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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

If one was to adopt a strictly financial perspective, today’s workplace probably would seem viciously calculated and uncaring. From that standpoint, one would only see organizations striving to acquire profits by using the most efficient, cost-effective mechanisms available. Loyalty would only exist in the most parasitic of relationships; A human resource would be nurtured and supported only as long as it continued to provide value better, faster, and cheaper than anything else. Despite the apparent concern for human welfare in the form of employee benefits, such as health plans, profit sharing, and retirement funds, these amenities are only made available to those who are deemed worthy enough to reap their benefits. If warranted, these perquisites may be stricken from the record to the extent that the law will allow.

From a humanistic point of view, one could point to the fact that these same organizations are actually taking an interest in their lower-level employees in the forms of empowerment, participative management, and affirmative action plans. As a result, the workforce has become more diversified, specialized, and insightful. Indeed, those aforementioned amenities that seemed perfunctory are
actually measures taken by upper management to ensure a higher quality of work life. As a result, corporations are able to do "more with less" as a result of improved efficiency and productivity.

Regardless of the perspective being utilized, organizations have become flatter and leaner. Their flow charts are becoming mere skeletons of what was once a legitimate "corporate ladder." Coinciding with this phenomenon, naturally, is the evolution of the modern work unit. The workload has either remained the same or become greater, but the nature of today's demands requires higher competency levels and a greater sense of urgency to react to it. Turning to Socio-Technical Systems theory, many of the prominent players in today's business world have decided that work teams are the best way to utilize both the social and technical facets of their labor milieu. While it seems ironic that people could be encouraged to work cooperatively in a high-pressure, capital-intensive environment, the fact is that teams do seem to satisfy both the strategic and the psychosocial needs of the modern-day workplace.

From a value-driven standpoint, teams make sense because "a group can more effectively allocate its resources when and where required to deal with its total variance in work conditions than can an aggregate of individuals, each of whom is assigned a portion of the variance (Susman, 1976, p. 183)." By allowing co-workers to collaborate in their
efforts, the desired output can be achieved more efficiently and in all likelihood with improved results. In this context, the whole is truly worth more than the sum of the parts. This rationale helps illustrate the core of the team dynamic, and has probably given rise to the notion of synergy, or the idea that a magical force exists that makes a group function above and beyond individual capabilities when it is performing "in sync."

Socially, teams are logical because they seem to make the majority of workers happier. Both Lawler (1986) and Manz and Sims (1986) have attested that self-managing teams have shown improvements in productivity and quality of work life measures, while exhibiting a reduction in both absenteeism and turnover. Keeping employees satisfied has become a priority, since leaner work units are more likely to suffer when the individuals that compose them are not motivated to be productive.

With all of the recent attention given to work teams, it seems odd that there is so little agreement on the proper recipe for team success. Bolman and Deal (1992) mention that "[A]lthough the corporate world relies more and more on teamwork, it often does so without a solid grasp of what makes a team work" (p.34). For this reason, it should come as no surprise that the inculcation of these structures into the workplace has been futile in several cases (e.g., Lawler, 1986; Verespej, 1990). Naturally, many theories are
available on what constitutes ideal team design, but almost all of them seem to have a definite opinion on what may be the cornerstone of the methodology’s successful deployment: leader behavior (Stewart & Manz, 1995).

If leadership is at the foundation of profitable team functioning, then it seems necessary to summarize some of the distinctive theories and models that pervade both business and psychological literature today. This paper will be an attempt to derive pertinent conclusions from these conceptualizations, and to subsequently develop testable hypotheses from them.

Types of Leadership

It would be difficult to begin this discussion without touching upon the classic work by McGregor (1960). He contends that two perspectives, “Theory X” and “Theory Y,” are responsible for dictating a manager’s style. The Theory X viewpoint assumes that individuals are lackadaisical and naïve. They abhor labor, and basically need to somehow be forced to do it via outside control and upkeep. Theory Y, however, imparts faith in the workers as being self-motivated and competent. Given the right circumstances, McGregor argues, Theory Y employees can allow their own goals to coincide with those of the organization, and thus actively enjoy their work.

If one is looking to facilitate a teamwork-oriented atmosphere, it might be difficult to execute such a strategy
while maintaining a Theory X perspective. In extreme cases, such as a group of athletes on a losing team (Bird, 1977), stoic discipline and a task orientation may be necessary in order to allow the group to become focused on winning. But in a business world that is pointed toward empowerment and diversification, that sort of philosophy might be difficult to either impose or justify.

Thus, the Theory Y mentality seems to win out. If one is going to entrust his or her employees with decision making and even self-leadership, it is probably essential that he or she adopt the view that the workers are capable, responsible, and sufficiently driven toward success without coercion. As we will see, this "humanistic" tenet seems to be present in the following theories on leadership in some form or another.

Symbiotic Leadership

In his optimistic vision of the future management-labor relationship, Edwards (1992) describes an "interdependent" system, in which both sides survive by engaging in an active, reciprocal alliance. The two parties are motivated to serve the customer, they "listen and respond" to each other's ideas and needs, and both teamwork and individual achievements are rewarded by the organization.

Still, embracing mutually beneficial behavior is not enough. Edwards (1992) criticizes traditional promotional criteria, and accuses top management of "cronyism."
Supervisors, he contends, should not bear the onus of deciding how rewards should be distributed. When that imbalance occurs, selection decisions are often made on the basis of both similarity and perceived threat, and the opportunity for cultural norms to evolve is greatly hindered as a result.

Edwards (1992) proposes a win-win strategy that is based on the acronym TRUST, which stands for Team Review (using multiple raters), Understanding (via improved communication), and Symbolic Teamwork (a fair distribution of rewards). By allowing one’s co-workers to aid in the evaluation process, the “quiet contributors” and the glass ceiling victims can be properly recognized.

Clearly, the realization of Edwards’ viewpoint requires a Theory Y perspective. If management lacks confidence in the abilities of lower-level employees, then the opportunity for dual beneficence is lost. Supervisors must be willing to “loosen the reins” and evolve into a more facilitative role if the necessary changes for a symbiotic system are ever to take place.

Symbolic Leadership

Bolman and Deal’s (1992) work on leadership couches the “symbolic” paradigm in the concept of “frames,” which are described as “cognitive maps...[that are] developed through education and experience (p. 35).” These mechanisms are utilized by supervisors in order to simplify their
surroundings. When one can conduct business by using a "manageable" number of frames, they contend, it allows that person to be able to obtain a more comprehensive grasp on a situation, and consequently, they are able to refresh their perspectives as needed during stressful times.

Bolman and Deal (1992) cite four different frames that are commonly found in today's working world: structural (an analytic, regimented orientation), human resource [a focus on the "interaction between individual and organizational needs" (p. 35).], political (an emphasis on resource allocation and conflict), and symbolic (the ability to create subjective interpretations). Certainly, all four frames are viable contributors to organizational success. For example, the works of Likert, Argyris, and McGregor operated in the human resource frame by concentrating on sociological factors in the workplace.

Much of Bolman and Deal's (1992) research is indicative of the fact that many managers turn to both the structural and the human resource frames in their undertakings; however, the political and the symbolic frames appear to be underutilized. It is the symbolic viewpoint, they aver, that differentiates managers from leaders. Symbolic leadership requires creative ability and complex thought, but by operating from such a framework, ordinary, lackluster work teams can be motivated to exceed their individual expectations. By creating myths, ceremonies, and dialects,
team members become unified by acquiring a "soul." Cultural diversity is welcomed, as people with disparate skills are able to find their niche when their leader creates an atmosphere that unearths meaning from chaos.

While symbolic leadership looks good on paper, it is difficult to imagine that a majority of managers are capable of using it effectively. Successful NBA (professional basketball) coaches, such as Phil Jackson and Pat Riley have shown that such a viewpoint can be quite effective in instilling the team dynamic, but how many corporate supervisors are capable of practicing it? The idea that only certain individuals are meant to lead is also the premise of the next subject.

Charismatic (Transformational) Leadership

A wealth of literature is available on transformational leadership, yet little has been done to unify the wide range of theories and constructs. Recently, Behling and McFillen (1996) made an effort to create a syncretical (compromising) model in order to promote a greater understanding of the concept and to stimulate further research. Additionally, the authors were able to develop an instrument that would enable them to test their hypotheses on relationships between supervisors and subordinates.

In the writers' own words, charismatic/transformational leadership occurs when "the actions of single managers appear to create extraordinarily high levels of employee
commitment, effort, and willingness to take risks in support of the organization or its mission" (p. 163). With the major changes that have taken place in today's fast-paced work environment as a result of overseas competition (and other occurrences in the 1970's), managers are turning to new leadership styles that promote employee involvement. The charismatic profile seems to provide one answer to the call for change.

The syncretical model is basically divided into two categories: "leader behavior" and their resulting "follower beliefs." Naturally, not every construct in literature could be utilized in the framework, but Behling and McFillen (1996) were still able to create a portrait that seems to capture the reasonably agreed-upon elements of the theory. One factor that does seem universal is known as "psychic distress," which is "the job-related anxiety, fear, and frustration created by traumas such as organizational birth, crisis, or malaise" (p. 166). These potentially stressful situations may increase the likelihood that a charismatic leadership style will be employed (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). At the very least, the authors feel that psychic distress serves to catalyze the relationship between the leaders' behaviors (which will be covered shortly), and the followers' resultant inspiration, awe, and empowerment.

Inspiration refers to the leader's "ability to define a clear mission, communicate it, and persuade others to join
up" (Leavitt, 1986, p. 11). Nearly all of the works on this subject seem to agree on this requirement. The leader needs to be able to cultivate some sort of conceptualization, and then communicate it to a group of followers who are capable of accepting it (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). The leader must be steadfastly committed to his or her vision, and the idea should have some sort of religious, moralistic overtones (House, 1977). Thus, by "displaying empathy," a leader is able to decipher the followers' needs and to subsequently calibrate the way in which he or she presents the plans to the subordinates. Furthermore, by "dramatizing the mission," followers' emotions can be fueled, as they become attuned to the leader's convictions and direction. The suggested usage of metaphors and allusions is probably similar to the ideas covered in the symbolic leadership section.

Awe is defined as "unreasoning faith in the abilities of the leader that is often...accompanied by affection for him or her" (Behling & McFillen, p. 170). Believing that the leader is "larger than life" may increase the plausibility that the subordinates will follow his or her example. Moreover, the employees will be less likely to judge the leader's actions. Most of the available writings on this topic involve the perception that the leader is either divine or superhuman (e.g., Willner, 1984). By "project[ing] self-assurance," then, supervisors have faith that their followers can perform their own work without constant
supervision, and problems can be dealt with as they occur. Meanwhile, the leader can “enhance [his or her] image” by creating an aura of success, attractiveness and competency (House, 1977). This course of action can be accomplished by patterning their actions after legendary figures specific to their culture (Willner, 1984). While these measures may be necessary for supporting the leader’s mystique, the available references did not seem to explicitly state what steps the figurehead should take in doing so.

Behling and McFillen (1996) identify empowerment as being “followers’ confidence in their own ability, or in the ability of the organization or unit of which they are a part, to overcome obstacles and control events” (p. 172). While empowerment does not seem to receive as much literary attention as the other two follower beliefs, those who mention it appear to recognize its importance. Indeed, cases in which high expectations and confidence result in increased ability are well documented in both psychological and business writings (e.g., House, 1977), so this modern-day “Pygmalion effect” should be considered relevant to the charismatic lexicon. Leaders may promote empowerment via either direct methods (“assur[ing] followers of their competency”) or by subtle strategies (“providing followers with opportunities to experience success”). Participative management, goal setting, modeling, and job enrichment are
all examples of the latter technique (Conger & Kanungo, 1988).

Charismatic/transformational leadership seems to require individuals who know how to capitalize on turbulent organizational scenarios. As in the aforementioned symbolic paradigm, these supervisors are portrayed as visionaries who are able to turn everyday business decisions into a new chapter in a masterpiece novel. They are supposed to find new ways to enhance their image, creating a presence characterized by wonder and mystique. While transformational leadership may be the most popular viewpoint today, critics are quick to point out that charismatic leaders become too rigid in their beliefs (Manz & Sims, 1991). Additionally, the inevitable schism that likely emerges between the "exalted" leader and the "subservient" followers may seriously limit the opportunity for true empowerment to occur. Indeed, it would be difficult to imagine the subordinates carrying out the leader's vision without his or her presence and guidance. Even when successful, charismatic supervisors leave their organization vulnerable if they should ever depart, since their successor(s) would probably be incapable of upholding their legacy.

SuperLeadership

"Leading others to lead themselves" is the statement that may best summarize the work of Manz and Sims (1991). These advocates of SuperLeadership contend that a leader's
vision should be capable of motivating followers to look within themselves for direction. In this sense, everyone is capable of "self-leadership" and may be entrusted to carry out the mission by themselves.

From a historical perspective, Manz and Sims (1991) believe that there have been three leader prototypes. The "strong man" probably operated via Theory X methodologies, relying on his (intentionally gender-specific) fortitude and prowess to compel subordinates to obey. A "transactor" gained influence by utilizing a medium of exchange, as desirable rewards were given to employees who are willing to work for them. The "visionary hero" managed to create an awe-inspiring (charismatic) manifesto that is supposed to guide his or her subordinates to the "promised land." In each of these situations, the leader represented the sole source of inspiration and guidance.

The SuperLeader (Manz & Sims, 1991), by contrast, instills confidence in the followers so they can use their own faculties to carry out the master plan. Once enriched, they too become self-leaders, and the power becomes distributed more evenly throughout the organization (much like within the symbiotic ideology). Ultimately, the decision-making process becomes more universal, allowing the followers to enjoy an increased ownership of their efforts.

One becomes a SuperLeader by employing cognitive-behavioral strategies (such as self-reward) that allow them
to learn how to motivate and direct their personal endeavors. These techniques can then be modeled so that the subordinates may practice them, as well. The next step is to encourage active participation in goal setting while maintaining a positive outlook. Soon, self-leadership can be fostered by constructively encouraging followers to set up their own reward system in place of the one that was probably established by a "transactor." Finally, teamwork is promoted as the methodology of choice in order to create a self-leadership culture. The key to successful implementation is a belief that anyone who works is eligible to be taught how to become a self-leader. Manz and Sims (1991) shun the notion that only certain individuals are "born leaders."

While it is probably not the most popular way of thinking, SuperLeadership (Manz & Sims, 1991) seems to provide the most rational arguments for its applicability. In an age where empowerment and participation have become mainstays of many corporate philosophies, why not utilize a strategy that allows individuals to learn how to guide themselves? While unique beings (such as Lee Iacocca) exist who may be capable of single-handedly resuscitating an organization under duress, it seems to make more sense (in the long run) to cultivate a legion of self-starters who are all reasonably capable of providing direction toward
organizational growth. The resulting profits could be exponential by comparison.

Summary

The main distinction between the four theories discussed seems to be what is expected of the leader. At one extreme (Symbiotic and SuperLeadership), superiors are supposed to concede their power to allow everyone to provide direction and claim ownership of their work. At the other end (Symbolic and Charismatic), leaders are portrayed as visionaries who are able to make a day at work seem like a quest for the Holy Grail, while deifying themselves in the process. What all four paradigms seem to have in common is a positive view of the workforce's competency. Even the charismatic leadership profile contains the follower belief of "empowerment," despite the apparent segregation from the role model. Ultimately, then, the Theory Y dynamic seems to typify modern approaches to leadership, despite the distinctive discrepancies. Figure 1 provides a comparison of the discussion up to this point.
Figure 1
Comparison of Leadership Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Symbiotic</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
<th>Charismatic</th>
<th>Super</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>Embellishment</td>
<td>Inspiration</td>
<td>Self-Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impetus</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Perspective-taking</td>
<td>Psychic distress</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader's role</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>Catalyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower's job</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
<td>Acquire a soul</td>
<td>Become inspired</td>
<td>Do it yourself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the diagram indicates, four critical facets seem to be involved in the different leadership styles. The first is the goal, or the expected result if the theory is carried out to the letter. The goal is probably the single most important variable, since it provides direction for those who apply the strategy. Symbiotic leadership, for example, asks management and labor to construct a mutually beneficial reward system that enables them to literally "feed off" of one another, so the term "reciprocity" seems to best capture that relationship. Impetus refers to the driving force that makes the paradigm happen. In the case of charismatic leadership, psychic distress appears to be the critical feature that enables a supervisor to employ the methodology. An opportunistic executive should seek to prey upon a
chaotic point in the organization's life in order to have the best chance to utilize the transformational tactics.

The leader's role appears to be either active or passive. Symbolic and transformational leadership need someone who can step to the forefront and make the workplace seem larger-than-life. Symbiotic and SuperLeadership, by contrast, ask the leader to step down and acquiesce the authoritative role for the sake of a win-win mentality. Thus, a distinctive dichotomy seems to exist among the four styles.

The expectations of the followers are vital to the four concepts. No matter what philosophy a leader uses, certain behaviors need to be specifically designed to evince the appropriate response from the subordinates. In SuperLeadership, followers need to be stimulated to discover their own self-leadership. This transition might entail a great degree of modeling and maintenance, or it may only require a small push before the empowered workforce embraces their new roles. In all four scenarios, the expectations of the followers must be satisfied if the strategy is to succeed at all.

A great deal of literature exists on what constitutes the appropriate leadership style for a corporate world that is gradually adopting leaner, flatter, team-oriented structures. While most contemporary theorists agree that workers can be motivated without punishment or coercion, a
discrepancy seems evident over the supervisor’s degree of involvement. The leader-follower relationship is also the focus of the second half of this discussion.

**Leadership Models**

Just as McGregor was pertinent to the discussion on leadership styles, it would be remiss not to mention the pioneering work of Fiedler (1967) with respect to this section. Fiedler’s contingency model for leader effectiveness basically states that three group-situational factors are responsible for determining whether or not a certain type of leadership is suitable for a given circumstance. “Position power” refers to the fact that a particular title alone may possess a degree of authority, regardless of who has the job. “Task structure” means an affinity for rules and regulations, and the extent to which they are enforced. The “interpersonal relationship” between superior and subordinates constitutes the third factor; A scenario epitomized by this dimension probably would include a leader who operated via the human resource frame (cf. Symbolic Leadership). As it turns out, the structure and relationship variables will seem omnipresent within the various models that will be reviewed.

**The Managerial Grid**

Over the years, a controversy has brewed over whether contingency theorists (such as Fiedler) or “one best style” advocates best describe the most appropriate forms of
leadership. Blake and Mouton (1978) would have you believe that the latter form of management is the most successful strategy. According to the Managerial Grid, two axes, labeled "concern for people" and "concern for production" form interactive coordinates (plotted on a scale from one to nine) that may define a given approach to leadership. A (9,1) leader, who is completely focused on production, is usually the autocratic sort, with a steadfast task orientation and little concern for human welfare. The other extreme, a (1,9) score, is referred to as the "country club manager," as they prefer to pamper their employees in lieu of "cracking the whip."

Blake and Mouton contend that the (9,9), or "team management" moniker, is the most applicable style for any situation. As they explain it, "(9,9) leadership involves achieving production through a high degree of shared responsibility, coupled with high participation, involvement, and commitment--hallmarks of teamwork" (1982, p.42). Their rationale for making this statement lies in "behavior science principles," which include candor, synergy, and mutual support, that are capable of being consistently applied to any situation.

The combination of those two dimensions would be impossible in Fiedler's (1967) model. His premise was that one could only be either task or relationship-oriented, but not both at the same time. Despite the divergence in
philosophy, both Fiedler and Blake and Mouton utilize similar dimensions. The "task structure" label is probably analogous to the "concern for production" concept, and the "interpersonal relationship" measure could be thought of as "concern for people." At any rate, the debate over their application has been furthered by the authors of the next model.

**Situational Leadership Theory**

More consistent with Fiedler's contingency principles is the work of Hersey and Blanchard (1982a). Several factors, such as guidance and support, help dictate the appurtenant prescription for leader behavior, but the most important determinant seems to be maturity, or the "readiness level" of the subordinates on a work team. Consequently, Situational Leadership Theory, or SLT, ascribes four different leadership styles (S1-S4) to four corresponding readiness levels (R1-R4). The Hersey and Blanchard model essentially resembles a bell curve that passes through four counterclockwise quadrants so that the fourth stage is closest to the origin. Almost as expected, the two axes are labeled "task" and "relationship."

Maturity levels are characterized by a combination of either high or low task (structure) and relationship (consideration) values. Thus, R1, or low subordinate readiness, requires "telling" behavior, and entails high structure and low consideration, since the leader is
primarily instructing an inexperienced and naïve group of subordinates. The second level, R2, is associated with a "selling" mentality, or high structure and consideration. "Participating" behavior, or low structure and high consideration, is appropriate for R3, and finally, a "delegating" mindset, or low structure and low consideration should be maintained at R4, leaving the workers to function on their own.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982b) justify their position by explaining that SLT is relative to overt behavior, while the Managerial Grid is rooted in cognition. By their rationale, "Situational Leadership describes how people behave, while the Managerial Grid appears to describe attitudes or predispositions toward production and people" (p. 50). They eschew the analogy made by Blake and Mouton (1982) between the two models, explaining that R4 (low structure and consideration), or "delegating" behavior should not be likened to the (1,1), or "impoverished" manager. Confident, capable followers should be empowered to regulate their own work and entrusted to carry it out without the concern and maintenance expected of the (9,9) leader. Hersey and Blanchard concede that the Managerial Grid is a useful training device, but aver that leaders may improve their effectiveness, if they learn to tailor their behavior to the demands of the specific state of affairs.
Power-Based Leadership

As we progress into an era where up to 40% of the work force may be involved with self-directed work teams (Verespej, 1990), leadership styles will probably adapt to this progression in order to accommodate the changing corporate flow chart. Whether that scenario requires a consistent (9,9), or a dynamic (SLT) perspective remains to be seen; What is significant is that the focus will change to a “team” orientation, and certain leadership guidelines are likely to accommodate this phenomenon. Accordingly, Stewart and Manz (1995) seem to integrate tenets from the previous models into their own paradigm, which is based on how the leader’s position power is applied to the subordinates.

With this particular model, we once again see a two-dimensional grid, but the labels are somewhat different from the “traditional” combination. Structure has been replaced by “power orientation,” which is either autocratic or democratic. Meanwhile, consideration gives way to “leader involvement,” rated as either passive or active. Whereas high consideration generally translates into a concern for well-being, active leader involvement does not always have a positive connotation.

Autocratic power orientation and active leader involvement creates what Stewart and Manz (1995) refer to as “overpowering” leadership, since it “often overwhelms team
autonomy" (p. 752). If a self-managing team were to have a despotic leader, it would be difficult to imagine them being truly empowered, as they would often be forced to comply with the demands of the leader. This perspective is probably akin to the (9,1) designation on the Managerial Grid, which is best suited for military settings. Traditionally, units in the armed forces have been quite different from self-managed teams, since they are normally encouraged to conform and to adhere to strict regulations. SDWT’s, on the other hand, should be expected to be subsistent, with only occasional coaching and facilitation from their supervisor. Still, the overpowering style may be useful, to a limited degree, in the S1, or "telling" stage, of SLT. During this early phase of maturity, the team members are new to the system and may be in need of a modicum of direction.

"Powerless" leadership is the result of an autocratic, passive style. Typically cited as "laissez-faire," supervisors in this instance prefer to allow the followers to do their own work, but occasionally step in to issue new decrees and to deliver punishment. Ultimately, a team would have difficulty functioning under this type of management, as its members would constantly be frustrated and unable to relate to their supervisor. The impoverished (1,1) score on the Managerial Grid probably provides the best analogy for this description. A leader without capability does not have a feel for the workers' needs, and may only dictate policy
on a limited basis, if at all. SLT, on the other hand, does not really account for this style, unless an S4 (delegating) leader was doing a really poor job! Be that as it may, Hersey and Blanchard (1982b) have pointed out that such a comparison is inappropriate in this case.

The combination of active involvement and a democratic power orientation causes "power-building" leadership. Individuals who employ this technique contribute to the growth and productivity of self-managed teams. Still, these work groups will probably never realize their potential for self-guidance until the leader "loosens the reins."

Similarly, the "selling (R2)" level of SLT has the supervisor undertaking a hands-on, high consideration approach until the team reaches a later stage of maturity. The Managerial Grid, however, would probably associate their "team management" style with power-building characteristics. Clearly, this particular area is characterized by dissonance among the competing theorists. Perhaps the distinction between behavior and attitude proposed before explains some of the discrepancy, but this quadrant still seems quite comparable to the "one best way" mentality.

Stewart and Manz (1995) conclude that "empowered (democratic and passive)" leadership legitimately allows a team to realize its potential, resulting in the "most significant long-term improvements in quality, productivity, and employee morale" (p. 755). The authors believe that any
form of active leadership inhibits a team's chance for success. Thus, a supervisor's involvement should wane as the team becomes increasingly capable of sustaining itself. SLT echoes this sentiment in the S4 (delegating) stage. At this level, the team has reached its peak maturity, and should be left to self-regulation when possible. Once again, though, the Managerial Grid seems to disagree, as the (9,1) archetype seems to best mirror the "empowered leadership" definition. Blake and Mouton suggest that the "country club" manager is best suited for "people-oriented" work situations that are not subject to close scrutiny. This description, in its own way, is similar to the independence enjoyed by a self-directed work team, even though the style is not the one recommended by the "one best way" theorists.

In actuality, no simple method for overlapping the three models seems to exist. If we simply transposed them on one another, impoverished leadership would be comparable to the S4 stage of situational theory, since both would be located in the lower left-hand corner. Certainly, this is not the case. Instead, what is interesting to note is the apparent "ideal" projected by the three schools of thought. Blake and Mouton contend that high structure and consideration are necessary at all times, while Hersey and Blanchard feel that the two factors vary with respect to maturity level. Stewart and Manz admit that power-building tactics can be beneficial, but claim that empowered
leadership is necessary for a team's potential to truly be realized. Clearly, the right answer to this dilemma is a subject that is still open to diverse viewpoints and extensive research.

**The LeaderPlex Model**

A more contemporary view of leadership has been proposed by Hooijberg, Hunt, and Dodge (1997). The writers point out that today's supervisor is subject to so much external stimuli that a simple "contingency" approach is inappropriate for satisfying the myriad number of simultaneous demands. Overseas impact, leaner production units, and workforce diversity constitute mere examples of the factors that influence a given decision. Thus, the LeaderPlex Model offers a "holistic" approach, which not only concerns itself with what behaviors leaders make use of, but how they actually go about structuring their decision-making schemata.

On the surface, the model's design appears rather simplified. "Leader effectiveness" (which points to "organizational effectiveness") is influenced by two factors, "behavioral repertoire," and "behavioral differentiation." The two behavioral components, in turn, are affected by both cognitive and social factors (differentiation and integration). The model resembles a flow chart, with unidirectional arrows all eventually pointing the way to the "leader effectiveness" bubble.
The cognitive and social variables seem to be post-modern revisions of structure and consideration, respectively. "Cognitive complexity" is the blanket term that refers to one's ability to organize (structure) their environment. This concept is much like the idea of "frames," which was discussed earlier in the symbolic leadership section. In essence, people who are cognitively complex are able to translate information into several different perspectives (differentiation) while maintaining their train of thought (integration) and may therefore adapt better to a turbulent organizational climate. Another important factor, "cognitive capacity," deals with one's ability to manipulate and utilize information (Jaques, 1989). By applying the best-suited combination of cognitive styles and aspects, it has been posited that leaders may cultivate teams that are capable of realizing their potential, since that individual is better able to balance the various assets and liabilities of the work unit (Shroder in Streufert & Nogami, 1989). By dividing complexity into differentiation and integration, the LeaderPlex Model is able to emphasize their distinctive influences and show that they are both mediated by the behavioral components.

"Social complexity," conversely, has been defined as "the managerial leader's capacity to differentiate the personal and relational aspects of a social situation and integrate them in a manner that results in increased
understanding" (Hooijberg, Hunt & Dodge, 1997, p. 382). This explanation seems to be an extension of the ubiquitous "consideration" variable in the previous models. The authors acknowledge the need for leaders to possess skills such as guidance and understanding, but assert that such qualities need to be tactfully applied to their surroundings in order for them to be effective. Consequently, "social differentiation" is applied when leaders are able to monitor the various emotions involved in a social setting (Saloney & Mayer, 1990) while maintaining an independent value system (Linville, 1985). "Social integration," meanwhile, involves the amalgamation of the social factors to create order and meaning. Like the cognitive variables, these two qualities are also reconciled by behavioral means.

"Behavioral complexity," then, seems to be at the hub of the LeaderPlex model. Since both cognitive and social influences affect what a leader ultimately does, Hooijberg, Hunt, and Dodge (1997) argue that contingency models are inadequate for predicting specific courses of action. Furthermore, leaders today are forced to cater to the needs of followers other than subordinates, and to "stakeholders other than followers" (p. 387), including both lateral and upward personnel. This notion further confounds the purely behavioral methodologies, because contemporary managers have too many role expectations for one predominant technique to be effective at all times. They are constantly forced to dip
into their "behavioral repertoire" in order to come up with the appropriate presentation for a given scenario. Having more roles available at their disposal can make them more effective (Quinn, Spencer & Hart, 1991), which in turn may improve the organization as a whole (Hart & Quinn, 1993; House, 1988). Likewise, "behavioral differentiation" involves tailoring one's repertoire to the various situations. Since managers are compelled to simultaneously meet the expectations of subordinates, equals, and superiors, they need to be able to adapt to the demands of these distinctive interactions. This idea is comparable to the tenets of the contingency theories, but it is more dynamic, because it takes into account all of the occurring interactions, as they take place in concert with followers, with the organization, and even with the community as a whole (Osborn, Hunt & Jauch, 1980).

The specific interactions between the three main headings (Behavioral, Cognitive, and Social) are too numerous to list in detail, but suffice to say that in general, the directionality of the model implies positive influences. For example, cognitive differentiation promotes cognitive integration, which subsequently benefits behavioral repertoire. Moreover, various additive combinations (such as high cognitive integration with a large behavioral repertoire) produce effects that appear greater than the "value" of the individual factors. In the
end, the authors reinforce the ongoing idea that "leader effectiveness has a positive impact on organizational effectiveness" (p. 398), but it is their synergistic approach that distinguishes the LeaderPlex paradigm from those previously discussed. A comparison of the four models is depicted in figure 2:

Figure 2
Comparison of Leadership Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Theory</th>
<th>Managerial Grid</th>
<th>SLT</th>
<th>Power-based</th>
<th>LeaderPlex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining Factor</td>
<td>Maximization</td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>Use of Power</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2 X 2</td>
<td>2 X 2</td>
<td>2 X 2</td>
<td>Multifaceted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader's Goal</td>
<td>Combine aspects</td>
<td>Tailor behavior</td>
<td>Empower</td>
<td>Adapt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

As in Figure 1, the second illustration points out the comparisons that might be gleaned from the second half of the discussion. The "type of theory" may be the crux of the synopses, since all four propositions seem to have a distinctive view concerning what constitutes the best form of team leadership. The only exception might be power-based theory, which basically states that empowered leadership is the most apropos, but also endorses the value of "power-building" strategies.

"Determining factor" refers to the concept around which the model is formulated. The highest (9,9) levels of both
structure and consideration comprise the "team management" style in the Managerial Grid, so the term "maximization" seems to best capture that premise. LeaderPlex theory, by contrast, is rooted in "complexity," due to the great variety of influences involved.

The 2 X 2 design is a common format for a countless number of models in social science literature. The LeaderPlex model breaks from this pattern, indicative of the dynamic structure that may be inherent to modern leadership. Perhaps a two-dimensional theory might be acceptable for explaining the bureaucratic, tightly wound managerial style of the 70's and 80's, but contemporary leaders are probably faced with more relationships and greater accountability than the "classic" models can identify. Hence, a "multifaceted," flow-chart diagram seems more capable of accounting for that diversity.

Similarly, the goal of the leader in each of the theories seems to have evolved over time. The era of singular strategies for most situations has probably run its course; Instead, we find multiple roles that are necessary in order to satisfy the needs of a given set of circumstances. Power-based theory is still relevant, since it tells us that empowering a team should yield the best results; the LeaderPlex model operates on a more intricate level, focusing on the diverse categories that all appear to
contribute to the current managerial decision-making process.

Measuring leader effectiveness

While a great deal of theories and conceptualizations exist on what contributes to a leader's success, comparatively little has been done to test many of their contentions. Certainly, research has been undertaken that utilizes the well-established works of McGregor (e.g., Neuliep, 1987) and Fiedler (e.g., Bird, 1979), but understandably, not as much has been published that incorporates the more recent writings. As a result, the need clearly exists for efforts that expound upon the current theories of team leadership, since they maintain a perspective that is probably essential in order to achieve desirable results in the modern workplace (Larson & LaFasto, 1989).

Accordingly, "congruence" seems to be the prevailing factor. Yukl (1971) explained that this phenomenon occurs when the subordinates' preferred behaviors are demonstrated by the leader. Assuming that the notion still holds true today, members of teams should desire leaders that are facilitative, empowering, and capable of any other appropriate actions that contribute to the work unit's success.

Additionally, Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory (Graen & Scandura, 1987) tells us that each relationship
between a manager and his or her (immediate) followers is unique. Consequently, an individual on a team may have an opinion on the leader's style that differs from the rest. LMX relationships that are characterized as "high quality" will result in interactions that go above and beyond mere formalities. That sort of mutual respect is almost necessary in the present age, given the solidarity expected of a high-functioning work team.

Thus, when attempting to assay leadership style and team effectiveness, it seems fitting that individuals' perceptions should be utilized, since their relationships with the leader may differ greatly from one another. It appears conceivable, then, that members of the same team might have a different opinion on whether or not congruence actually exists within that particular group, which further emphasizes the necessity for studying their personal accounts separately. Furthermore, it has been shown that the followers' observations of leader behavior are better at determining the need for performance improvement than those of either superiors or of the leaders themselves (Wilson, O'Hare & Shipper, 1990). Thus, subordinate evaluations are not only distinctive, they also are probably capable of providing the most useful data in this particular context.

Purpose

The intent of this particular study has two facets: (a) to determine if members of work teams can concur on the fact
that they are receiving a singular leadership style, and (b) to determine if a perceived style can translate into successful or unsuccessful dimensions of team performance. Within the context of this study, "style" refers to the various tactics utilized by leaders in their interactions with their subordinates. The Stewart & Manz (1995) model will constitute the basic framework for the data, but that does not mean that certain elements from the other methodologies cannot be integrated as well. For instance, a team leader's style might be perceived as "power-building," but he or she may implement various strategies such as enhancing his or her image (House, 1977), modeling self-leadership (Manz & Sims, 1991), or creating mythical interpretations of everyday situations (Bolman & Deal, 1992). Thus, both style and tactics will be examined in order to determine what might be indicative of perceived effectiveness.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested:

(H1) Interview statements made by team members that describe their leader can be classified as being indicative of one of the four leadership styles in the Stewart and Manz (1995) model;

(a) Perceptions of team leaders will differ, based on whether that person was elected or appointed;
(b) A greater proportion of a team's members will perceive the internal leader's style as "empowered" if they elected that person.

(H2) Perceiving that a certain leadership style exists will impact how a team member views the performance levels of his or her work unit. In this particular study, ten different "Perceptions of Team Performance (PTP)" dimensions (which will be detailed shortly) will be matched with four different leadership styles (cf. Stewart & Manz, 1995) by using scoring means to determine which styles are capable of generating perceived effectiveness within the ten categories. Accordingly, team members who believe that their leader has an "empowered" style should generate the highest overall ratings.

(a) According to Leader-Member Exchange theory (Graen & Scandura, 1987), individuals on a team will not agree (via chi-square analysis) on the particular style of leadership they are receiving, since they each have a unique interaction with the team leader. If this scenario holds true, individual leadership perceptions will be correlated with performance dimensions to create collective ratings of each leadership style.

(b) If a predominant style is evident on the team, that aggregate style can be correlated to team means on the PTP data to determine effectiveness of that style for that team. Consequently, perceived "empowered"
leadership will result in higher PTP means at the "team" level.

(H3) Despite employing similar styles, leaders may use various "tools" in order to create the work atmosphere that their subordinates perceive. Behaviorally complex leaders (Hooijberg, Hunt & Dodge, 1997) have a greater repertoire of roles to choose from and are thus able to utilize more of the aforementioned strategies to achieve their goals. By appropriately applying a diverse number of these tactics (as identified within interview statements), leaders should be able to elicit higher ratings of effectiveness from their subordinates.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

The data collected for this analysis came from a multisite study on technical and professional teams conducted by students and professors at the University of North Texas. These work units were generally thought of as white-collar workers in both technical (e.g., engineering, R & D) and professional (e.g., human resources, legal) who required at least a Bachelor's degree for their position. The researchers were interested in developing an understanding of effective team leadership, since it was postulated that teams often fail as a result of liabilities in that area. Furthermore, the investigators wanted to combine methodologies afforded by the computer science, industrial/organizational (I/O) psychology, management, engineering, and anthropology departments in order to broaden their perspective on the subject. The diversity of the contributing departments enabled the researchers to obtain their data using a bona fide "clean slate" that was capable of being analyzed by a multitude of paradigms.

Participants

The intent of the inquiry was to utilize "knowledge" workers whose need for an interactive situation went beyond
that of a simple "assembly line" approach. Manufacturing teams have the advantage of a clear-cut task that revolves around production data that can be quickly ascertained and evaluated; Technical/professional teams, on the other hand, are generally characterized by roles that are not as clearly defined. Their tasks tend to be more dynamic in nature, so constructs such as success, leadership, and effectiveness are considerably more difficult to delineate, and thus require the attention and emphasis that this sort of study could provide.

The study was conducted at nine different companies, generally in either industrial or technological settings. Funding was established via a grant from the National Science Foundation (grant #SBR-9422368 in the new "Transformation to Quality Organizations" program), and the study that began in 1995 is still continuing at the time of this writing. Researchers included 12 graduate students and nine professors at the university, spanning 5 departments over the life of the project.

Data Acquisition

Interviews. The qualitative data was collected using "anthropological" style interviewing, which utilizes a structured set of questions that is intended to provoke open-ended responses. Representatives were instructed to follow up on the subjects' dialogue by employing rhetoric that would prompt them to "ramble." Interviews were tape
recorded so that they could be transcribed and stored on AFTER, a software program that enables users to affix search terms and codes to selected words and phrases. Follow-up interviews were conducted on a longitudinal basis in order to obtain updates on changes that occur on either the team being studied or within the organization as a whole. An example of the interviews utilized appears in Appendix A.

**Surveys.** Quantitative data, on the other hand, came from various survey instruments that were introduced at different points in time during the study. Their content varied from demographic to behavioral measures, but the measurements of particular interest came from the "Perceptions of Team Performance (PTP)" survey, which was designed by Dr. Michael Beyerlein at the university and Sue Freedman of Texas Instruments. Basically, the inquiry asks subjects to rate how well their team performs in ten different areas on a scale of zero to 100 percent. The intent of this instrument is to obtain candid responses that can allow researchers to identify specific strengths and weaknesses of team output. A list of the dimensions pertinent to this study is also presented in Appendix A.

**Procedure**

**Interviews.** The exact line of questioning and the specific handouts varied with respect to when the research site was introduced into the study and how long the site had been an affiliate, but the basic process remained the same.
First, participants were asked to sign consent forms, and their anonymity was protected by coding that was only known to the researchers; interview tapes were identified solely by code numbers. Next, the interviews were tape recorded with the interviewee’s permission so that the discussion would not be impeded by handwriting every statement. "Leading" questions, such as those depicted in Appendix A were read to the interviewee in order to prompt conversation. From that point, the course of the interview was determined by how talkative the participant was and the ideas generated by the initial question. Pre-written questions were merely used as a guide for the interview; the actual conversations that took place were quite variegated, and ranged in duration from about 30 to 120 minutes. After the interview, the tapes were quickly coded and returned to the university. Secondary interviews were utilized to a lesser extent, but still were capable of providing insight via in-depth questioning.

The interviews were then transcribed on AFTER software, a program that is similar to a word processor that allows one to apply codes to relevant sections of data. A full list of the codes is presented in Appendix B, but suffice to say that the sections of text that are relevant to this study were marked with the "leader" designation. Subsequently, those statements were further broken down into segments that could be classified as either indicative of one of the
power-based leadership styles (Stewart & Manz, 1995, using the criteria outlined in Appendix C), or as evidence that one of the leadership "tools" (see Appendix D) was being employed.

Surveys. Surveys were generally distributed at about the same time as the interview. Participants were not supervised while filling the forms out, but were assured that the information obtained would be kept confidential via the same coding that was utilized for the interview. The subjects were unaware of their own code, so the surveys were either returned to the visiting researcher or mailed directly to the university for designation. Generally, 4 or 5 surveys were given to each participant (including the Perceptions of Team Performance), with the notation that no one had to disclose any information that made them "uncomfortable."

Feedback. Feedback will be given to the participating companies on a team-by-team basis only if a certain percentage of members participate, so organizations with minimal activity will only receive generalized findings. For purposes of this particular study, names and research sites will not be revealed.

Data Analysis

The interview data has a specific set of questions that deal with leadership. When leadership or management-oriented dialogue occurs, the discussion was coded as "LEADER" using
the AFTER software. In the end, marked statements were compiled, read, and coded as indicative of either a power-based leadership style (Stewart & Manz, 1995), or as the perceived use of a leadership tool (see Appendix D) where relevant. Examples of statements that have been coded for these criteria appear in Appendices D and E.

The second part of the study involves team member agreement. If enough participants on the same work group generate statements that are indicative of a particular leadership style, a chi-square computation will be performed on that data to determine if a specific style is evident on a particular team. By “expecting” an equal distribution of leadership style perceptions, it can be determined whether or not a statistical consensus exists.

Since each team member may have a unique interaction with the external (supervisory) leader (Graen & Scandura, 1987), the initial expectation is that a consensus will not exist. In that case, the power-based style (Stewart & Manz, 1995) perceived by each individual will be compared with the PTP via the student’s t-test (using mean PTP ratings) in order to determine which style is associated with significantly positive (or negative) results. If team agreement does exist, the aggregate style will be weighted against team means on the same data to determine the relationship between that style and the work unit as a whole. Finally, evidence of any leadership tools will also
be analyzed to determine if a significant relationship or interaction is feasible as a result of using those strategies.

Limitations of the Data

The use of data in this study is privy to several possible setbacks. First of all, a list of statements has to be obtained that is capable of suggesting specific leadership styles. Furthermore, changes were made to the structured interview format during the course of the study, so the interviewee’s preliminary responses will vary. Additionally, using multiple researchers will create some inconsistencies in the interview styles, because of their loosely-structured nature. As a result, there is no way to predict what direction a conversation will take, and consequently, no guarantee that leadership style will ever be mentioned in the interview. Finally, while the PTP underwent two revisions, the actual set of questions that will be analyzed remained the same. Still, not every participant completed and returned the survey, and those who did sometimes withheld their name because they felt that the information was too sensitive. Consequently, the actual number of subjects that produce data that will satisfy all of the aforementioned criteria (both relevant leadership statements and useable PTP scores) will probably be a low percentage of the total number of participants. Still, the research has generated a large, diverse database that should
yield an acceptable amount of "quality" data, despite the truncation.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Overall, the amount of useable data acquired was far below expectations. Anonymously-filled surveys, inappropriate interview statements, and the lack of fortuitous matches between the two sets of data conspired to make the content of this section somewhat limited. Still, the salvageable information did provide significant results that are worthy of both study and speculation.

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis was tested by examining all of the interview text that was coded as "LEADER" in the records stored on AFTER software. The program is able to print out a complete list of those excerpts, which totaled about 450 pages of statements. As predicted, the interviews did produce some relevant dialogue, both for the leadership style and the leadership tools criteria. Unfortunately, the paucity of individuals who both completed the PTP form and wrote their name on it did not correspond very well with those who produced the appropriate commentary. Even so, the pairings that did exist were able to provide some insight into this inquiry.
To test the notion that teams with elected leadership would rate their teams higher than those with appointed leadership, a single organization that had one team with elected leadership had its PTP scores compared with those for the rest of the company (five teams with appointed leadership) using the student's t-test. The results of the comparison are shown in tables 1 and 2, and figure 3.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Appointed and Elected Team Members' PTP ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTP Dimension</th>
<th>Appointed Team Leadership</th>
<th>Elected Team Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling costs</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>79.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting goals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>81.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle time</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating quality products</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>32.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased capacity</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of expertise in the group</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying customers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>83.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing quality service to customers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to customer needs</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>87.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>87.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3
Mean PTP Ratings for Elected and Appointed Leadership Teams
Table 2

T-test Values and Probability levels for Significant Disparities between Appointed and Elected Leadership Team Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTP Dimension</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting goals</td>
<td>0.4790</td>
<td>0.0531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0.4774</td>
<td>0.0571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of expertise in the group</td>
<td>0.4795</td>
<td>0.0517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying customers</td>
<td>0.4805</td>
<td>0.0490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing quality service to customers</td>
<td>0.4824</td>
<td>0.0444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to customer needs</td>
<td>0.4812</td>
<td>0.0476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Table 1 and Figure 3 show a comparison of mean scores for each of the ten PTP categories for the one team with elected leadership versus the four teams with appointed leadership. The relevant significance levels for those discrepancies can be found in Table 2. As indicated, the statistically relevant gaps can be found in the categories meeting goals, innovation, use of expertise in the group, satisfying customers, providing quality service to customers, and responding to customer needs, with “appointed” teams providing the higher mean ratings in each scenario. Oddly enough, the significant disparities occurred in the opposite of the predicted direction.

With regard to leadership style, the team with elected leadership did not produce any pertinent statements, so the second
part of the hypothesis could not be assessed for this case. In fact, the total number of individuals who both made statements indicative of perceived "empowered" leadership style and completed a useable PTP form was so small (three) that the second sub-component of the hypothesis could not be tested at all.

**Hypothesis 2**

Like the first hypothesis, the second set of contentions suffered a similar fate due to the lack of useable data. When weighing individuals who contributed both codeable statements and a completed PTP survey against those who handed in a survey but did not produce applicable statements, the disparity was so large (about thirtyfold) that a formal analysis for those two data sets probably would not be worthwhile. Boneau (1960) in a classic study of unequal sample sizes found significant variability between the actual and the predicted probability levels. Howell (1992) adds that "the difficulty we face when we have unequal sample sizes is that in this case, the row, column, and interaction effects are no longer independent. The lack of independence produces some difficulty in interpretation" (p.410). Even if the data could be adjusted by some correction factor, the calculated probability for a meaningful relationship between the two sets of data could potentially be either inaccurate, contaminated, or both. Accordingly, it may only be feasible to look at general trends with respect to those comparisons (figures 4-7):
Figure 4
Mean Overpowering Leadership Ratings vs. All Others
Figure 5
Mean Powerless Leadership Ratings vs. All Others
Figure 6
Mean Power-Building Leadership Ratings vs. All Others
Figure 7
Mean Empowered Leadership Ratings vs. All Others
While statistical significance cannot be determined, one can still point to the fact that ratings given by the individuals who made statements indicative of both overpowering and powerless leadership are generally lower than those given by the rest of the population, while those who made statements indicative of empowered leadership show mean scores that do not appear higher than the rest of the sample.

On the other hand, the individuals that both produced codeable statements and had useable test scores did fall into groups of similar size, so a t-test was performed on the ratings for each of the four subgroups. Both Figure 9 and Table 3 contain a comparison of mean scores for each of the leadership styles, while Table 4 reveals which comparisons yielded a significant t-test result. Generally speaking, the individuals in the overpowering leadership group rated their teams the lowest, while the highest ratings for each category belonged to individuals in either the power-building or the empowered leadership group, as the diagrams indicate.

Determining whether or not a particular team gave statements consistent with a single leadership style was not feasible, given the lack of codeable dialogue for that task. Thus, chi-square analyses could not be performed on the data to determine whether or not a consensus exists. Still, that part of the hypothesis does appear testable, given a large enough data set, and should be the topic of future research.
Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for Team Members’ PTP Ratings with Respect to the Four Leadership Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTP Dimension</th>
<th>OverPowering Leadership</th>
<th>Powerless Leadership</th>
<th>Power-Building Leadership</th>
<th>Empowered Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling costs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.80</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting goals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42.20</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating quality products</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58.60</td>
<td>44.94</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.80</td>
<td>37.29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased capacity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>36.85</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of expertise in the group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51.60</td>
<td>32.56</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying customers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>39.16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing quality service to customers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59.20</td>
<td>39.16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to customer needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>36.51</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9
The Four Leadership Styles
Table 4

T-test Values and Probability levels for Significant Disparities among the Team Members' PTP Ratings under the Four Leadership Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowered Leadership greater than Overpowering Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTP Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing quality service to customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to customer needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power-Building Leadership greater than Overpowering Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTP Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating quality products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of expertise in the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying customers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowered Leadership greater than Power-Building Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTP Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 3**

The third hypothesis was concerned with the leadership "tools" that are cited in Charismatic Leadership (Behling & McFillen, 1996), SuperLeadership (Manz & Sims, 1991), and LeaderPlex theory. Given the lack of useable data for the second hypothesis, it should come as no surprise that the pertinent data needed to test the effectiveness of
leadership tools was insufficient. Still, elements of the three theories were found within the dialogue, and they should be thought of as an indication that research on the topic can be pursued. A complete list of the tools and their prevalence are cited in Appendix C.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The depth of the results that were generated by this study was largely dependent on two factors: codeable interview statements and filled-out surveys. Most of the study’s participants spent time discussing their team supervisor, corporate management, or the concept of leadership in general during their interview. Often times, these statements contained information that seemed indicative of either a leadership style (Stewart & Manz, 1995) or a leadership tool (Manz & Sims, 1991; Behling & McFillen, 1996; Hooijberg, Hunt & Dodge, 1997) that was being utilized at their workplace. The idea of this study was to determine if the presence of one of those elements impacted a person’s perception of their team’s efficacy in certain areas.

The second construct was to be established by surveys that had been completed by the same individuals who had provided the relevant interview data. In a perfect world, every single participant would speak plainly on the topic at hand, and they would cheerfully return their completed forms with their names clearly printed at the top. Reality,
though, provided circumstances that would not allow this research utopia to exist.

First of all, this study was designed as a divergent approach to data that had been collected for other purposes, so the leadership rhetoric was not guaranteed to satisfy the intent of this particular focus. Participants' commentary was based on a quasi-structured interview that happened to include leadership as one of its topics. The pertinent data was only gleaned when the conversation happened to take the desired course.

Secondly, rating one's own team must have been such a sensitive issue to some of the participants that they were unwilling to leave their name on the PTP form, even after they were assured of confidentiality. Thus, a study that produced a relatively low turnout of completed surveys was set back even further by several occurrences of anonymity. In the end, some of the handwriting needed to be matched in order to expand the sample size.

Finally, and perhaps most important, was the lack of consistency within the overall research effort. For instance, the series of interview questions changed several times during the study, perhaps curtailing opportunities to uncover appropriate dialogue. Also, the PTP was revised several times, limiting analysis to the first ten questions, which were never altered. Lastly, the overall research was conducted by several representatives, which led to different
interview styles, varied rapport with participating firms, and inconsistent methods of data acquisition. In some cases, the representative would only stay at the research site for two weeks, which was just long enough to conduct interviews and leave surveys behind to be mailed back. In another circumstance, the representative was present on an internship and had more time to establish a working relationship with the subjects. In the end, though, despite the array of limitations, this study was able to produce some significant results that are worthy of commentary.

Elected vs. Appointed Leadership

The case study on elected team leadership revealed some significant differences in mean ratings, but in the opposite direction as predicted. The specific categories that produced these discrepancies included customer service (PTP 8-10), core competencies (PTP 5 & 7), and getting the work done (PTP 2). Thus, the team with elected leadership gave lower ratings on three distinct phases of operation, an indication that their group was probably less effective overall than the rest of the participating groups in the organization.

Indeed, the team with elected leadership might be inferior to the other teams in the organization, but selecting teams exclusively from one company allows the study to control for varying external factors such as organizational climate, type of industry, and structure of
the control groups. As an example, all of the "appointed" leadership came from the direct supervisor, rather than from a facilitator or a "team coordinator" with limited authority. As a result, it appears that one conclusion from this analysis is that elected leadership, in and of itself, does not seem to confer any advantages in the areas of performance examined.

In fact, the reverse might be true. In this setting, the upper management of the company might have a better feel for what is necessary in key areas, such as customer service, and consequently, they might be able to make better decisions when appointing their team leaders. At the same time, the competency level of the upper-tier employees might be higher due to a lack of empowerment of the subservient team members. If the latter scenario holds true, one might deduce that working towards "empowered" team leadership (Stewart & Manz, 1995) is a slow, evolving process that requires substantial support in the areas of training, development, and transfer of power.

Comparison of Leadership Styles

In general, the contrast of the four leadership styles with the rest of the test-taking sample (figures 4-7) revealed generally lower scores for both overpowering and powerless leadership, but no particular trends for either power-building or empowered leadership. In this context, it appears that what might fuel team effectiveness is not the
presence of democratic leadership, but rather the absence of an autocratic culture. Within the constraints of the Stewart and Manz (1995) model, it appears that the first two styles may have a sort of "negative reinforcement" effect: Democratic behavior may not enhance team performance, but autocratic strategies could conceivably make things worse.

A more direct comparison within the model's framework revealed legitimate disparities within the data. The strongest probability rating was found for the difference between empowered versus overpowered team members in meeting goals. Perhaps the truly "self-led" teams are more pragmatic in creating guidelines and boundaries that they can operate within. Overpowered teams, on the other hand, may be ruled by unrealistic expectations and might even "rebel" against the system, which may lead to the inhibited performance levels shown in figure 4. The empowered leadership style also had advantages relative to overpowering leadership in the areas of "providing quality service to customers" and "responding to customer needs." In this case, customer service probably is superior under an "empowered" regime due to both an increased awareness of what the customer really wants and the increased adaptability and efficiency that results from a self-led team in more direct contact with the customer. Conversely, resentment and rebellion might be prevalent among overpowered team members, and they might channel these feelings into turning out inferior products.
Response time may also be delayed, as clients are forced to go through extra "red tape" in order to deal with their day-to-day needs.

Similarly, the power-building leadership style seemed to provide several advantages when applied to overpowering methodologies. In this comparison, the strongest probability rating was found for the "use of expertise in the group" dimension. A possible explanation for this relationship is that active, democratic leaders may be able to not only recognize the inherent strengths of their teams, they might also be capable of encouraging the team members to fully utilize their assets. Similarly, the power-building style may also be conducive to motivating workers to "create quality products," which, in turn, can lead to "satisfied customers." As previously theorized, the overpowering style might cause its recipients to create inferior products through lack of motivation (or rebellion), which would often result in less satisfied customers. Hence, this proposed dichotomy of attitudes may explain the resulting disparity in ratings.

The final discrepancy in scores occurred between power-building and empowered leadership in the category "cycle time," with empowered leadership receiving the higher ratings. This particular finding may lend credibility to the notion that an evolution indeed exists from power-building to empowered teams. It is conceivable that one might expect
the teams with active (overpowering and power-building) leadership to have an accelerated turnaround time, given that they have a supervisor who can crack the whip (or at least give a gentle push) when productivity is falling behind schedule. Instead, the perceptions of these team members are indicative of the idea that mature, empowered teams are best able to complete their work at an efficient, rapid pace. Consequently, while power-building strategies may confer some advantages upon the team, it is the empowered teams that appear best able to achieve bottom-line results.

Leadership Tools

The dearth of useable data prevented a formal analysis of leadership tools as designed in this study. However, the fact that several of these techniques were cited (see Appendix D) among the relevant interview statements may suggest that exploring the relationships between leadership tools and performance ratings should be considered for future research. A lesson that can be taken from the data is that leaders in this study seemed to follow a "LeaderPlex" approach (Hooijberg, Hunt & Dodge, 1997). The dynamic nature of team leadership, coupled with the multitude of demands simultaneously forced on that figurehead may require that individual to employ tactics that allow him or her to comply with the requirements of the position. By being able to think, observe, and act competently with respect to several
areas of responsibility, LeaderPlex theory predicts that the person who possesses those abilities (and their organization) will be more effective. Analysis of the interview statements revealed that management in contemporary organizations might be drifting towards those strategies.

Charismatic/transformational leadership (Behling & McFillen, 1996) may be the casualty of this philosophy. Team leaders are probably too busy satisfying their everyday demands to worry about enhancing their image. Instead, those individuals are more likely to require a workforce that is capable of handling their own areas of responsibility without having to rely on being led to the promised land by a local icon.

On the other hand, SuperLeadership theory (Manz & Sims, 1991) might be too idealistic for team leaders to follow. Certainly, team members want to empower their staff to handle the work, but how many of them have the time or the foresight to develop the proposed culture by vicarious learning techniques? A focus on strategic planning and interpersonal differences might make it difficult for team leadership to ascend to the "higher level" at which this theory seems to operate.

Limitations of the Data

The data for this study came from a much larger project that was not constructed with this particular analysis in
mind. That reason alone should help explain why the amount of applicable data obtained was rather small. In the first place, the interviews were not designed to assess leadership style. Granted, this notion has been discussed before, but what has not been mentioned is the fact that a fair amount of useable statements were still obtained. Thus, it stands to reason that if questions were consistently asked on the subject of leadership style (and methodologies) as part of the interview, the pool of data would have been greatly increased for at least this part of the study.

A second shortcoming arose from the use of survey data. Unless the participants are consistently monitored while completing the forms, there is no way to ensure that they will be properly filled out. One of this study's confounds was that subjects often did not leave their name on the answer sheet. While the content may have seemed to sensitive for them to take that risk, it is incumbent upon the researcher to assure them of confidentiality. Still, if the administrator is no longer present at the site, how can the subject know for certain who is handling the data? The list of hypothetical situations for the surveys is probably quite extensive, so it should be sufficient to say that an ideal scenario would have involved direct, personal handling of the survey data at all phases of the study. Unfortunately, time constraints on the part of both the researchers and the subjects made that situation impossible.
Another potential pitfall is the fact that multiple raters were not used to classify the interview data into the four leadership styles. Had such an approach been undertaken, it would have required both persons who were willing to undertake this task and an adequate amount of time to both train and prepare them for doing so. Given the general lack of those resources during this research process, satisfying this possible requirement would have been difficult. Even so, the guidelines used to identify the four styles (Stewart & Manz, 1995) are relatively easy to recognize and are listed in Appendix C.

The final limitation of note is the ongoing revision of methodologies that occurred within the scope of the larger study. As yearly discoveries were reported, certain changes needed to be made in the interviews in order to clear up some of the nebulous findings. At the same time, obsolete surveys had to be eliminated, while newer editions were introduced. Within the context of this particular study, rewritten interview questions might alter the extent to which leadership was discussed. Similarly, variability in certain scales on the PTP limited analysis to the first ten items on the survey, which remained unchanged throughout the course of the three revisions. Overall, the data for this study was pigeonholed as a result of the adaptations, but the bottom line is that useable information was still
obtained, leaving a general sense of optimism regarding the future of this topic.

**Further Research Pursuits**

Between the general trends that were uncovered and the significant results that were pinpointed, the data obtained from this study should serve as an indication that further research is certainly warranted. For one thing, many facets of the hypotheses were neither confirmed nor disconfirmed. For example, an absence of data on team with "elected" leadership left the question concerning the preferred leadership style unanswered. To be sure, an adequate amount of statements generated by this group could at least provide the opportunity to provide an analysis of the topic. Similarly, the evidence of leadership tools being employed was left uncoupled with the appropriate survey data. Clearly, the unanswered questions from this study could lead to another full project by themselves.

A second category of future research could be inspired by some of the significant results. For instance, empowered leadership yielded the highest ratings in some areas (e.g., meeting goals), while power-building leadership seemed to provide advantages in others (such as satisfying customers). According to Stewart and Manz (1995), though, power-building leadership is only necessary until teams are capable of self-leadership, at which point, the empowered style is most appropriate. Given the potential liabilities that philosophy
may entail, perhaps an advanced study could "fine-tune" the ideas associated with the contention.

Finally, some additional work could be done on the general trends (figures 4-7) revealed by the data. If overpowering and powerless leadership make things worse, but the other two styles do not appear to cause improvements, perhaps some other approach exists that is superior to what either power-building or empowered leadership prescribes. The fact that the latter two styles provided superior ratings in different areas might suggest that a new set of contingencies should be elucidated if one wishes to optimize the performance of their team across several different dimensions.

Conclusion

Overall, this study appears to have yielded a bittersweet combination of results. On the one hand, the amount of usable data that could be analyzed led to speculation and conjecture that compromised the legitimacy of the findings. Still, the information that was gained was both consistent and provocative. Unfortunately, many of the questions raised remained unanswered.

The value of this effort, then, might be in its ability to stimulate further research. Several avenues of opportunity have been opened, but the professional and academic community must bear the onus of following up on whatever might seem worthwhile. Otherwise, all we are left
with is several grand, encompassing theories, but nothing underneath that captures the subtle nuances.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE INTERVIEW

AND QUESTIONNAIRE
INITIAL INTERVIEW

Opening comments:
"This interview is part of a set of interviews here. It represents the first stage in our research project. It is designed to get general information about the company and the work teams. I would like to tape the interview if you don't mind; that way I don't have to concentrate on note-taking while we are talking."

Leading questions:
1. Let's start with your giving me some information about yourself and your work here. For the record, please tell me your (a) name; (b) job title; (c) the name of your team; (d) the name of the organization.
2. What do you like about your current work situation?
3. If the work situation was ideal here, what would it look like?
4. What do these terms mean to you: (a) leader; (b) leadership; (c) work team; (d) teamwork.
5. What is the function and goal of your team?
6. Please, describe the steps in the usual work process.
7. How does working in teams help get the work done?
8. What has worked well in the transition to work teams?
9. How has the transition to teams impacted quality?
10. How has your team changed over the past year?
11. What does your team do well?
12. How has leadership contributed to the changes going on here?

13. Where does leadership come from for the team?

14. When do you feel like a real team? Please give an example.

15. What does your team do now that supervisors/managers used to do?

16. What decisions does the team make? How do the decisions get made?

17. What changes has the team initiated?

18. How do you measure success here?

19. When do you feel responsible about the team’s outcomes?

20. What support do you need to do the job well?

21. Who do you depend on to get the work done?

22. Who does your team depend on to get the work done?

23. Are there ways to change your job that would help get your work done?

24. How could your manager help you get your work done?

25. How can other teams and departments help you get your work done?

26. Assume I just started work here today; what are the unwritten things I need to know to survive and succeed?

27. Is there anything else you would like to share with me that would help me understand the teams here?

Thank you.
PERCEPTIONS OF TEAM PERFORMANCE

Directions: This rating form describes the current performance level of the team. Please fill in the demographics questions at the top of the page, then use the rating scale described below to indicate your perceptions of the team on the ten performance indicators.

Name of the team you are rating: ____________________________

Company/Organization's name: ___________; Site: __________

Your role with the team (circle): manager supervisor coach
team-leader team-member customer other: _______________

Type of work done by the team: ____________________________

Name of your team &
company/organization: _________________________________

Today’s date________ Your name: ___________________________

Directions: Rate the team on the basis of the following: If 100% means the best the team could do with all of its current resources, how well is it actually doing now (write a percentage ranging from 0% to 100% on the line after each statement).

1. Controlling costs: ___
2. Goal achievement: ___
3. Cycle time: ___
4. Quality of products: ___
5. Innovation: ___
6. Increased capacity: ___
7. Use of expertise of the team: ___
8. Customer satisfaction:____

9. Quality of service to customers:____

10. Responsiveness to customer requirements:____
APPENDIX B

EXAMPLES OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH CODES
**Age**: value (age of the interviewee)

**Career**: interviewee's career history

**Culture**: any information that references the culture of the organization

**Comskills**: reference to the communication practices

**Date**: 0=1st interview (not baseline), 1=baseline, 2=mapping, 3=2nd anthro. Interview, 4=new baseline interview

**Defteam**: the answers to "define a team" and "define success"

**Educ**: interviewee's formal education

**Eval**: formal employee evaluation process & information about team or individual rewards or success

**Expteam**: any prior experience with teams

**Function**: 1=Multifunctional, 2=Single function

**Leader**: anything about formal and informal leadership

**Manager**: 1=1st level; 2=2nd level; 3=3rd level; 5=facilitator or coach

**Proscons**: the pros and cons of working in teams

**Sex**: 1=female; 2=male

**Stories**: random or specific stories that illustrate the organization, teams, etc.

**Stress**: anything that relates to stress and pain experiences due to work

**Struct**: factors external to the teams or organizations that impinge or impact the whole (outside of their control).

**Teamhist**: information about the team's past (team maturity)

**Training**: information in regards to training
**wkproces**: information about what the members do or are responsible for
APPENDIX C

CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION
OF LEADERSHIP STYLES
Overpowering Leadership (Stewart & Manz, 1995, p.752)

**Leader Behaviors:** Coercion, Reinforcement and Punishment, Autocratic Decision Making, Initiating Structure

**Team Reactions:** Compliance, conformance, skepticism

Powerless Leadership (Stewart & Manz, 1995, p.752)

**Leader Behaviors:** Intermittent Initiation of Structure, Enforcement of Sanctions, Psychological Distancing

**Team Reactions:** Lack of direction, power struggles, frustration

Power-Building Leadership (Stewart & Manz, 1995, p.752)

**Leader Behaviors:** Guidance and Encouragement, Delegation, Reinforcement, Culture Development

**Team Reactions:** Learning, skill development, team building

Empowered Leadership (Stewart & Manz, 1995, p.752)

**Leader Behaviors:** Modeling, Boundary Spanning, Assisting

**Team Reactions:** Self-direction, strategic planning, ownership
APPENDIX D

LEADERSHIP TOOLS

ABBREVIATIONS & DEFINITIONS
Charismatic Leadership (Behling & McFillen, 1996)

Empathy—displaying empathy (deciphering needs) in communicating the mission.

Drama—dramatizing the mission via metaphors and allusions to fuel support.

Assure—projecting self-assurance to instill confidence in the followers to work on their own.

Enhance—enhancing their image to create an aura of success, attractiveness, and competency (House, 1977).

Example: “And [he] is a leader. He’ll take a hold of... a lot of problems... he makes sure that he gets the training so that he can answer all the questions. That’s how he does that. Plus, I guess he just, he’s the supervisor, so you have to look to him for you know, for the structure. He’s there, he’s the one you’re supposed to go to if we have problems, or need to know something.”

Commentary: This individual increases his competency level by receiving all of the training so that the followers must rely on him in order to understand what’s going on.

Comp—asking followers to view them as competent.

Success—providing followers opportunities to experience success (participative mgmt., job enrichment, etc.).

Example: “I feel like from my visits with him, he’s a very people-oriented person. He’s a kind of person who kind of feels like everybody in this organization is important. If they have something to contribute to the program, a product line that they are working on, they have an opportunity to be heard. And their suggestions are acted upon and not just brushed off, in one ear and out the other ear. [He] is the kind of person that feels like...”
all the resources that you need to do the job is going to be available to you. You have your engineer right there in your work group. You have your inspectors there, you have your production person and everybody works together to accomplish this same common goal. [He] enables that to happen."

Commentary: The leader in this instance utilizes his followers' suggestions and provides ample resources to ensure that the subordinates have everything they need in order to take an active role in their group's successes.

SuperLeadership (Manz & Sims, 1991)

Model— modeling cognitive-behavioral strategies that reinforce desired personal goal attainment.

Example: "And by having, I guess, a senior member of the group, he does have, you know, experience in, in helping us in that guideline type, mentor type situation. Um, which actually, like I said, works pretty good for us right now. Like I said, I know it's hard on him, but for us, it's, it's pretty nice to be able to have someone you can say, 'Where is that at?' so that at least I know where to start looking."

Commentary: This leader seems to display behaviors that are emulated by less-experienced team members.

Reward— encouraging followers to create their own reward system.

Teamwork— promoting teamwork in order to facilitate the creation of a self-leadership culture.

Example: "But he does, he always tries to join in with, with everybody. And he's tried to make sure that we know who the other teams out here are with the different products, that do essentially the same thing or a very similar function to, to what
we do. We’ve had group meetings that he’s, you know, brought everybody together for just, you know, let’s have a meeting of, to, if nothing else, to walk around, shake hands, and say, ‘Hi, my name is [X], I work with [Y].’ Oh, okay. And like I said, that way we have knowledge of other. I guess you could call it support and that well this is a hurdle that they’ve, you know, we’re dealing with reporting really heavily right now. Well, one of the other groups is just now coming to that hurdle and so there’s been a lot of times that they’ll pick up a bone or they’ll, they’ll send you a message that says, ‘hey, what, what did you all, where did you all start?’

Commentary: This leader arranges meetings that allow members of similar teams to interface and provide support for one another.

LeaderPlex (Hooijberg, Hunt & Dodge, 1997)

Cognitive—effectively communicating information to different groups of people.

Example: “She knows a lot of people, she hears everything first hand, she can sort what information kind of fluff from what’s really good information, um, and she’s basically our corporate—she’s good at making that network, that corporate network, or, you know…”

Commentary: This individual is able to determine which information is appropriate to pass on to her subordinates.

Social—understanding and dealing with different social scenarios.

Example: “She has worked her way up, okay, based upon her knowledge and talent and ability to deal with people and keep those visions in focus and get things done, you know. She’s just the most talented person that I know about.”
Commentary: This individual seems to satisfy the above criteria by effectively dealing with people while keeping everything "in focus."

Behavior - appropriately applying different roles to different situations.

Example: "I think that he can often add insight if something is going on and there's an attempt to get to a certain decision or certain information, he may be able to add information from the [local] viewpoint that may put another perspective on an issue, or he may offer to carry it further, uh, escalate the discussion, or whatever."

Commentary: This person appears to be able to bring an appropriate "perspective" to a situation that allows circumstances to be approached at a more dynamic level.
APPENDIX E
EXAMPLES OF IDENTIFIED LEADERSHIP STYLES
The general guidelines for interpreting these styles can be found in APPENDIX C.

**Overpowering leadership**

**Statement:** "Because for in order for teaming to really work, you’ve got to believe that the top level is truly into it. And truly involved and that does not happen in this organization. There’s a lot of dictatorial type things that go on. And, the whole culture has always been a lack of trust. Whatever. And...it’s just that they can’t help it because they’re from a different organization. They don’t know what we do, and that whole environment needs to change and so I...they...the powers that be, they did not just wake up one day and say, ‘You know, I thought of this great thing teaming.’ I’m sure it was forced down on us. I’m absolutely positive on that. And that’s a problem."

**Commentary:** The "dictatorial type things" seem to represent an autocratic decision-making process, and the notion that the team culture was “forced down” on the employees seems indicative of structure initiation. Additionally, the tone of the speaker appears to be skeptical, a typical reaction to the overpowering style.

**Powerless Leadership**

**Statement:** "Things are changing, and we got all these new rules, and nobody has explained it to us, and we don’t have black and white direction from management, so therefore I’m not going to do anything, ‘cause nobody can make me do anything. And when we try to get some guidance from our supervisor, we’ve seen him at team meetings exactly twice."

**Commentary:** Lack of direction seems to best typify this statement. The speaker’s tone appears to be characterized by frustration, and the fact that the supervisor does not show up at meetings very often may cause the team to feel “alienated.”

**Power-Building Leadership**

**Statement:** "From, well yeah, he, he tries to stay involved from the standpoint of, I wouldn’t necessarily say he takes um, a very controlling role on the team. He does take an active part on the team. Um, and, and, he certainly helps keep us, ah, you know, make sure we stay on track as far as, as what we’re trying to accomplish. Um, does a very good job of that. Of, of, of helping our, assisting with, with that
part of our teaming, you know. So what we said was, 'We're starting here and were ending here.' Well, yeah, that's actually what we said, wasn't it? Okay. That type of contributions. And I said he, he is an active member of the team. Um, which he, you know like I said, he certainly is, you know, ah, who we answer to. Um, he is more like I said, I'd consider him more of a team member than, than the supervisor."

Commentary: The supervisor in this case seems to have a hands-on (active) approach without overwhelming the team with it. The reinforcement and direction provided by this leader seems to represent the power-building style.

Empowered Leadership

Statement: "He's our...our coach, we'll bring him into...we'll... he... he'll let us run what we want to do... I mean, [He] doesn't get involved, you know, unless he has to. Okay? You're... You're the coach of the area; You run it. You know? You have a problem... let me know, but you run what you're doing out there yourself... unless there's a major problem, then you come and see me. So... we have our production without [him], but if we need him, we'll bring him into it. If it's a problem we can't solve, we bring him into it. ??? on our own out there."

Commentary: This leader seems to have a passive approach, but appears to be available whenever the team needs him or her, which is indicative of the "assisting" mentality specified by the model. As a result, this team appears to be doing its own planning and it probably carries out as much of the workload as possible.
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