LEADERSHIP AND MOTIVATION

THE OBJECTIVES OF THIS CHAPTER ARE TO:

1   INTRODUCE A WORKING DEFINITION WHICH REFLECTS THE GENERAL NATURE OF LEADERSHIP

2   EXAMINE THE TRAIT APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP

3   EXAMINE THE STYLE (BEHAVIOURAL) AND CONTINGENCY APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP

4   EXPLORE THE NATURE OF HEROIC AND POST-HEROIC LEADERSHIP

5   INVESTIGATE THE LINK BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND MOTIVATION

Leadership and motivation are two of the most loaded and misunderstood words in management. Individual managers are often seduced by concepts of leadership that show them to be knights in shining armour with superhuman qualities and (this is the really dangerous bit) adoring followers. The followers rarely have that view of their managers. Motivation is often constructed in the same way, 'How can I motivate the members of my team?', although this ignores the mainsprings of motivation, which are in the performer rather than in the manager of the performer.

We must not, however, underestimate the importance of leadership, motivation *and the link between the two*. There are indeed sometimes needs for individual leaders who have outstanding personal qualities and who achieve extraordinary change in their business, sometimes more subtle leadership qualities are more important, and there are infinitely more roles which call on different and more modest leadership skills, which can be learned and which are equally important, even if they do not merit shining armour and a white charger.

Understanding of both leadership and motivation was well developed in the second half of the twentieth century and it is this work which is the basis of our understanding and analysis today. The one major addition of recent years has been an appreciation of the impact of changing circumstances of contemporary business and the role of women. All of the twentieth-century studies and theories were based on two complementary assumptions; first, the business norm was of large, stable organisations steadily getting bigger; second, management was almost exclusively a male activity, with male norms. This led to explanations and suggestions based on those two givens. We now see a weakening of both these assumptions. Effective businesses are not necessarily large, growing organisations and there are many more women in the workforce and in management positions within it. Although charismatic leaders (a predominantly male concept) are still needed in some situations, empowering leaders are increasingly required. We reach this at the close of the chapter, but we can only get there by starting further back.

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Northouse (1997) suggests that there are four components that characterise leadership: that leadership is a process; it involves influence; it occurs within a group context; and it involves goal attainment. This corresponds with Shackleton's (1995) definition, which we shall use as a working definition for the remainder of the chapter:

> Leadership is the process in which an individual influences other group members towards the attainment of group or organizational goals. (Shackleton 1995, p. 2)

This definition is useful as it leaves open the question of whether leadership is exercised in a commanding or a facilitative manner. It does suggest, however, that the leader in some way motivates others to act in such a way as to achieve group goals.

The definition also makes no assumptions about who is the leader; it may or may not be the nominal head of the group. Managers, therefore, may or may not be leaders, and leaders may or may not be managers. Some authors distinguish very clearly between the nature of management and the nature of leadership but this draws on a particular perspective, that of the transformational leader, and we will consider this in the section on whether the organisation needs heroes. This is a school of thought that concentrates on the one leader at the top of the organisation, which is very different from organisations and individuals who use the terms manager and leader interchangeably with nothing more than a vague notion that managers should be leaders. Indeed, any individual may act as a manager one day and a leader the next, depending on the situation.

The flow of articles on leadership continues unabated, but it would be a mistake to think that there is an ultimate truth to be discovered; rather, there is a range of perspectives from which we can try to make sense of leadership and motivation. Grint (1997) puts it well when he comments that

What counts as leadership appears to change quite radically across time and space. (p. 3)

In the following three sections we will look at three questions which underlie virtually all the work on leadership. First, what are the traits of a leader, or an effective leader? Second, what is the 'best' leadership style or behaviour? Third, if different styles are appropriate at different times, what factors influence the desired style?

WHAT ARE THE TRAITS OF LEADERS AND EFFECTIVE LEADERS?

Trait approaches, which were the earliest to be employed, seek to identify the traits of leaders – in other words what characterises leaders as opposed to those who are not leaders. These approaches rest on the assumption that some people were born to lead due to their personal qualities, while others are not. It suggests that leadership is only available to the chosen few and not accessible to all. These approaches have been discredited for this very reason and because there has been little consistency in the lists of traits that research has uncovered. However, this perspective is frequently resurrected.

Kilpatrick and Locke (1991), in a **meta-analysis**, did seem to find some consistency around the following traits: drive to achieve; the motivation to lead; honesty and integrity; self-confidence, including the ability to withstand setbacks, standing firm and being emotionally resilient; cognitive ability; and knowledge of the business. They also note the importance of managing the perceptions of others in relation to these characteristics. Northouse (1997) provides a useful historical comparison of the lists of traits uncovered in other studies. Perhaps the most well-known expression of the trait approach is the work relating to charismatic leadership. House (1976), for example, describes charismatic leaders as being dominant, having

a strong desire to influence, being self-confident and having a strong sense of their own moral values. We will pick up on this concept of leadership in the later section on heroes.

In a slightly different vein Goleman (1998) carried out a meta-analysis of leadership competency frameworks in 188 different companies. These frameworks represented the competencies related to outstanding leadership performance. Goleman analysed the competencies into three groups: technical, cognitive and emotional, and found that, in terms of the ratios between each group, emotional competencies 'proved to be twice as important as the others'. Goleman goes on to describe five components of emotional intelligence:

- **Self-awareness:** this he defines as a deep understanding of one's strengths, weaknesses, needs, values and goals. Self-aware managers are aware of their own limitations.

- **Self-regulation:** the control of feelings, the ability to channel them in constructive ways. The ability to feel comfortable with ambiguity and not panic.

- **Motivation:** the desire to achieve beyond expectations, being driven by internal rather than external factors, and to be involved in a continuous striving for improvement.

- **Empathy:** considering employees' feelings alongside other factors when decision making.

- **Social skill:** friendliness with a purpose, being good at finding common ground and building rapport. Individuals with this competency are good persuaders, collaborative managers and natural networkers.

Goleman's research is slightly different from previous work on the trait approach, as here we are considering what makes an effective leader rather than what makes a leader (irrespective of whether they are effective or not). It is also different in that Goleman refers to competencies rather than traits. There is a thorough discussion of competencies in Chapter 17; it is sufficient for now to say that competencies include a combination of traits and abilities, among other things. There is some debate over whether competencies can be developed in people. The general feeling is that some can and some cannot. Goleman maintains that the five aspects of emotional intelligence can be learned and provides an example in his article of one such individual. In spite of his argument we feel that it is still a matter for debate, and as many of the terms used by Goleman are similar to those of the previous trait models of leadership, we have categorised his model as an extension of the trait perspective. To some extent his work sits between the trait approach and the style approach which follows. It is interesting that a number of researchers and writers are recognising that there is some value in considering a mix of personality characteristics and behaviours, and in particular Higgs (2003) links this approach to emotional intelligence.

Rajan and van Eupen (1997) also consider that leaders are strong on emotional intelligence, and that this involves the traits of self-awareness, zeal, resilience and the ability to read emotions in others. They argue that these traits are particularly important in the development and deployment of people skills. Heifetz and Laurie (1997) similarly identify that in order for leaders to regulate emotional distress in the organisation, which is inevitable in change situations, the leader has to have 'the emotional

capacity to tolerate uncertainty, frustration and pain' (p. 128). Along the same lines Goffe (2002) identifies that inspirational leaders need to understand and admit their own weaknesses (within reason); sense the needs of situations; have empathy and self-awareness.

ACTIVITY 14.1

Think of different leaders you have encountered – in particular those that were especially effective or ineffective:

1 What differences can you identify in terms of their traits (personal characteristics)?

2 What differences can you identify in terms of their behaviour?

3 Are the trait and behaviour lists connected in any way? If so how?

4 Which of these two approaches – trait or behaviour – do you find more helpful in helping you to understand the nature of effective leadership?

WHAT IS THE 'BEST WAY TO LEAD'? LEADERSHIP STYLES AND BEHAVIOURS

Dissatisfaction with research on leadership that saw leadership as a set of permanent personal characteristics that describe the leader led to further studies that emphasised the nature of the leadership process – the interaction between leader and follower – aiming to understand how the leaders *behave* rather than what they *are*. The first such studies sought to find the 'best' leadership style; from this perspective leadership comprises an ideal set of behaviours that can be learned. Fulop *et al.* (1999) suggest that Douglas McGregor's (1960) work, *The Human Side of Enterprise*, can be understood from this perspective. McGregor argued that American corporations managed their employees as if they were work-shy, and needed constant direction, monitoring and control (theory 'x'), rather than as if they were responsible individuals who were willing and able to take on responsibility and organise their own work (theory 'y'). McGregor argued that the underlying assumptions of the manager determined the way they managed their employees and this in turn determined how the employees would react. Thus if employees were managed as if they operated on theory 'x' then they would act in a theory 'x' manner; conversely if employees were managed as if they operated on theory 'y' then they would respond as theory 'y' employees would respond. The message was that management style should reinforce theory 'y' and thus employees would take on responsibility, be motivated by what they were doing and work hard. Although the original book was written over forty years ago, this approach is being revisited (*see*, for example, Heil *et al.* 2000) and it fits well with the empowering or post-heroic approach to leadership that we discuss later in the chapter. Another piece of research from the style approach is that by Blake and Mouton (1964), who developed the famous 'Managerial Grid'. The grid is based on two aspects of leadership behaviour. One is concern for production,

Table 14.1 Blake and Mouton's four leadership styles

High concern for people	High concern for people
Low concern for production	High concern for production
Country Club management	**Team management**
Low concern for people	Low concern for people
Low concern for production	High concern for production
Impoverished management	**Authority-compliance management**

Source: Adapted from R.R. Blake and J.S. Mouton (1964) *The Managerial Grid*. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing.

that is, task-oriented behaviours such as clarifying roles, scheduling work, measuring outputs; the second is concern for people, that is, people-centred behaviour such as building trust, camaraderie, a friendly atmosphere. These two dimensions are at the heart of many models of leadership. Blake and Mouton proposed that individual leaders could be measured on a nine-point scale in each of these two aspects, and by combining them in grid form they identified the four leadership styles presented in Table 14.1.

Such studies, which are well substantiated by evidence, suggest that leadership is accessible for all people and that it is more a matter of learning leadership behaviour than of personality characteristics. Many leadership development courses have therefore been based around this model. However, as Northouse (1997) argues, there is an assumption in the model that the team management style (high concern for people and high concern for production; sometimes termed 9,9 management) is the ideal style; and yet this claim is not substantiated by the research. This approach also fails to take account of the characteristics of the situation and the nature of the followers.

WINDOW ON PRACTICE

A large organisation adopted the Managerial Grid as the framework for its leadership development programme. The programme was generally well accepted and successful application of the team management style was seen to be connected to future promotions. Most managers, on leaving the programme, set out to display 9,9 leadership behaviours. However, this had unexpected and undesirable consequences. Not only were team members daunted by their managers suddenly displaying a different style, but sometimes the 9,9 style was not appropriate in the circumstances in which it was used. The organisation eventually discontinued the programme due to the damage that it was causing.

Much of the recent work on the notion of transformational/heroic leadership, and empowering/post-heroic leadership, similarly assumes that what is being discussed is the one best way for a leader to lead, and we return to this leadership debate later on.

DO LEADERS NEED DIFFERENT STYLES FOR DIFFERENT SITUATIONS?

WINDOW ON PRACTICE

Mintzberg (1998) spent some time observing the conductor of an orchestra, Bramwell Tovey, to see whether this could help managers understand a different perspective on leadership. He found what he called covert as opposed to overt leadership, and proposed that this leadership approach was more appropriate than a traditional approach for professionals and knowledge workers. He argued that such employees respond better to inspiration than supervision, as they do not need to be told what to do, but rather to have their expertise coordinated. Mintzberg also makes the important point that such professionals need the support and protection of their leader in respect of dealings at the boundary of the organisation (in this case the orchestra).

A variety of models, sometimes termed contingency models, have been developed to address the importance of context in terms of the leadership process, and as a consequence these models become more complex. Many, however, retain the concepts of production-centred and people-centred behaviour as ways of describing leadership behaviour, but use them in a different way. Hersey and Blanchard (1988) developed a model which identified that the appropriate leadership style in a situation should be dependent on their diagnosis of the 'readiness', that is, developmental level or maturity, of their followers. The model is sometimes referred to as 'situational leadership', and works on the premise that leaders can 'adapt their leadership style to meet the demands of their environment' (Hersey and Blanchard 1988, p. 169). Readiness of followers is defined in terms of ability and willingness. Level of ability includes the experience, knowledge and skills that an individual possesses in relation to the particular task at hand; and level of willingness encompasses the extent to which the individual has the motivation and commitment, or the self-confidence, to carry out the task. Having diagnosed the developmental level of the followers, Hersey and Blanchard suggest that the leader then adapts their behaviour to fit. They identify two dimensions of leader behaviour: task behaviour, which is sometimes termed 'directive'; and relationship behaviour, which is sometimes termed 'supportive'. Task behaviour refers to the extent to which leaders spell out what has to be done. This includes 'telling people what to do, how to do it, when to do it, where to do it, and who is to do it' (Hersey 1985, p. 19). On the other hand, relationship behaviour is defined as 'the extent to which the leader engages in two-way or multiway communication. The behaviours include listening, facilitating and supporting behaviours' (ibid.). The extent to which the leader emphasises each of these two types of behaviour results in the usual two-by-two matrix. The four resulting styles are identified, as shown in Table 14.2.

There is an assumption that the development path for any individual and required behaviour for the leader is to work through boxes 1, 2, 3 and then 4 in the matrix. Hersey and Blanchard produced questionnaires to help managers diagnose the readiness of their followers.

Table 14.2 Hersey and Blanchard's four styles of leadership

High relationship behaviour	High relationship behaviour
Low task behaviour	High task behaviour
Followers are able, but unwilling or insecure	Followers are unable, but willing or confident
Supportive (participating) style (3)	**Coaching (selling) style (2)**
Low relationship behaviour	Low relationship behaviour
Low task behaviour	High task behaviour
Followers are both able and willing or confident	Followers are unable and unwilling or insecure
Delegation style (4)	**Directing (telling) style (1)**

Source: Adapted from P. Hersey and K.H. Blanchard (1988) *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*, 5th edn. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall International. © Copyright material, adapted and reprinted with the permission of Center for Leadership Studies, Escondido, CA92025.

Other well-known contingency models include Fielder's (1967) contingency model where leadership behaviour is matched to three factors in the situation: the nature of the relationship between the leader and members, the extent to which tasks are highly structured and the position power of the leader. The appropriate leader behaviour (that is, whether it should be task oriented or relationship oriented) depends on the combination of these three aspects in any situation. Fielder's model is considered to be well supported by the evidence. The research was based on the relationship between style and performance in existing organisations in different contexts. For a very useful comparison of contingency models *see* Fulop *et al.* (1999).

WINDOW ON PRACTICE

Hilary Walmsley (1999) reports some of her work as a consultant with BUPA. One of the aims of the exercise she was involved in was to:

> raise individuals' awareness of their own management styles and encourage them to stop and think about which approach to adopt rather than automatically respond to every challenge in a similar way. (p. 48)

She recounts the experiences of Brian Atkins, General Manager of BUPA's Gatwick Park and Redwood Hospitals, as an illustration of this learning process. On joining the hospital group, which was undergoing a critical phase of change, in 1990, Atkins consciously used an authoritative leadership style, at the directive and controlling end of the spectrum. Once the hospital was soundly on course for recovery he began to use a more empowering and facilitative style. Atkins describes modern managers as 'style travellers', and suggests that they need to be skilled at using different styles, even though they may naturally prefer one approach. Walmsley notes that managers are tempted to use the same styles out of habit, and are often unaware of alternative styles they could use.

Table 14.3 Six leadership styles reported by Goleman

Coercive style	Leader demands immediate compliance
Authoritative style	Leader mobilises people towards a vision
Affiliative style	Leader creates emotional bonds and harmony
Democratic style	Leaders use participation to build consensus
Pacesetting style	Leader expects excellence and self-direction from followers
Coaching style	Leader develops people for the future

Source: Reprinted by permission of *Harvard Business Review*. Adapted from 'Leadership that gets results', by D. Goleman, March–April, pp. 80 and 82–3. Copyright © 2000 by the Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation; all rights reserved.

Goleman (2000) reports the results of some research carried out by Hay/McBer who sampled almost 20 per cent of a database of 20,000 executives. The results were analysed to identify six different leadership styles, which are shown in Table 14.3, but most importantly Goleman reports that 'leaders with the best results do not rely on only one leadership style' (p. 78).

Goleman goes on to consider the appropriate context and impact of each style, and argues that the more styles the leader uses the better. We have already reported Goleman's work on emotional intelligence, and he links this with the six styles by suggesting that leaders need to understand how the styles relate back to the different competencies of emotional intelligence so that they can identify where they need to focus their leadership development.

ACTIVITY 14.2

For each of Goleman's six styles think of a leader you have worked with, or know of. For each of these individuals write a list of the *behaviours* that they use. Then consider the impact that these behaviours have on followers.

Do the behaviours have the same impact on all followers? If not, why not?

One of the differences between the contingency models we have just discussed and the 'best' style models is the implications for development. The Blake and Mouton model suggests leaders can be developed to lead in the one best way. The Hersey and Blanchard model, and most other contingency models, stress the flexibility of the leader – to learn to lead differently with different employees depending on their needs; hence the leader should learn many styles and learn to diagnose the needs of their employees. Fielder's model, however, emphasises matching the leader to the context (a selection decision), rather than developing leaders in the context.

WINDOW ON PRACTICE

International perspectives on leadership style

Kakabadse *et al.* (1997) carried out a 600-respondent survey of top management styles in Europe (the Cranfield study). The analysis produced four distinct styles:

Leading from the front – where charisma, dominance and self-motivation were valued, with a reliance on an individual's leadership ability and a view that rules and procedures were a hindrance.

Consensus – where team spirit, effective communication and an open dialogue were valued, with attention to organisational detail and consensual decision making.

Managing from a distance – where strategic and conceptual thinking was valued, with a tendency to pursue personal agendas coupled with ineffective communication, lack of discipline and ambiguity.

Towards a common goal – where functional-based expertise, clear roles, systems and controls and discipline are valued, with authority-based leadership.

The researchers found that leading from the front was most common in the UK, Ireland and Spain; consensus was most common in Sweden and Finland; managing from a distance, most common in France; and towards a common goal most common in Germany and Austria.

Source: Summarised from A. Kakabadse, A. Myers, T. McMahon and G. Spony (1997) in K. Grint (ed.) *Leadership*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DO WE REALLY NEED HEROES?

A different approach to understanding leadership is transformational leadership, which focuses on the leader's role at a strategic level, so there is a concentration on the one leader at the top of the organisaton. There is a wide range of literature in this vein, most of it written in the 1980s. Since that time the academic literature may have moved on but the image of the transformational leader still remains widely attractive. While this is a different approach it links back to our original three questions about leadership. Transformational leadership shows elements of the trait approach, as leaders are seen to 'have' charisma, which sets them apart as extraordinary and exceptional, and they are also seen to use a set of 'ideal' behaviours, with the assumption in many writings that this is the 'best' approach.

The leader is usually characterised as a hero, although Steyrer (1998) proposes that there are other charismatic types such as the father figure, the saviour and the king. Such leaders appear to know exactly what they are doing and how to 'save' the organisation from its present predicament (and consequently such leadership is found more often when organisations are in trouble). Leaders involve followers by generating a high level of commitment, partly due to such leaders focusing on the needs of followers and expressing their vision in such a way that it satisfies these needs. They communicate high expectations to followers and also the firm belief that followers will be able to achieve these goals. In this way the leader promotes

self-confidence in the followers and they are motivated to achieve more than they ordinarily expect to achieve. In terms of behaviours, perhaps the most important is the vision of the future that the leader offers and that they communicate this and dramatise this to the followers. Such leaders are able to help the followers make sense of what is going on and why as well as what needs to be done in the future. It is from this perspective that the distinction between management and leadership is often made. Bennis and Nanus (1985), for example, suggest leadership is path finding while management is path following; and that leadership is about doing the right thing whereas management is about doing things right. Kotter (1990) identified leaders as establishing a direction (whereas managers plan and budget); leaders align people with the vision (whereas managers organise things); leaders motivate and inspire (whereas managers control and solve problems); and leaders encourage change (whereas managers encourage order and predictability). Other writers analysing leadership from this perspective include Tichy and Devanna (1986) and Bass (1985), and there is a wide research base to support the findings. The approach does have a great strength in taking followers' needs into account and seeking to promote their self-confidence and potential, and the idea of the knight in shining armour is very attractive and potentially exciting – Tichy and Devanna, for example, present the process of such leadership as a three-act drama. However, in spite of the emphasis on process there is also an emphasis on leadership characteristics which harks back to the trait approach to leadership, which has been characterised as elitist. There is also the ethical concern of one person wielding such power over others.

Maybe we should ask whether organisations really require such leaders. A very different conception of leadership is now offered as an alternative, partly a reaction to the previous approach, and partly a response to a changing environment. This is termed empowering or post-heroic leadership, and could be described as the currently favoured ideal way to lead.

WINDOW ON PRACTICE

Arkin (1997) reports on the leadership experiences of Percy Barnevik who was Chief Executive of the engineering company ABB. Arkin explains how this charismatic leader transformed ABB into a 'competitive fighting force across the globe' (p. 27). Ten years later, on leaving the role of Chief Executive, Barnevik is reported to have said, 'Ten years after our big merger, we have come a long way from the large dependence on one man at the top' (p. 28).

Source: Summarised from A. Arkin (1997) 'The secret of his success',
People Management, 23 October, pp. 27–8.

Fulop *et al*. (1999) identify factors in a rapidly changing turbulent environment which by the 1990s dilute the appropriateness of concentrating on the one leader at the top of the organisation. These factors include: globalisation making centralisation more difficult; technology enabling better sharing of information; and change being seen as a responsibility of all levels of the organisation – not just the top. They also note a dissatisfaction with corporate failures, identify few transformational

leaders as positive role models, suggest that such a model of male authoritarian leadership is less relevant, and in particular that the macho leader with all the answers does not necessarily fit well with the encouragement of creativity and innovation. In addition they suggest that increasing teamwork and an increasing emphasis on knowledge workers mean that employees will be less responsive now to a transformational leader. The emphasis has therefore moved away from understanding the traits and style of the one leader at the top of the organisation who knows how to solve all the organisation's problems, to how empowering or post-heroic leaders can facilitate many members of the organisation in taking on leadership roles. In this context Applebaum *et al.* (2003) comment that female leadership styles are more effective in today's team-based consensually driven organisations. Many commentators speak of leaders with integrity and humility, the ability to select good people and to remove barriers so they can fulfil their potential and perform (*see*, for example, Collins 2003; Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe 2002).

The leader becomes a developer who can help others identify problems as opportunities for learning, and who can harness the collective intelligence of the organisation, and Fulop *et al.* (1999) note that this means in practice that they encourage the development of a learning organisation. Senge (1990), who is a protagonist of the learning organisation (*see* Chapter 11 for further details), sees the leader's new roles in encouraging a learning organisation as designer, teacher and steward, rather than a traditional charismatic decision maker. He suggests that leaders should *design* the organisation in terms of vision, purpose, core values and the structures by which these ideas can be translated into business decisions. However, he also suggests that the leader should involve people at all levels in this design task. It is the role of the leader not to identify the right strategy, but to encourage strategic thinking in the organisation, and to design effective learning processes to make this happen. The leader's role as a *teacher* is not to teach people the correct view of reality, but to help employees gain more insight into the current reality. The leader therefore coaches, guides and facilitates. As a *steward* the leader acts as a servant in taking responsibility for the impact of their leadership on others, and in the sense that they override their own self-interest by personal commitment to the organisation's larger mission. To play this role effectively Senge suggests that the leader will need many new skills, in particular vision-making skills – a never-ending sharing of ideas and asking for feedback. Skills that will encourage employees to express and test their views of the world are also key. These involve actively seeking others' views, experimenting, encouraging enquiry and distinguishing 'the way things are done' from 'the way we think things are done'.

WINDOW ON PRACTICE

The role that leaders play in the organisation in the twenty-first century is seen by some as very different from the hero roles of the past, and leaders are no longer expected always to know the solutions to problems.

Williams (2000), who talks about enabling and empowering leadership, suggests that 'twenty first century leaders are not expected to be all-knowing gurus and

peddlers of panaceas' (p. 113). However, they are expected to know the right questions to ask, as Heifetz and Laurie (1997) suggest: 'leaders do not need to know all the answers. They do need to know the right questions' (p. 124).

Building on this a speaker from Henley Management College (Radio 4, 25 February 2001) argued that leaders need to be able to admit that they do not know all the answers, and that there was a paradox in leadership, as leaders need to display both boldness and humility.

Taking this one step further Anne Atkinson (Radio 4, 29 November 2000), speaking in relation to the tussle over who won the American presidential election, described the leader as a servant, arguing that the best leaders are unwilling leaders and do not seek power, but instead have a desire to benefit the people they lead.

These ideas take us some way from the charismatic and transformational view of the leader.

This changing perspective on leadership is well demonstrated by a survey on leadership skills reported by Rajan and van Eupen (1997). The research is based on interviews with 49 top business leaders, 50 HR directors and a postal questionnaire of 375 companies in the service sector. They asked what were the most important leadership skills during the period 1995–7 and compared the results with those of a similar survey conducted in the late 1980s. The change in skills base shown in Table 14.4 reflects very well the change in the idealised leadership role and the increasing importance of facilitative people-related skills. They also note the prediction that the future will require an equal balance of traditionally masculine and feminine personality traits.

Higgs (2003) argues that leaders need a combination of skills and personality: envisioning, engaging, enabling, enquiring and developing skills are needed, together with authenticity, integrity, will, self-belief and self-awareness.

Top five skills in order of importance		
1995–7	1	Ability to inspire trust and motivation
	2	Visioning
	3	Ability, willingness and self-discipline to listen
	4	Strategic thinking
	5	Interpersonal communication skills
Late 1980s	1	Strategic thinking
	2	Entrepreneurial skills
	3	Originality
	4	Flair
	5	Problem-solving skills

Table 14.4
Leadership skills compared

Source: Adapted from A. Rajan and P. van Eupen (1997) 'Take it from the top', *People Management*, 23 October, pp. 26 and 28.

From a slightly different perspective Heifetz and Laurie (1997) propose six guiding principles of post-heroic leadership, and they conclude that leadership is about learning and that the idea of having a vision and aligning people to this is bankrupt. The idea of one leader at the top creating major changes in order to solve a one-off challenge is no longer appropriate, as organisations now face a constant stream of adaptive challenges, and leadership is required of many in the organisation, not just one person at the top. They argue that employees should be allowed to identify and solve problems themselves and learn to take responsibility. The role of the leader is to develop collective self-confidence. As Grint (1997) puts it, 'the apparent devolvement (or desertion – depending on your perspective) of responsibility has become the new standard in contemporary models of leadership' (p. 13). For further discussion on the devolution of responsibility *see* case 14.1 on the website.

These visions of leadership are very attractive but they do require a dramatic change in thinking for both leaders and followers. For leaders there is the risk of giving away power, learning to trust employees, developing new skills, developing a different perspective of their role and overriding self-interest. For followers there is the challenge of taking responsibility – which some may welcome, but others shun. Yet, if sustained competitive advantage is based on human capital and collective intelligence, it is difficult to relegate this perspective to 'just an ideal'.

While empowering leaders have been shown to fit with the current climate we may sometimes need heroic leaders. Kets de Vries (2003) makes the point that heroic leadership will never die as change makes people anxious and we need heroic leaders to calm them down, but since no one can live up to the expectations of heroic leaders, they will eventually become a disappointment. We conclude with the thought that there is no one best way – different leaders and different leader behaviours are needed at different times. For an example of a mixed approach to leadership *see* case 14.2 on the website about Tim Smit of the Eden Project.

LEADERSHIP AND MOTIVATION

All leadership models are based on the assumption that one person can motivate another to act, and we have looked at different explanations of how leaders may do this – based on their traits, their employment of the one best leadership style or their use of a style which matches (in some ways) the needs of their followers, and is responsive (in some ways) to the context. We have also explained how the leader may be reconceptualised as heroic (transformational leader) and as empowering or post-heroic.

Some interconnections can be made between these theories and motivation theories. It is not our purpose here to recount any motivation theories in detail (for this *see* texts such as Buchanan and Huczynski 1997; Mullins 1999; Fulop and Linstead 1999; or Hollyforde and Whiddett 2002). Below we identify some of the key concepts addressed in motivation theories and suggest which leadership perspectives tap into these concepts:

- **Expectancy has an impact on motivation.** We have already mentioned McGregor's (1960) model and his argument that if you treat people as responsible and self-motivated then they will act in a responsible and motivated manner. In addition Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory of motivation recognises that in

the process of motivation the extent to which the individual feels they can realistically achieve the target will have an influence on whether they are motivated even to try. In respect of transformational leadership it is argued that followers can be inspired to achieve beyond the normal, partly because the leader has high expectations of the followers and in addition the leader expresses the belief that the followers are capable of achieving these great things. From a different perspective the post-heroic leader concept is based on trusting organisation members to play their part, trusting them with information and expecting them to use this wisely for the good of the organisation.

- **Social needs are important.** Maslow (1943), Mayo (1953) and McClelland (1971), among others, highlight the need for affiliation as a motivational factor. Some leadership models specifically respond to this, for example Blake and Mouton (1964) ('one best style' theory), Hersey and Blanchard (1988) and Fielder (1967) (contingency theory) all use 'concern for people' in some form as one of the key aspects of their leadership models. The concept of post-heroic leadership concerns involving those who may previously have been excluded, and concerns the impact of their leadership on individuals. In addition this perspective concentrates on the importance of learning and acting collectively.

- **Importance of the work itself.** Maslow (1943), Herzberg (1968), and Hackman and Oldham (1976), for example, all underline the way in which individuals are motivated to seek and may achieve satisfaction through their jobs. Herzberg, for example, identifies how opportunities for achievement, recognition, responsibility, autonomy, challenging tasks and opportunities for development may all be motivational. In some ways, Hersey and Blanchard's (1988) model addresses these needs in their 'delegation' style. In the post-heroic model many people in the organisation need to be involved in meeting adaptive challenges, in working out solutions and in contributing to vision building and many need to take on the responsibility of leadership. This is very different from the transformational leadership model in which the leader at the top of the organisation is seen to have all the responsibility.

- **Recognising different people are motivated by different things.** Expectancy theory, previously mentioned, also identifies that different individuals value different things and hence have different motivational needs. In the process of motivation, only those things that the individual values will spur them to act. Contingency models of leadership take this on board to some extent. From a different perspective the transformational leader develops an interpretation of the world, or narrative, that plays to the followers' needs. However, while post-heroic leadership identifies that different people may play a different part, there is an assumption that all will be prepared to be involved, to share information and to develop themselves in line with the needs of the organisation.

- **Social influences on motivation.** Recent work in the area of motivation suggests that motivations are socially or culturally determined, and to a limited extent the transformational leader ties into this as they reinterpret the world for their followers.

In spite of the links between leadership and motivation theories, there are many aspects of motivation that the leadership theories ignore. For example, some people have less internal energy and drive than others and less need for growth. Also,

individuals with high levels of energy and drive may satisfy these outside the work environment. While we may try to motivate people externally the greatest power for motivation comes from within and is therefore under the control of the individual rather than another. The best we can say is that leaders can enhance followers' motivation by the way they treat them, and at worst leaders may neutralise the motivational energy in their followers. There will always be some factors on which leaders have no impact whatsoever.

SUMMARY PROPOSITIONS

14.1 Leadership is a process where one person influences a group of others to achieve group or organisational goals – leadership is thus about motivation.

14.2 The trait model of leadership, although often discredited, continues to play a part in our understanding of leadership.

14.3 Behavioural models are more helpful than earlier models as they concentrate on what leaders do rather than on what they are.

14.4 Some behavioural models offer a 'one best way' of leadership, but more sophisticated models take account of contingency factors such as maturity of followers and the nature of the task.

14.5 Models of transformational leadership treat the leader as a hero who can (single-handedly) turn the organisation around and deliver it from a crisis.

14.6 Empowering and post-heroic leadership models conceptualise the leader as teacher and facilitator, who involves many in the leadership task.

14.7 While there are many ways in which leadership theories tap into concepts of motivation, at best leaders may enhance the motivation of their followers and at worst they may neutralise it.

GENERAL DISCUSSION TOPICS

1 Do we need leaders at all? Discuss what alternatives there might be.

2 Consider the four types of charismatic leader identified by Steyrer (1998): hero, father figure, missionary and saviour. Discuss the ways in which the types of leader are similar or different.

FURTHER READING

IDS (2003) *IDS Studies: Leadership Development*, No. 753. London: Incomes Data Services A useful book outlining the work of five case study organisations, in terms of their conception of leadership, what prompted their leadership development programmes and an outline of the programmes themselves. The case organisations are the Dixons group, the Inland Revenue, Novartis Pharmaceuticals, Portsmouth City Council and Skipton Building Society.

Nicholson, N. (2003) 'How to motivate your problem people', *Harvard Business Review*, January, pp. 57–65

Despite the title this article is focused on the perspective of the employee rather than the leader. Nicholson takes the view that leaders need to decentre, in other words put aside their views and look at the world in terms of how the employee sees it – the employee not being a problem to be solved but a person to be understood.

REFERENCES

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. and Alban-Metcalfe, J. (2002) 'The great and the good', *People Management*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 10 January, pp. 32–4.

Applebaum, S., Audet, L. and Miller, J. (2003) 'Gender and leadership? Leadership and gender? A journey through the landscape of theories', *Leadership and Organisation*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 43–51.

Arkin, A. (1997) 'The secret of his success', *People Management*, 23 October, pp. 27–8.

Bass, B.M. (1985) 'Leadership: Good, Better, Best', *Organisational Dynamics*, Winter, pp. 26–40.

Bennis, W.G. and Nanus, B. (1985) *Leaders: the strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.

Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J.S. (1964) *The Managerial Grid*. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing.

Buchanan, D. and Huczynski, A. (1997) *Organisational Behaviour*. London: Prentice Hall.

Collins, J. (2003) 'From good to great', presentation to the CIPD National Conference, Harrogate, 22–24 November 2003.

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

Fulop, L. and Linstead, S. (1999) *Management. A Critical Text*. South Yarra: Macmillan Business.

Fulop, L., Linstead, S. and Dunford, R. (1999) 'Leading and managing', in L. Fulop and S. Linstead, *Management. A Critical Text*. South Yarra: Macmillan Business.

Goffe, R. (2002) 'Send out the right signals', *People Management*, Vol. 8, No. 21, 24 October, pp. 32–8.

Goleman, D. (1998) 'What makes . . . a leader?' *Harvard Business Review*, Nov.–Dec., pp. 93–102.

Goleman, D. (2000) 'Leadership that gets results', *Harvard Business Review*, March–April, pp. 78–90.

Grint, K. (1997) 'Introduction' in K. Grint (ed.) *Leadership*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hackman, J. and Oldham, G. (1976) 'Motivation through the design of work; test of a theory', *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*, Vol. 16, pp. 250–79.

Heifetz, R. and Laurie, D. (1997) 'The work of leadership', *Harvard Business Review*, Jan.–Feb., pp. 124–34.

Heil, G., Bennis, W. and Stephens, D.C. (2000) *Douglas McGregor, revisited: managing the human side of the enterprise*. New York: Wiley.

Hersey, P. (1985) *Situational Selling*. Escondido, Calif.: Centre for Leadership Studies.

Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K.H. (1988) *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*, 5th edn. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall International.

Herzberg, F. (1968) 'One more time. How do you motivate employees?' *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 46, pp. 53–62.

Higgs, M. (2003) 'How can we make sense of leadership in the 21st century?' *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 5, pp. 273–84.

Hollyforde, S. and Whiddett, S. (2002) *The Motivation Handbook*. London: CIPD.

House, R. (1976) 'A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership', in J. Hunt and L. Larson (eds) *Leadership: the Cutting Edge*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press.

Kakabadse, A., Myers, A., McMahon, T. and Spony, G. (1997) in K. Grint (ed.) *Leadership*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kets de Vries, M. (2003) 'The dark side of leadership', *Business Strategy Review*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 25–8.

Kilpatrick, S. and Locke, E. (1991) 'Leadership: Do Traits Matter?' *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 48–60.

Kotter, J. (1990) *A Force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.

McClelland, D.C. (1971) *Motivational Trends in Society*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

McGregor, D. (1960) *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Maslow, A. (1943) 'A theory of human motivation', *Psychological Review*, Vol. 50, pp. 370–96.

Mayo, E. (1953) *The problems with an industrialized civilization*. New York: Macmillan.

Mintzberg, H. (1998) 'Covert leadership: Notes on managing professionals', *Harvard Business Review*, Nov.–Dec., pp. 140–7.

Mullins, L. (1999) *Management and Organisational Behaviour*, 5th edn. Harlow: Financial Times Pitman Publishing.

Northouse, P. (1997) *Leadership – Theory and Practice*. California: Sage.

Rajan, A. and van Eupen, P. (1997) 'Take it from the top', *People Management*, 23 October, pp. 26–9.

Senge, P. (1990) *The Fifth Discipline: The art and practice of the learning organisation*. London: Century Business, Random House.

Shackleton, V. (1995) *Business Leadership*. London: Routledge.

Steyrer, J. (1998) 'Charisma and the Archetypes of leadership', *Organisation Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 5, pp. 807–28.

Tichy, N. and Devanna, M. (1986) *The Transformational Leader*. New York: Wiley.

Vroom, V. (1964) *Work and Motivation*. Chichester: John Wiley.

Walmsley, H. (1999) 'A suitable ploy', *People Management*, 8 April, pp. 48–50.

Williams, M. (2000) *The war for talent: Getting the best from the best*. London: CIPD.

An extensive range of additional materials, including multiple choice questions, answers to questions and links to useful websites can be found on the Human Resource Management Companion Website at **www.pearsoned.co.uk/torrington**.