively harnessed for the good of the organization; motivation of the employees, therefore, becomes a critical management factor in increasing productivity. Kotter (1990) opines that the management process involves (a) planning and budgeting, (b) organizing and staffing, and (c) controlling and problem- solving. Further, the management process reduces uncertainty and stabilizes the organization, and finally management is a set of processes that keep an organization functioning. That there are differences between and distinct and separate roles between leadership and management is supported by several theorists. Bennis and Nanus (2007) argue that the main difference between managers and leaders is their attitude to risk and innovation. Managers, he argues, administer. They focus on systems and processes, on maintaining order through a formal structure. Leaders, on the other hand, innovate. They ask *why*, not *how*. While managers may succumb to the pressures of shareholders and Wall Street, leaders keep a firm eye on innovation. In emphasizing the difference between leaders and managers, Bennis (1989) goes further by noting that to survive in the twenty-first century, we are going to need a new generation of leaders—leaders, not managers. The distinction is an important one, he continues. Leaders

conquer the context—the volatile, turbulent, ambiguous surroundings that sometimes seem to conspire against us and will surely suffocate us if we let them- while managers surrender to it (Bennis, 1989).

Bass (2008) summarizes the differences between management and leadership best when he concludes that leaders manage and managers lead, but the two activities are not synonymous. Management functions can potentially provide leadership; leadership activities can contribute to managing. Nevertheless, some managers do not lead, and some leaders do not manage (Bass, 2008). “Leadership is path-finding; management is path-following. Leaders do the right things; managers do things right. Leaders develop; managers maintain. Leaders ask what and why; managers ask how and when. Leaders originate; managers imitate. Leaders challenge the status quo; managers accept it. Leadership is concerned with constructive or adaptive change, establishing and changing direction, aligning people, and inspiring and motivating people. They set the direction for organizations. They articulate a collective vision. They sacrifice and take risks to further the vision” (Bass, 2008). Managers plan, organize and arrange systems of administration and control. They hold positions of formal authority. Their position provides them with reward, disciplinary, or coercive power to influence and obtain compliance from subordinates. The subordinates follow directions from the manager and accept the manager’s authority as long as the manager has the legitimate power to maintain compliance—or the subordinates follow out of habit or deference to other powers of the leader. Management is concerned with consistency and order, details, timetables, and the marshaling of resources to achieve results. It plans, budgets, and allocates staff to fulfill plans (Bass, 2008).

On the subject of the overlap between management and leadership, the degree of overlap is a point of disagreement (Yukl, 2013). In suggesting ways in which management and leadership differ, Yukl (2013) opines that while some theorists advocate treating leading and managing as separate roles or processes, the proposed definitions do not resolve important questions about the scope of each process and how they are interrelated. Bass (2008) argues that although management and leadership overlap, the two activities are not synonymous in that leadership and management entail a unique set of activities or functions. In conclusion and to answer the question of any overlap between management and leadership, as Northouse (2013) posits, although there are clear differences between management and leadership, the two constructs overlap.

References

- Bass, B. M. (2008). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bennis, W. G. (1989). Managing the dream: Leadership in the 21st century. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 2(7). doi:10.1108/09534818910134040
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (2007). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Kotter, J. P. (1987). *The leadership factor*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Van Fleet, David D. & Peterson, Tim O. (1994). *Contemporary Management* (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Yukl, G. A. (2013). Leadership in organizations. Boston, MA. Pearson.

2. Thoroughly explain how a compelling vision is important with respect to implementing change.

Several theorists insist that with respect to implementing change in an organization, a compelling vision is an important catalyst for change. Kotter (1996) opined that every successful large-scale change that he has seen has, as a part of it, a change vision, a clear and compelling vision. He further surmises that really compelling change visions set out what the organization will be able to do, and what opportunities it will be able to take advantage of after the changes have been achieved. In other words, the vision also includes the reason for the change. Yukl (2013) posits that before people will support radical change, they need to have a vision of a better future that is attractive enough to justify the sacrifices and hardships the change will require. The vision to orchestrate change must be inspiring and compelling. To be inspiring and compelling, the vision must include strong ideological content that appeals to organization members' shared values and ideals concerning customers, employees, and the mission of the organization. The vision is usually created in an interactive process involving key stakeholders. Organizational leaders must create a compelling vision that will inspire and motivate their employees in the change process. Manasse (1986) contends that vision is more than an image of the future. It has a compelling aspect that serves to inspire, motivate, and engage people. Compelling visions move people to action, change their behaviors, focus on key priorities, and follow the pathway that the leader lays out. While pursuing the vision followers learn how they fit in with the organization or society in general. (Northouse, 2013) suggests that conveying a compelling vision is a crucial aspect of leadership as it enables people with diverse backgrounds to work productively together

towards a shared goal while carrying out effectively various, sometimes conflicting, roles and functions within an organization. Blanchard (2006) opines that having a compelling vision is not negotiable; it impacts the motivation, energy, and inspiration of yourself, your team, and your organization; a compelling vision tells you who you are (your significant purpose), where you're going (your picture of the future), and what will guide your journey (your values). In explaining the components of a compelling vision he postulated that a significant purpose tells you the reason for your existence. In other words, it answers the question "Why?" rather than just explaining what you intend to do. The second aspect of a compelling vision is a picture of the future. What do you want to be true in the future that is not true today? If you do a great job at what you're doing, what will happen? Focus on the end result, not the process of getting there. And your picture of the end result should not be abstract-it should be a mental image you actually can visualize. The last component of a compelling vision is having a clear set of operating values. What will guide our behavior as we move forward? Values provide guidelines for how you should proceed as you pursue your purpose and the picture of the future. They answer the questions "What do I want to live by?" and "How?" What are the operating values that should guide the behavior of the leaders? For a compelling vision to endure, all three elements—a significant purpose, a picture of the future, and clear values—are needed to guide behavior on a day-to-day basis. It's only a stretching, distinctive and compelling vision that paints a picture of a future and presents a desired and attainable state of affairs that can engage and motivate an organization towards change.

In conclusion, Gordon (2017) makes the case that a compelling vision is important on an individual level and becomes even more essential as it spreads to teams, communities, and organizations. He further posits that it is important, as a leader, to develop a vision so compelling

that employees can see, and even feel the opportunity that the future holds, a vision so compelling vision that motivates, energizes, and inspires employees and other external and internal stakeholders to work with the leader toward building the future for the company.

References

- [Blanchard](#), Ken (2006). *Leading at a higher level: Blanchard on leadership and creating high performing organizations*. Indianapolis: IN. [Pearson Prentice Hall](#)
- Gordon, John (2017). *The power of positive leadership: How and why positive leaders transform teams and organizations and change the world*. Hoboken, NJ. Wiley & Sons.
- Kotter, J.P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Manasse, A.L. (1986). Vision and leadership: Paying attention to intention. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 63(1), 150-173. Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership: Creating a compelling sense of direction for your organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Northouse, P. G. (2013), *Leadership: theory and practice* (6th ed.). London: Sage Publication.
- Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. Boston, MA. Pearson.

3. Explain the Vroom-Yetton normative model of leadership.

Yukl (2013) explains that a model of participative leadership theory was developed by Vroom and Yetton in 1973 to help managers identify the appropriate decision procedures in different situations. The premise of the theory was that leaders develop an exchange relationship with each subordinate as the two parties mutually define the subordinate's role. Yukl (2013) further explained that the model theorized that most leaders develop a high-exchange relationship with a small number of trusted subordinates who function as assistants, lieutenants, or advisors. These

relationships are formed gradually over a period of time, through reciprocal reinforcement of behavior as the exchange cycle is repeated over and over again. Unless the cycle is broken, the relationship is likely to evolve to the point where there is a high degree of mutual dependence, loyalty, and support.

The best explanation of the Vroom-Yetton normative model of leadership was put forth by the theorist of the model himself when he (Vroom (2007) postulated that the normative model developed with Yetton (Vroom and Yetton, 1973) and further expanded with Jago (1988) is a contingency approach to group decision-making that is designed specifically to help leaders select the best approach to make decisions. The model, he explained, identifies different ways a decision can be made by considering the degree of follower participation. It proposes a method for leaders to select the right approach to making a decision in a given set of circumstances.

Vroom (2007) opined that the Vroom-Yetton (and Jago) normative model of leadership points to the value of situation-specific trait descriptions, described as consistent behavior patterns in specific kinds of contexts. To understand how situations affect leader's behavior's and to simplify how the model worked, the theorists conducted research with 30 leaders (Vroom, 2007).

The theorists gave the leaders a set of 30 written cases, each describing a situation in which a leader was confronted with a problem to solve or decision to make. Each subject was asked to choose from a set of five decision processes, varying in the form and amount of participation provided by members of his or her team. Thus the dependent variable was one of behavioral intent rather than actual behavior. Various problem sets have been used over time, but each manipulates relevant situational variables in a systematic manner that reflects a within-person, repeated-measures, experimental design. When administered to a sample of managers, a problem set produces a two-dimensional data matrix. Each row represented the responses from a single

manager to each of the 30 circumstances. Each column represented the responses elicited from different managers to a single situation. In the analysis of these data, row variance was collapsed across columns, which produced the average measures. The results of this experiment produced the following results: Vroom and Yetton (1973) and Vroom and Jago (1988) found that people are different in their overall levels of participation. But when they looked at all the variance in the Row -Column (Person - Situation) matrix, such preferred style differences only accounted for about 8–10% of the total variance. In the same matrix, situation, treated as a nominal variable, accounts for about 30% of the variance. As Vroom and Yetton (1973) noted more than 30 years ago, it makes more sense to talk about autocratic versus participative situations than autocratic versus participative leaders (although both types of differences exist).

The Vroom-Yetton-Jago model provides guidance for leaders trying to determine which approach to decision making to use (AI through GII). The model uses a decision-tree technique to diagnose aspects of the situation methodically. This technique involves answering a series of yes or no questions and following the yes path to the recommended type of decision-making approach. The situational variables are characteristics of the decision situation that determine whether a particular decision procedure will increase or decrease decision quality and acceptance. The model was extended by Vroom and Jago to include other criteria and aspects of the situation. The revised model is built on the 5 main decision making leadership styles from the original model of Vroom and Yetton and adds 12 contingency variables. Each of the 12 contingency variables can each be rated on a sliding scale of 1 to 5 on a decision tree. Working through the decision tree provides a leader with the most appropriate decision leadership style to employ for that particular situation and set of contingency variables.

In the final analysis, before determining an appropriate decision-making style, the leader needs to consider the following aspects:

- (i) Quality requirement: How important is the quality of this decision?
- (ii) Commitment requirement: How important is subordinate commitment to the decision?
- (iii) Leader's information: Does the leader have sufficient information to make a high-quality decision?
- (iv) Problem structure: Is the problem well structured?
- (v) Commitment probability: Are the subordinates likely to be committed to the decision?
- (vi) Goal congruence: Do subordinates share the organizational goals to be attained in solving this problem?
- (vii) Subordinate conflict: Are the preferred solutions likely to create conflict among subordinates?
- (viii) Subordinate information: Do subordinates have sufficient information to make a high-quality decision?

The Vroom-Yetton-Jago model requires the use of decision-trees involving the answers to the preceding eight questions. The model identifies five decision-making styles:

Autocratic I (A1): The manager alone takes the decision.

Autocratic II (A2): The manager elicits information from subordinates but makes the decision alone. Subordinates may or may not be informed about the situation.

Consultative I (C1): The manager shares the situation with subordinates individually and asks for information and evaluation. Subordinates do not meet as a group and the manager alone takes a decision.

Consultative II (C2): The manager and subordinates meet as a group and discuss the situation, but the manager alone takes the decision.

(Group II (G2): The manager and subordinates meet as a group discuss the situation and together make a decision. However, because this model is relatively new, it has not been fully scientifically tested.

(Yukl, 2013) concludes that research on these models is limited, but it provides moderate support for them. The findings suggest that managers are likely to be more effective if they use decision procedures that are appropriate for the situation. The Vroom-Yetton-Jago Model assumes that no one decision-making process is best for all situations. The extent of subordinate participation in the decision-making process depends on the problem attributes.

References

- Vroom, V. H. (2003). Educating managers in decision making and leadership. *Management Decision* , 41 (10). 968–978. doi:10.1108/00251740310509490
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision making*.
- Vroom (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*. 62 (1). 17.
Retrieved from <http://doi.10.1037/003-066X.62.1.17>
- Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. Boston, MA. Pearson.

4. Compare/contrast situational leadership theory with servant leadership theory.

The Situational Leadership Theory (Model) by Hersey and Blanchard and the Servant Leadership Theory by Greenleaf were published at similar times in the 1970s.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) suggested four Situation Leadership styles as telling, selling, participating, delegating, and encompassing represented by the following descriptions: S1 (high-directive but low-supportive), S2 (high-directive and high-supportive), S3 (low-directive but high supportive), and S4 (low-directive and low-supportive). Hersey & Blanchard (1966) developed the theory's model (called Situational Leadership II or SLII) to promote a particular leadership style depending upon the development level of the follower as: D1 (low-competence but high-commitment), D2 (moderate-competence but low-commitment), D3 (moderate-competence but no commitment), and D4 (high-competence and high-commitment). The explanation was that effective leadership is a matter of assessing the development level of a follower and acting in the correlating leadership style to elicit the best response from followers where (D1s respond to S1, D2s respond to S1, and so on). Each style is appropriate for certain kinds of situations defined by subordinates' maturity levels. The prescribed leadership style is contingent on follower maturity, defined as the degree to which followers are ready and willing to tackle the task facing the group. This is represented by a life cycle model, analogous to a parent-child relationship where the parent gradually relinquishes control as the child matures.

Yukl (2013) opines that situational leadership is based on the assumption that each situation is different, and each requires a unique combination of followers, leaders, and leadership situations.

The leader's perception of the follower and the situation will affect what he does rather than the truth of the situation. The leader's opinion of him and other factors such as stress and mood will also modify the leader's behavior. There are to combine others approaches and identifies six variables: subordinate effort, subordinate ability and role clarity, the organization of the work, cooperation and cohesion, resources, support and, external coordination (Yukl, 1989).

The concept of servant leadership was defined by Greenleaf (1977) through example and grounded in his understanding of philosophy and practice. The subject of Servant Leadership would not be complete without considering it as a very popular concept in Christian leadership circles that has been making major inroads into corporate leadership circles in recent years thanks to the literature of such theorists as Greenleaf (1977/2002), Blanchard (1996) and Covey (1989). To be a servant leader, to be like Jesus, we must develop habits like Jesus. Blanchard and Hodges (2016) write that you cannot have habits like Jesus if you don't have a heart, a head, and hands like Jesus first. To have habits like Jesus means to have solitude, prayer, study and application of scripture, accepting and responding to God's unconditional love, and involvement in supportive relationships. Core constructs of servant leadership include an innate value and desire to serve, willingness to act on the desire to serve, and trust from those led. The foresight of the leader as well as the ability to act constructively on that knowledge when given a chance to act is derived from their ethics and is a foundational component (Greenleaf, 1977). The focus is not the act of serving but rather the process in serving. Greenleaf's (1977) initial premise of Servant Leadership was as follows:

1. The leader is a servant first. It begins with the natural feeling of wanting to serve first.
2. The servant first makes sure that the highest priority needs of others are being met.

3. Success is when those who are served become healthier, freer, more autonomous, and wiser and as a result become servants themselves.
4. A servant can only become a leader if a leader remains a servant.

To compare and contrast situational leadership theory with servant leadership theory involves first understanding the similarities between the two. Each theory focuses on the individuality of a leader being relationship oriented or task oriented. The servant leader exudes the characteristic of being a servant first and understanding the needs of the followers by seeking to understand the situations of the environment at hand. Similarly, the situational leader must also focus on the circumstances at hand in order to properly assess the presenting situations. The situational leader must ascertain the degree of commitment, needs, and abilities of the group, measures that must also be taken by the servant-leader, so that he or she may chart the developmental needs of the group. Situational Leadership Theory requires the leader be closely familiar with the intellectual and development level of those being lead. The servant leader recognizes the tremendous responsibility to do everything in his or her power to nurture the personal and professional growth of employees and colleagues. The ability of situational and servant leaders is framed by the emphasis on the nature of the followers so, in effect situational theory may a modified form of servant leadership.

What differentiates the two is that in situational leadership different from servant leadership is the lack of an organizational vision and the empowerment of the followers by the Situational leadership because the Situational Leadership Model revolves around the leader changing leadership behaviors to meet the needs in relationship to the follower (Kouzes, 2003). Servant Leadership theory relies on the present situation opposed to the attitude and behaviorism that is dealt with in the situational theory. Servant Leadership theory consists of a leader's natural

ability to adapt based on their leadership style. Situational leadership is flexible to the leader, giving the opportunity to use the appropriate skills to resolve or attend to a situation. Servant Leadership Theory predicts that all followers will function simultaneously based on the style of the leader. Situational Theory, however believes that the followers will have altered responses based on their personal level of combined efforts of being willing, able, and confident.

In contrast to Situational Leadership, the effectiveness of Servant Leadership is frequently supported by research. Liden, Liao, and Meuser, (2014) determined that unlike Situational Leadership, Servant Leadership might be more effective in improving customer service in servant cultures. In addition to its effectiveness, servant leadership corresponds with the view that leadership development is a collaborative and emerging process that impacts the entire organization.

In conclusion, Servant leaders can utilize the situational leadership model to appropriately serve and lead their followers; the two models are not mutually exclusive. Leaders must understand their given situation to effectively approach their situational roles of directing, coaching, supporting, or delegating within various situations and circumstances. Servant leaders understand that any given situation may require a different type of leadership with a different approach, practice, action, or message; however, leadership principles should be consistent across the organization and time (Yukl, 2013).

References

- Blanchard, K.H., & Hodges, K. (2016) *Lead like Jesus revisited*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.
- Covey, S.R., (1989). *The seven habits of highly effective people*, Simon and Schuster, New York,

Greenleaf, R. K. (1996). On becoming a servant leader (In D. M. Frick & L. C. Spears, Eds.).
San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977/2002). *Servant-leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1996). Great ideas revisited: Revisiting the life-cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development*, 50 (1), 7-42.

Kouzes, J. M. (2003). *Leadership practices inventory* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Liden, R. C., Liao, R., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1434–1452.

Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251-289. doi: 10.1177/01492063890150020

Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

5. Explain leader-member exchange theory.

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory belongs to one of the first described taxonomies of domains of leadership and, as such, is significant for anyone wanting to understand how to implement effective leadership (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1996). Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory posits that leaders develop special relationships with certain employees (Northouse, 2007). Another name for the theory is the Vertical Dyad Linkage Theory. Subordinate-members of these relationships are referred to as either In Group or Out Group members in high or low quality relationships, respectively (Dansereau, Graen, and Haga, 1975).

Graen and Scandura (1987) theorize that the LMX relationship must go through three important phases that every leader and member will experience. The three stages involved are *Role-Taking*, *Role-Making*, and *Routinization*. Role-taking is when team members first join the group and when managers use their time to assess new member's skills and abilities. This is an important phase of the three stages because it is the first stage and it's when the first impressions will be made to the manager. Role-making is when new team members begin to work together on goals and assignments. In this stage managers generally expect that new team members will work hard, be loyal and prove themselves trustworthy as they get used to their new role. During this phase is when you will see the team members starting to stand out from one another. Yukl (2013) warns that despite the growing body of research on LMX, we still know little about how the role-making process actually occurs. After managers evaluate group members during the role-making phase they then will put members into two groups. The two groups are called the In-Group and the Out-Group. The In-Group is the group of team members that prove they are loyal and trustworthy. This group is full of members that the manager seeks as reliable. Gaining trust will lead to new tasks for new group members to work on. New task and projects will include more challenge and will intrigue workers with opportunities for training. The last phase is Routinization, when the routines between team members and their managers are established. This phase requires hard work to maintain good opinions by their managers.

Yukl (2013) posited that the dyadic theories do not include some leadership behaviors that are necessary to facilitate collective performance by a team or organization. Moreover, some of the dyadic behaviors that are effective in terms of dyadic influence will be ineffective with regard to team performance or organizational performance; however this literature has evolved from focusing exclusively on the consequences of the LMX relationship to focusing on both

antecedents and consequences. The original work produced by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) on the role-making and role-taking processes has been extended by Uhl-Bien, Graen, and Scandura (2000) to examine how leader-follower dyads transform from individual interest to shared interest based on the development of trust, respect, and obligations to each other. Similar work along these lines has examined the effects of goal congruence on the quality of the LMX relationship. This work suggests that to the extent that goals are similar or mutually reinforcing, one would expect to produce a higher-quality LMX relationship. This work reported that the quality of the relationship moderated the relationship between downward influence tactics and helping behaviors.

The LMX 7 scale assesses the degree to which leaders and followers have mutual respect for each other's capabilities, feel a deepening sense of mutual trust, and have a sense of strong obligation to one another. Taken together, these dimensions determine the extent to which followers will be part of the leader's in-group or out-group. According to [Yukl](#) (1970), managers evaluate each employee as competent and loyal (CL) or incompetent and untrustworthy (IU). Sometimes the employee falters, or sometimes the manager changes his or her evaluation of you daily, weekly, monthly, or (least likely) at the time of your annual performance appraisal. Another term for this process is the attribution theory. According to Green and Mitchell (1979), attribution is a 2-stage process: 1) determine the cause of any poor performance and 2) formulate a corrective response. Whether talking about LMX or the more generic attribution theory, the cause of less-than-stellar performance can be attributed to internal or external forces.

Yukl (2013) suggests that the benefits to the leader from a high-exchange relationship are evident. Subordinate commitment is important when the leader's work unit has tasks that require considerable initiative and effort on the part of some members to be carried out successfully. The assistance of committed subordinates can be invaluable to a manager who lacks the time and energy to carry out all of the administrative duties for which he or she is responsible. However, the high exchange relationships create certain obligations and constraints for the leader. To maintain these relationships, the leader must provide attention to the subordinates, remain responsive to their needs and feelings, and rely more on time consuming influence methods such as persuasion and consultation. The leader cannot resort to coercion or heavy-handed use of authority without endangering the special relationship

References

- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role-making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
doi:10.1016/003-5073(75)90005-7
- Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.). *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 9, pp. 175–208). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader–member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219–247.
doi:10.106/1048-9843(95)90036-5

Uhl-Bien, M., Graen, G., & Scandura, T. (2000). Implications of leader–member exchange.

(LMX) for strategic human resource management systems: Relationships as social capital for competitive advantage. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol. 18, (pp. 137–185). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Yukl, G.A. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations*. Boston, M.A :Pearson

6. What leadership roles and process are important for self-managing teams?

To ascribe leadership to a self-managed team might seem a paradox, but self-managing teams are not leaderless. Carson, Tesluk, and Marrone (2007) suggest the need for internal leadership in self-managed teams due to the added nature of tasks in self-managed teams. They suggest that the rotation of the team leader position among members and other aspects that are shared can vary significantly especially when a member with relevant expertise may assume responsibility for providing coordination and direction on specific team activities. Routine administrative tasks may be assigned to individual members, or a team member with a strong interest in a task may take the initiative to do it without being asked. Difficult supervisory functions such as enforcing group norms may be performed collectively. Yukl (2013) concurs that in self-managed work teams (sometimes called semi-autonomous work groups) much of the responsibility and authority usually vested in a manager’s position is turned over to the team members. Although self-managed teams are autonomous in terms of how they manage and carry out their work, they still require guidance from external leaders within the organizational hierarchy. Many specific types of leadership behaviors are relevant for improving external coordination and adaptation. His examples include: (1) maintaining a network of contacts who can provide relevant information; (2) encouraging members to develop their own networks of useful contacts; (3)

consulting with other subunits about plans and decisions that affect them; (4) monitoring progress in operations involving other subunits or organizations; (5) meeting with clients or users to learn more about their needs; and (6) negotiating agreements with clients. As in the case of internal coordination, responsibility for the leadership functions can be shared by members of the team.

Zawacki and Norman (1994) suggest that the leadership of successful self-managed teams processes through five stages. These are:

Stage 1: The typical hierarchical structure where the leader provides one-on-one supervision.

Stage 2: The leader evolves into a group manager whose role is making the transition into team coordinator/coach,

Stage 3: The group manager becomes the team coordinator and provides a structure for self-managed team members to receive the necessary training to take on more leadership tasks.

Stage 4: The team assumes most of the duties previously reserved for the group manager, who now becomes a boundary interface, or external manager; and

Stage 5: The group manager or external manager is a resource for the team.

Cohen, Chang, & Ledford, 1997 posit that a competent external leader is important for the success of self-managed teams, not only in the transition phase but also in the performance phase. They suggest that to improve external coordination in a dynamic environment, the external leader should clearly communicate objectives and changing priorities, facilitate collective learning, and continue to help the team obtain necessary resources and political support from the organization. Finally, it is often necessary for the external leader to assist the team in dealing

with unusual, disruptive events, and the leader can help the team to understand the problem and coach members in how to respond effectively.

A final word to the external leader of self-managed teams comes from Druskat and Wheeler, (2003) who postulate that the external leader must be able to influence team members to think and behave in ways that increase team effectiveness, and to influence other people in the organization to do what is necessary to facilitate team effectiveness. They also suggest that unlike leaders of traditional functional teams, external leaders of self-managed teams are less likely to use their legitimate power in directive ways to influence the team; instead, they are more likely to ask questions and use influence based on their expert and referent power.

References

- Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50 (5), 1217-1234. doi:10.2307/20159921
- Cohen, S. G., Chang, L., & Ledford, G. E. (1997). A hierarchical construct of self-management leadership and its relationship to quality of work life and perceived work group effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 50: 275-308. doi:10.1111.1746570.1997.909
- Druskat, V. & Wheeler (2003). Managing from the Boundary: The Effective Leadership of Self-Managing Work Teams *The Academy of Management Journal*, 46 (4). pp. 435-457. doi: 10.2307/30040637
- Zawacki, R. A. and C. A. Norman. (1994). Successful Self-Directed Teams and Planned Change: A Lot in Common. *Organization development and transformation: Managing effective change*, 6, 216-242.

Yukl, G.A. (2013). Leadership in Organizations. Boston, M.A: Pearson.

7. Discuss the importance and potential of cross-cultural leadership. Also identify potential pitfalls/risks in implementing cross-cultural leadership.

Due to the rise of multinational and transnational organizations, cross-cultural leadership has grown in importance (Rupp, 2011). The results, he adds is an understanding from the perspective of cultural exchange and cultural changes that cross-cultural leadership has to adapt to a new wave of globalization and services and the worldwide wave of cultural leadership activities. From this perspective, cross-cultural leadership is a unique phenomenon to test the ability of leaders to ensure that they are able to lead and adapt the cultural challenges. To help leaders navigate the maze of different processes and to help leaders realize the importance of cross-cultural leadership [Hofstede](#) (2003) utilizes five [dimensions](#) of culture as a tool to give leaders an understanding of how to adjust their leadership styles accordingly. These dimensions include [individualism/collectivism](#), [feminine/masculine](#), [power distance](#), [uncertainty avoidance](#), and long-term/short-term orientation. According to Hofstede's research (2003), people in individualistic societies, are expected to care for themselves and their immediate families only; while in collectivist cultures, people view themselves as members of larger groups, including extended family members, and are expected to take responsibility in caring for each other. With regards to power distance, different countries have varying levels of accepting the distribution of unequal power. Uncertainty avoidance takes into consideration the [extent to which a society feels threatened](#) by uncertain and ambiguous situations. Masculinity-femininity examines the

dominant values of a culture and determines where these values land on a spectrum in which masculine is associated with assertiveness, the acquisition of money and things, as well as not caring for others. Finally, long-term orientation looks at the extent to which a society considers respect for tradition and fulfilling social obligations; some future-oriented values are persistence and thrift. The other part of the puzzle is to understand the leadership styles of individuals. If leaders are to be effective in a diverse environment and to make the most of a global people resource, they must understand their own leadership style and leadership behaviors, and they must demonstrate enough flexibility to adapt these to different cultural expectations. Over three decades of leadership assessment has shown us that many people are not able to flex their leadership style. These people may be successful leaders in their own cultures, but they will struggle in even marginally different cultures.

GLOBE, the acronym for Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness was conceived in 1991 by Robert J. House of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania and led by Professor House to study the scope, depth, duration, and sophistication of the relationship of culture to conceptions of leadership. House (2004) concluded that we are in a position to make a major contribution to the organizational behavior and leadership literature. To date, more than 90% of the organizational behavior literature reflects U.S.-based research and theory but hopefully, GLOBE will be able to liberate organizational behavior from the U.S. hegemony (House, 2004). The GLOBE study also found that several attributes reflecting charismatic/transformational leadership are universally endorsed as contributing to outstanding leadership. These attributes include foresight, a willingness to encourage colleagues and staff, communicativeness, trustworthiness, a dynamic presence, a positive attitude, and being seen as a confidence builder. Certain charismatic attributes are perceived to be culturally contingent. These

include enthusiasm, risk-taking, ambition, humility, sincerity, sensitivity, and compassion. House (2004) argues that as the globalization of business continues to increase in the 21st century, organizations must consider the cultural differences and as economic borders come down, cultural barriers go up, thus presenting new challenges and opportunities and potentials for culture-cultural leadership."

Adler and Osland (2016) opine that to lead in the cross-cultural arena, organizations that have a set of global leadership competencies must inculcate the employees with a mindset that includes a culture of meritocracy which promotes and utilizes the best within the organization, male or female, and moves even further away from the previous mindset of a male-only or male-dominated workforce. By moving away from this mindset, organizations are able to use and make the most of women throughout the world which brings in more and varied experiences and opinions to help the organization meet their goals, thereby adding to the potential that the highest order of leadership is in place within the organization. By combining many of the concepts, including women as leaders, into a new framework or model, insights can be offered into successful leadership. This model would need to be based on three very important areas that are endemic to leadership. Those areas are competence, character, and community. The essence of strategic planning is execution and the essence of execution is leadership. Without leadership, there is no guiding light to assist any member of the organization to reach the goals and objectives set for the group. For any organization, whether it is public, private, for-profit, or non-profit, to be successful in the pursuit of its goals and objectives, leadership is essential. Some potential pitfalls/risks in implementing cross-cultural leadership are noted by House Javidan, and Dorfman (2001) who opine that almost all prevailing theories of leadership and most empirical evidence is North American in character, that is, individualistic rather than

collectivistic; emphasizing assumptions of rationality rather than ascetics, religion, or superstition; stated in terms of individual rather than group incentives, stressing follower responsibilities rather than rights; assuming hedonistic rather than altruistic motivation and assuming centrality of work and democratic value orientation' (House et al, 2001). As a result, there is a growing awareness of the need for a better understanding of the way in which leadership is enacted in various cultures and a need for an empirically grounded theory to explain differential leader behavior and effectiveness across cultures. House (2004) argues that as the globalization of business continues to increase in the 21st century, organizations must consider the cultural differences. He also states that "as economic borders come down, cultural barriers go up, thus presenting new challenges and opportunities for culture to cultural leadership." Another observation is that the differences in culture between two or more groups need to be identified and consciously addressed. If left unattended, they form unnecessary risks to the success of the project (Hofstede, 2003). Given the difficulties involved, it can be tempting for corporate leaders in general, to ignore cultural issues or to seek an unthinking, least common-denominator approach to differences. This arises from two misconceptions: that culture can be confined among reasonable people to external manifestations rather than something deeper that shapes many individuals' understanding of important aspects of life; and that these differences are not, or should not be relevant to an enterprise focused on profit. Matters become even more complex when corporate values are incorporated into the cultural equation. Teaching and embedding a common organizational culture is widely viewed as a critical success factor, however, statements of supposedly common business values are also potentially far less universal than thought: what is considered "ethical" or "safe" can vary widely between countries, and even supposedly neutral

codes of conduct can be misunderstood and cause friction within parts of an organization based amid different national cultures (Hofstede, 2003).

In conclusion, Yukl (2013) suggests that in the 21st century the demand for cross-cultural leaders will be more and more, and for leaders of today's and tomorrow's businesses, the ability to connect people and lead successful teams in a cross-cultural environment is an important competency. The organizations will become more effective when they are able to identify and foster the appropriate leader behaviors for the relevant cultural situation, thereby highlighting the importance of cross-cultural leadership and increasing the potential for the success of leaders.

References

- Adler, N. J., & Osland, J. (2016). Women Leading Globally: What We Know, Thought We Knew, and Need to Know about Leadership in the 21st Century. *Advances in Global Leadership*. (Vol. 90, pp. 13-54). doi:10.1108/S135-12032016000000903
- Hofstede, G. 2003, *Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*, Sage Publications, Inc.
- House, R. J., (2004). *Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program: Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- House, Robert, Javidan, Mansour & Dorfman, Peter (2001). *Project GLOBE: An Introduction. Applied Psychology*. 59 (4). 489-505. doi:10.1111/14640597.00070.1464-0597
- Rupp, S. 2011. *Forests of belonging: identities, ethnicities, and stereotype in the Congo River Basin (Cultural, Place, Nature)*, USA: University of Washington Press.
- Yukl, G.A. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

8. What is the most effective training method for developing leadership skills?

Yukl (2013) supports the views of theorists Vicere and Fulmer (1997) that the old pattern of selecting mostly fast track managers for leadership training and providing it only once or twice during a manager's career is gradually being replaced by a series of leadership training opportunities that are available to any manager in the organization at appropriate points in the individual's career. Kouzes and Posner (1995) wrote, "Contrary to the myth that only a lucky few can ever decipher the mystery of leadership, our research has shown us that leadership is an observable, learnable set of practices." They further suggests that given the array of leadership development efforts and the considerable funds expended upon those efforts, there seems to be widespread agreement that effective leaders can be developed and that leadership makes a positive difference. Guzzo, Jette, and Katzell (1985) revealed that [training interventions](#) lead to stronger and more consistent gains in productivity than most other organizational development processes, including: performance feedback, management by objectives, work redesign, supervisory methods, and decision-making strategies (Guzzo et al, 1985). Several researchers (e.g. Hall and Seibert, 1992), and McCall (1992) found that leaders across-the-board said in-role assignments are most effective for developing their leadership skills, followed by formal training, coaching from one's manager, and ranking last, technology-enabled training methods. Yukl (2013) seems to agree with this view when he suggests that the extent to which leadership competencies are acquired and used depends on the type of developmental activities that occur (e.g., training, experiential learning, self-learning), facilitating conditions (e.g., boss support, learning environment), and qualities of the individual managers (flexible, pragmatic, learning-oriented). Training and development are more effective when they are mutually

consistent, supported by a strong learning culture, and integrated with other human resource activities such as career counseling, staffing decisions, performance appraisal, and succession planning. Leadership development should include shared leadership processes relevant for teams and organizations, and it should be consistent with an organization's strategic objectives.

Day (2001) proposed that effective leadership development is less about which specific practices are endorsed than about consistent and intentional implementation. A key to effective implementation is having the organizational discipline to introduce leadership development throughout the organization, rather than bounded by specific (usually top) levels. Another key to effectiveness is linking initiatives across organizational levels and in terms of an overall developmental purpose within the context of a strategic business challenge. Yukl (2013) posits that despite the massive volume of formal leadership training that occurs, there is relatively little research to assess its effectiveness. Training methods such as behavior role modeling, cases, simulations, and action learning projects appear promising, but the importance of learning from experience on the job is now widely acknowledged, and researchers are now mapping the relationships between specific experiences and specific leadership competencies. In general, more development occurs for managers who experience challenges that require adaptation to new situations and provide opportunity to learn to deal with a variety of different types of problems and hardships. More learning also occurs when people get accurate feedback about their behavior and its consequences and use this feedback to analyze their experiences and learn from them.

In the final analysis, Arthur, Bennett, Edens, and Bell (2003) conclude that after training, it is important that employees are given opportunities to perform the skills they've learned. If the

post-training environment does not support this, research has shown that training will have little to no impact on trainee performance and organizational utility.

References

- Arthur, W., Jr., Bennett Jr., W., Edens, P. S., & Bell, S. T. (2003). Effectiveness of training in organizations: A meta-analysis of design and evaluation features. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 234–245. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.234
- Day, V. D. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*(4), 581-613. [doi:10.1016/S1048-9843\(00\)00061-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00061-8)
- Guzzo, R. A., Jette, R. D., & Katzell, R. A. (1985). The effects of psychologically based intervention programs on worker productivity: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 38*, 275-291. doi:10.1111.1744-6570.198500547
- Hall, D.T. & Seibert, K.W. (1992) Strategic management development: linking organizational strategy, succession planning, and managerial learning, in Career Development: Theory and Practice, Montross, D.H. and Shinkman, C.J., (eds). Springfield, Il: Charles C. Thomas.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Vicere, A., & Fulmer, R. M. (1997). Leadership by design. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.
- Yukl, G. A. (2013). Leadership in organizations. Boston, MA: Pearson.

9. What can be done to increase ethical behavior and decrease unethical practices by leaders in an organization?

Yukl (2013) highlights the theories of transforming leadership, servant leadership, authentic leadership, and spiritual leadership as having a strong emphasis on ethical leadership. Executives are perceived from a distance. Several researchers (e.g. Trevino, Brown, and Hartman (2003) and Stead, Worrell, and Stead (1990) believe that the philosophies of top managers as well as immediate supervisors represent a critical organizational factor influencing the ethical and the social salience of their “ethical” leadership is particularly important. Ethical leadership also reduces deviant or unethical behavior in followers ([Mayer, Kuenzi, Greenbaum, Bardes, and Salvador, 2009](#)). When unethical acts do occur in the social environment, employees who have an ethical leader are more likely to report the wrongdoing to management because ethical leaders create a psychologically safe environment and are trusted to handle reports fairly and with care (Mayer et. al, 2009).

Since the implementation of the U. S. Sentencing Guidelines in 1991 the majority of large business organizations have developed formal systems such as codes of conduct, ethics and legal compliance training programs, and telephone advice and reporting lines that answer employees’ questions about appropriate conduct in ambiguous situations and that allow employees to anonymously report misconduct they observe (Joseph, 2000). To the extent that these formal systems are supported by other formal organizational systems such as performance management systems and norms of daily business practice, unethical conduct should be lower (Joseph, 2000).

On the one hand, a strong ethical context can be thought of as providing a kind of substitute for ethical leadership; thus, individual leaders may have less influence on their direct reports in such settings. On the other hand, in a strong ethical context, leaders are expected to provide ethical

guidance. So, their efforts simply become part of the larger ethical environment that supports and encourages ethical conduct (Trevino et. al, 2003).

References

Joseph, J. (2000). *Ethics Resource Center's National Business Ethics Survey, Vol. 1: How Employees perceive ethics at work*. Washington, DC: Ethics Resource Center.

[Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. \(2009\)](#). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle down model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108, 1–13.

Trevino, 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*, 55, 5–37.

Yukl, G.A. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

10. Explore the strengths and weakness of charismatic leadership and express your view on whether or not it is an appropriate style of leadership in a not-for-profit organization.

Research on charismatic leadership can be traced to the work of Max Weber. Weber (1947) theorized that like leadership in general, charismatic leadership has a wide range of definitions, especially since charisma has varied meanings in different cultural and temporal settings. Setting aside normative judgments about whether a leader is good or bad, just or not, and moral or immoral, there is something about certain leaders that make them unique and exceptional. Weber (1968) later defined charisma as a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or

at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. In this definition, Weber (1968) opined that charisma is determined not only by the personal profiles of a leader, but also by followers' responses to and beliefs in their leaders. Endorsing this attribution approach, Conger and Kanungo (1987) suggests that the image of charismatic leaders is socially constructed and validated by followers' attributions. According to Arthur, House, and Shamir (1993) one of the most significant effects of charismatic leadership behavior is that it increases the intrinsic value of effort within followers. Furthermore, by increasing the effort-accomplishment expectancies and expressing high expectations towards the followers, charismatic leaders enhance the self-esteem of followers and their confidence in the abilities to meet those expectations.

On the topic of the strengths and weakness of charismatic leadership, Yukl (1999) posits that specific qualities separate charismatic leaders from other types of leaders. One characteristic that defines the strengths of charismatic leaders is the timing of their entrance on the scene. Charismatic leaders also initially possess so-called "inclusive" attributes, although those who lose these attributes over time become personalized charismatic leaders. Inclusive attributes are the ability to easily gather support, communicate a vision of change, convey energy and a sense of presence, and to take unconventional, innovative approaches to problem-solving.

Adding to the topic of the weaknesses of charismatic leaders, Yukl (2013) suggests that a "dark side" of charisma on that being in awe of the leader reduces good suggestions by followers, desire for leader acceptance inhibits criticism by followers, adoration by followers creates delusions of leader infallibility, excessive confidence and optimism blind the leader to real dangers, denial of problems and failures reduces organizational learning, risky, grandiose projects are more likely to fail, taking complete credit for successes alienates some key followers, impulsive, nontraditional behavior creates enemies as well as believers, dependence

on the leader inhibits development of competent successors, and the failure to develop successors creates an eventual leadership crisis. Yukl (2013) further suggests that charismatic leaders can have a tremendous influence on an organization, but the consequences are not always beneficial as evidenced by the following; some entrepreneurs who establish a prosperous company are narcissistic charismatics with a personalized power orientation, these leaders are insensitive, manipulative, domineering, impulsive, and defensive, they consider follower devotion more important than commitment to an ideological vision, and, their arrogance and excessive self-confidence encourage risky decisions that can cause the downfall of their company.

On the topic of whether or not charismatic leadership is an appropriate style of leadership in a not-for-profit organization and my views on the subject, Baruch and Ramalho (2006) suggest that there is no reason to believe that differences between for-profit and not-for-profit organizations are so broad that organizational performance and effectiveness must be as considered as fundamentally different constructs. These scholars further state that profitability, as well as employee satisfaction, might be considered a central factor for long-term sustainability. Herman and Renz (1998) used financial management, fundraising, program delivery, volunteers, and human resource management to measure nonprofit organizational success, which demands high levels of social capital relationships with people who will make introductions, recommend the organization for funding, build partnerships, advocate for the cause, tell others about the organization's work, recruit staff and clients, and act in dozens of other ways to support the organization. Instead of focusing on major donors or influential policymakers, organizations that hope to increase their influence and impact need to focus on building relationships at all levels. In short, social capital is the key to unlocking all other essential forms of capital that nonprofits need-including financial, human, and political capital.

My view is that in today's world of financial uncertainty, the higher level of charismatic leadership of a not-for-profit organization would be able to sustain the social capital, the key to unlocking all other essential forms of capital that nonprofits need including financial, human, and political capital, necessary to sustain and grow the organization. The higher level of charismatic leadership, the higher the grant revenue, percentage of renewed grants and client retention. Finally, Weber's concept of charismatic dominance was discussed in relation to the charismatic leaders within nonprofit organizations. Weber viewed the leaders or founders as natural leaders because of the amount of charisma they show to actually starting the organizations and developing them into huge, worldwide organizations (Weber, 1978).

References

- Arthur, M.B., House, R.J., & Shamir, B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, Vol. 4, No. pp. 577-594.
- Baruch, Y., Ramalho, N. (2006). Communalities and distinctions in the measurement of Organizational performance and effectiveness across for-profit and nonprofit sectors. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35, 39-65. doi:10.1177/0899764005282468
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). Charismatic leadership in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., Menon, S. T. & Mathur, P. (1997). Measuring charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 14, 290-302. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-4490.1997.tb00136.x>
- Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (1998). Nonprofit organizational effectiveness: Contrasts between

especially effective and less effective organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 9, 23-38. doi:org/10.1002/nml.9102

Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and Society*. Vol. 3. G. Roth & C. Wittich (eds.). New York: Dedminister.

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. G. Roth, & C. Wittich (Eds.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Yukl, G. (1999). An Evaluation of Conceptual Weaknesses in Transformational and Charismatic Leadership Theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*. Doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00013-2

Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations*. Boston, MA.: Pearson.