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The leadership phenomenon first became interesting to me when I was commissioned in the army in 1978. Before this time, I never really took an analytical perspective concerning any of my personal experiences. As I am sure is the case with most kids raised in middle-class America, I was raised initially to do what I was told. As I grew older and took high school and college employment, the dynamics of leadership and followership again were a given as my goals were purely instrumental rewards. This outlook changed when I entered active duty and embarked upon a career.

I arrived at my first duty station with the usual arsenal of role expectations. This was not unusual since the military has a clear rank structure and efficient insignia system for overt display of superordinate and subordinate distinction in any given interaction. What I was totally unarmed for and unaware of was the vast difference in the exercise of power on both the leader's and the follower's part. My response to this was curiosity and frustration. How could an authoritarian system with such clear rank distinction display such varied execution of problem solving and task completion? I had never studied nor been instructed in leadership
styles, theories or dynamics in a formal manner. What I had been given was result oriented and based on the givens of this research. Basically, I knew what to do and what worked when, but I didn't really know why. Though this curiosity did not become an obsession, it did remain in the forefront.

My greatest practical experience with leadership came as a field artillery service battery commander. In this position, I was in the unique position of leading seventy-five soldiers within a hierarchical structure that allowed for six distinct sections, each containing its own leader or section chief. Although I greatly influenced all seventy-five soldiers, I only rated or directly supervised two. These were my executive officer and first sergeant. Even the most rudimentary understanding of organizations is enough to see how the exercise of leadership in a setting such as this could be extremely varied.

As commander, I had the option of closely supervising all sections, some sections, or none at all. The same is true for the two individuals I rated. Depending on the policies I established, I could have been democratic with my section chiefs while they in turn could have been autocratic with their subordinates. As for the subordinate perspective, they too had role expectations and past experiences upon which to draw. The experience
of my section chiefs had been not to take the initiative and to await instructions. This is somewhat understandable because of their training, since the first days of basic training and their experiences with, as a minimum, their previous commander. Their role expectation for the battery commander was that he be very directive in nature. My style was to solicit input from my subordinates and base decisions on the best possible course of action. The section chiefs responded with mixed feelings. Some appreciated the freedom and others preferred the specific instructions. The soldiers responded to the leadership style of their section chiefs in a similar manner. Some responded positively and some negatively, regardless of the style used. I concluded from this that the leadership dynamic was greatly influenced by the role expectations for a given structure.

When the time came for my next assignment, it turned out to be a teaching position at the United States Military Academy. I would be teaching leadership my first year and sociology my second and third years. In order to do this, I was required to obtain an advanced degree (M.A. in Sociology). That brought me to William and Mary, where I was afforded an opportunity to explore the leadership phenomenon from an academic perspective. As things turned out, I was able to pursue this phenomenon throughout the
various courses I took (papers, article research). I was also afforded the opportunity to present a paper on one aspect of leadership at a professional society meeting and teach a complete course on advanced management and leadership. Needless to say, since leaving the realm of practical experience only a short time ago, I have immersed myself quickly in the realm of academic study.

Having now approached leadership from both the practical experience and academic perspectives, I see the dynamics of human interaction and leadership as even more intriguing. My experiences have made me ask why and my research has offered possible explanations. My intentions with this thesis are to combine the two realms by taking a reflective and meta-analytical look at the contemporary academic literature on leadership theories. This is not the result of a researcher looking into a snapshot of human behavior in the world but rather the opposite. I do not wish to examine leadership as a researcher exploring the empirical universe. As a professional leader and designated instructor of leadership, I intend to examine the research from the perspective of a member of the living reality. In short, the phenomenon is measuring the researchers.
I hope to bring some vitality to this thesis by looking at theories of leadership as potential explanations of everyday human interactions. To present some idea of the problem of explaining this phenomenon, consider the situation where an individual is both a leader and follower simultaneously. Numerous examples of this situation immediately come to mind. A store salesman whose boss has given him very explicit instructions on what to say to customers in order to entice a sale is one such instance. Here, the salesman is compelled as a follower to follow his instructions. These same instructions, however, imply that he take the lead in the interaction between the customer and himself in order to achieve his desired outcome. Another example is the leadership dynamic exemplified by the neighborhood pickup baseball or football game. Although the same boys or girls may emerge as leaders for these events, do they always emerge as leaders in other types of pickup activities such as after school clubs or around other athletes equally as gifted? My point is that few studies I have come across examine the practical side of life, for various legitimate reasons. The fact remains, however, that the measurement of workers in a furniture factory in Great Britain must somehow be generalized to a rather all-encompassing phenomenon.
I lead a multi-faceted life of roles which is more deeply immersed in the reality of life than in the study of the reality of life. I am a professional leader, a follower, a husband, a father, a teacher, a student, a landlord, a mortgagor, a constituent, and a taxpayer. In my many experiences of constantly changing roles, I have found leadership as a phenomenon to be anything but static. Leadership has always been characterized by some form of situational nuance. It is from this frame of mind that I have analyzed the literature of the past fifteen years.

It is my hope that this thesis in its final form will provide a useful reference to future readers. In order to meet this goal, I have organized it so that the text itself appeals to leaders and followers from both an academicians' and practitioners' perspective. I have included within the body of the text a description of the theories I found in my research, four schemes displaying how I have categorized these theories, and my rationale for each. In my discussion, I have used my own experiences to illustrate the reality of leadership and projected the usefulness of theory for instruction and application to positions of leadership. In this regard, I hope I have appealed to both the user and the researcher.
I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Larry Beckhouse, David Aday and Ed Rhyne for their sincere interest, guidance, wisdom and unselfish willingness to help me on this and numerous other works on this subject. I am forever in your debt. I especially wish to express my unending love for my wife Jill and our children Michelle, Robert and Ashley, who have once again experienced the reality of life with a dedicated army officer.
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ABSTRACT

This thesis presents an assessment of the current state of theories of leadership. It is a reflective analysis of a portion of the literature that covers the period 1975-1989 and addresses leadership theory specifically. It represents a usable reference that will assist in the future study, use and application of the leadership phenomenon. The review is multidisciplinary. The analysis suggests that there is a consensus in the contemporary literature concerning a situational orientation in the leadership phenomenon. It also reveals the potential of current theories for instructional and practical field applications.
THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP:
A CONTEMPORARY ANALYSIS 1975-1989
I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of sociological interest in an analysis of this nature is to identify patterns in the contemporary use of leadership theories. With the goal of creating a usable reference for future instruction and positions of leadership, I want the result to reflect the most current state of academic study. In order to solve this problem, a twofold approach will be taken. First, as a foundation for the analysis itself, a background discussion of the inception and dilemma of leadership is undertaken. Second, careful scrutiny is made of the theories themselves, with regard to what they attempt to explain and how they contribute to the understanding and prediction of leadership behavior. Both will provide the data necessary for analysis. The importance of the first step, however, cannot be overestimated. It is here in the basic framework of the phenomenon that the clearest indications of the direction of leadership study can be found. As I mentioned previously, academic explanation of the leadership phenomenon is difficult. There is a tendency in the literature to assume things that are highly dependent on particular theories. There is room for caution in that approach. I have chosen to err on the side of that
caution by commencing with a return to basics in the study of leadership.

Personality theorists relate behavior to a dynamic of tension and tension reduction. This perspective encompasses the complete range of levels of analysis starting with the micro level--biological cellular functioning--and progresses to the macro level--human interaction between and within societies. If we relate this to the phenomenon of leadership, we find ourselves in a homeostatic state around the line of demarcation between the individual and group level of analysis. The reason is simple. Leaders can be and often are individuals, and subordinates can be both individuals and groups. When the two are combined, however, the resultant overall dynamic is that of two or more people or a group. Already, I have fallen somewhat prey to the "given" trap: in order for leadership to exist, there must be followers to lead and hence a group. Although this is true, starting here puts the powder before the projectile (I am an artilleryman). The first question to pursue is why groups form. The answer I am going to use is based on an organizational outlook: groups are formed to solve problems that arise from environmental demands. Some sort of external tension arises that results in the formation of a group when an individual is incapable of solving the problem alone. The
goal of the group members becomes tension reduction. For an existent group, the tension can be either internal or external. In either case, groups exist for a reason. When the reason for existence ends, so does the group. Lindgren (1982) reduces group survival to two basic needs. The first is purpose and meaning for its members, and the second is to find ways to translate purpose and meaning into action. All groups must have leadership or direction to meet these needs.

Leadership could arguably be considered a byproduct of environmental demand. Lindgren (1982) contends that leaders must perform three tasks. They must interpret the group's meaning to its membership, help the group make changes and adjust, and help the group resist change and remain the same. These apply to all leaders whether emergent or formally appointed. By studying the implication of each of Lindgren's tasks carefully, the dilemma of leadership becomes apparent: how to get the job done while caring for the needs of subordinates. From the social psychologist's point of view, the actual task before the group is not important. What is important is the interaction it stimulates between the group members. The output of the group is secondary (Davis, 1969). The key to this dilemma lies not in what the group produces, solves, or accomplishes but in the interaction between the
leader and subordinates within the context of the organization to which they belong. Knowles and Saxberg (1971:144) address this interaction specifically:

The main arena of action for the leader is the informal emergent organization which is composed of human values and patterns of behavior not covered by rules and arising naturally from the interactions of persons as they go about their daily tasks. These are the everyday, day-in and day-out, face to face encounters through which flesh and blood members attempt to translate into goal-seeking action the rational order of the formal organization. This goal-seeking activity gives life to the skeletal social structure and the prescribed relationships. It is here that leadership, whatever its variety and style, is practiced. For it is here that the leader, through his influence and power rather than through any ordained position of authority, must use his capacity to mold and change the course of human activity.

Nevertheless, the dilemma remains for each leader. The group exists to solve problems and the leader exists to see that the problem is solved and that the subordinates are cared for.

Studies of leadership mean little if the groups being led and followership are not also examined. The behaviors of both the leader and the follower are influenced by the situation and the interactions of each with the other (Vroom, 1973). This interaction can take any form in terms of two or more persons partaking in some sort of social exchange. I prefer to examine the specific impact
of power, as possessed by both, and the marshalling of resources, as performed by both. The fact that both leader and follower possess certain powers in a given situation is not new. It is, however, an important factor in the behavior of each. A leader's power comes from two sources. One is the legitimate power afforded him by the position he holds:

Positional authority arises from the implicit or explicit agreement among members of an organization to designate the rights of individuals to direct the activities of others within prescribed limits (Dalton, 1968:45).

The second is the power yielded by the subordinates as an exchange for an acceptable performance of the leadership role. If the exchange is rewarding, the power is yielded. If not, the power can be withdrawn. An example of this can range from simple forgetting to sabotage. The follower has the power to prevent the group from performing successfully or to prevent the leader from leading effectively. Sims and Manz (1984) examined this interaction between leader and follower by looking at reciprocal determinism in leadership theory. They found that subordinate performance does appear to act as an influence on subsequent leader behavior. Their conclusion was that "... the behavior of a leader is not solely an independent stimuli but can also be dependent" (p. 222).
This was the result of reverse causality due to subordinate behavior.

The second aspect is the marshalling of resources. The means available to both leader and follower in a given situation are the basis of the power each possesses. Zaleznik refers to this as the action of the fusion oriented manager (Cribbin, 1981), but it applies equally to the follower. A resource, then, is anything that allows either party in a given exchange to manipulate or affect the environment. The result is often a behavioral response. Some of the obvious examples are people, supplies, an operating budget or positional authority to make decisions. Some of the more subtle are the key to the storeroom, holding the position of coach of the baseball team on which the boss's son plays, and personal power held as leader of an emergent informal organization within the formal structure of the work place. Depending on how resources are used, each party has the ability to profoundly affect the behavior of the other. The dynamics of leadership transcend the seemingly straightforward relationship of leader and subordinate within the context of a group in its environment.

The ability of the follower to affect the behavior does not absolve the leader from responsibility of the performance (or lack thereof) of the group he leads.
Early theories of leadership were based on this reasoning. The focus in these theories is on what makes an effective leader. The implied assumption is that good leaders produce good results. This suggests that the relationship between good leaders and their subordinates is good axiomatically. Though logically it makes sense, the follower aspect of leadership receives little or no analysis of significance. Worchel et al. (1988), Bass (1985), Bons (1987), Lindgren (1982), Heller (1982), and House and Baetz (1979) provide an historical perspective on the evolution of theories of leadership. This look focuses on three particular theories. All three are specifically oriented toward an explanation of leader behavior. The first of these theories is the Great Man or Trait Theory of leadership. Formally labeled in 1841 by Thomas Carlyle, it proposed that historical events were shaped by individuals who possessed certain traits that made them prone to greatness. Early theorists reasoned that if these traits could be isolated and identified in people, then the prediction of future successful leaders

1 This is by no means an all-inclusive list. Most complete works on the subject of leadership contain a discussion on the historical perspective of leadership theory.
would be possible. This logic prevailed through World Wars I and II, which created significant demand for leaders. The same academic focus that perpetuated the theory, however, contributed to its demise as study upon study failed to identify specific traits of leadership. The inevitable conclusion of this failure was that leadership is not based on innate or acquired traits that contribute to successful leadership.

The void left by Trait Theory was filled by the Zeitgeist or Situational Theory as the study of leadership shifted from historical events being shaped by man to man being shaped by historical events. In this context, traits have no bearing other than whether or not they happen to be present. Zeitgeist theorists attribute the particular time or situation as the determinant of who becomes a leader. Marx and Engels included this in their writings as a result of the influence of the Industrial Revolution in the late nineteenth century. Max Weber's work on leadership also contributes to this theoretical position. He proposed "... an impersonal, bureaucratic type of leadership--not leadership by attribute, characteristics or loyalty, but leadership by legitimate authority based on established rule" (Bons, 1987:1-5).

Like its predecessor, this theory enjoyed early popularity based on communication and group studies.
Groups did not always pick the same leaders in different situations, and seemingly unimportant factors such as seating arrangements in a room yielded an inequitable distribution of power. Findings such as these supported the proposition that the situation within which the group found itself was salient in the determination of a leader. As with Trait Theory, however, Zeitgeist Theory started to reveal failings in the understanding and prediction of leadership effectiveness. Why can some people lead any group in any situation while others cannot lead even the most organized unit in the most undemanding environment?

Evolving from this theory was a synthesis that fit the Hegelian dialectic as if by design. Interactionist theory proposes that leadership is a function of the individual and the environment interacting with each other. With this theory, emphasis is returned to the human element, but not completely. Recall my earlier discussion of the effects of environmental demands on groups. They are too influential to ignore. Neither man nor his environment, as the interactionists suggest, can be studied in isolation in an attempt to explain leadership behavior. The task that presents itself with this theory is to explain leadership behavior in terms of this interaction.
A review of the contemporary literature has revealed a patterned approach to the study of leadership in the past fifteen years. The contemporary focus of leadership theory is on the dichotomous nature of leader behavior. This behavior, in the theories that I used for this thesis, reduced leadership to task or person orientation. These two orientations are called other things such as initiating structure and consideration, or are accompanied by additional specific behaviors, but the majority of theories studied or analyzed critically in the latest literature contained this general dichotomous orientation. This approach is not without justification. If the functions of a leader are carefully considered, the leader has at least a twofold task in every situation. He is ultimately responsible for accomplishment of the mission and for the welfare of his subordinates. The latter, of course, is a key ingredient to the former. Peter Blau (1964:204) refers to this as the dilemma of leadership:

The dilemma of leadership is resolved by devoting different time periods to coping with its two horns, so to speak. This parallels the conclusion of Bales and Strodtbeck (cited) that the dilemma of group problem solving posed by the need for a cognitive orientation to the task and the need for a supportive orientation that reduces tensions which are incompatible, is resolved by donating different time phases to meeting these two needs.
Lindgren (1982) refers to the dichotomy as two distinct types of leadership. Dynamic leadership is the first and is largely concerned with bringing about change or action of some sort. This type is aggressive and forceful. The second is the administrative type, which is concerned with organizing and maintaining the group in order to meet its goals and purposes. This type is not change oriented. In a variation of the same theme, Biggart and Hamilton (1987:439) examine leadership behavior as a function of the role demands of positions of leadership versus the possession of innate qualities or traits of leadership:

Strategies of leadership must consider the normative basis of the relationship and the setting, and the distinctive performance abilities of the actors involved.

Unlike Biggart and Hamilton, Hare (1962:248) focuses more specifically on the nature of the task, but the dichotomy is still readily apparent:

In its broadest sense then the definition of the task is the definition of the situation, and differences in behavior which appear between situations are the most general indication of differences in tasks.

This dichotomy has been integrated into nearly all aspects of our culture, including our entertainment medium. In an episode from a space travel television show
that was popular in the late 1960's, the captain of the ship is transported aboard by a malfunctioning transporter. His body and mind are duplicated in a manner that one of him is aggressive and the other passive and compassionate. Over time, the compassionate captain loses the ability to make assertive command decisions while the aggressive half becomes increasingly hostile. The first officer theorizes that it is the negative human side that contains the capacity for cold, hard decision making and that the positive side contains the warmth and compassion for interrelations and coexistence. It is no small coincidence that a show about military command in space would reflect what was then the latest developments in theories of leadership. Nevertheless, the dichotomy again presents itself—task and person orientation.

It is in the direction of this dichotomy and its variations and additions that I find the contemporary state of theories of leadership. My analysis of specific theories is based upon how this dichotomy is used to explain and predict leadership behavior and effectiveness.
II. METHOD

The design of this study was to take an inventory of leadership theories, analyze their general contentions, and develop three distinct approaches to leadership in the form of reflective comparison to actual experience, explore potential value for instruction of leadership as an academic subject, and assess the potential for application to future leadership situations. This design has provided a twofold point of departure for further research. The first is the example I provide with my analysis and assessment of the literature. The second is the provision of my data for future researchers to use in their own assessments.

In order to avoid a study that encompasses only library research, this thesis is reflective of my practical experiences. More specifically, I separated the discussion of the theories from the review of my experiences. This approach also provided the opportunity to include an assessment of the literature used by the military in both instruction and application of leadership.

The relevant literature for this study was limited to professional journal articles and published original
studies of leadership. I limited the literature using two major criteria. The first was publication between the years 1975 and 1989. I determined this to be suitably encompassing and contemporary. The second criterion was specific reference to the study, use, or development of any theory of leadership.

A careful review of the literature yielded the sources I have listed as primary in my bibliography. The list is not intended to be an exhaustive list of materials on leadership, just as this study is not intended to be the definitive analysis of theories of leadership in the contemporary literature. Instead, this is a first effort at a meta-analysis of the leadership literature.

The variables for this study are the theories identified in the literature. Some of the sources that turned up in my review were helpful in this process as they represented studies of the more dominant theoretical perspectives in the field of leadership. In this regard, recognition and analytical evaluation were presented within the context of each study. For those sources that included variations of more salient leadership theories or represented offshoots of theories of other phenomena, I evaluated them in terms of explaining leadership behavior as an inherent element.
III.

RESULTS

My research findings in the leadership field yielded a not-so-surprising multidimensional academic approach. A finding such as this suggests support for my contention in the preface that leadership is at best a difficult phenomenon to capture and explain in general terms let alone in terms of distinct and predictable behavior patterns. The two major disciplines involved are psychology and sociology. Here again there are no surprises since, if we may take such categorical license, leadership is a social psychological phenomenon. Business literature was the next most prevalent, followed by the field of education. I interpreted this multifaceted approach as a dedication of varied resources to the solution of a given problem. As an officer in the military, I find that problem solving is a full-time occupation for which there are never enough resources.

As I discussed in the previous chapter, my first step was an inventory of leadership theories. My research revealed eighteen such theories in the literature. I have taken these theories and broadly categorized them into four general schemes. Of the four, Trait Theory and Interactionist Theory are theories of leadership. The
other two, Social Exchange Theory and Theory of Group Dynamics, are theories that include leadership as an element of some larger social reality. The groupings in each scheme reflect broad similarities of the inclusive theories. My purpose for these distinctions is to illustrate the pervasiveness of leadership theories and to clarify the various directions that each scheme takes. Neither of these schemes is mutually exclusive. This is an approach I have taken to order the diversity found in the literature.

**Trait Theory**

The first scheme is Trait Theory. This scheme contains theories that attempt to explain leadership in terms of innate qualities. As this implies, trait theories focus on the individual. For this reason, I have included Personality Theory, Psychological Androgyny Theory, Attribution Theory of Leadership, and Charismatic Theory of Leadership in this scheme.
Cribbin (1981) discusses how Zaleznik's personality approach proposes that leaders are a certain personality type and that personality characteristics determine their behavior. The types are task oriented, person oriented, and fusion oriented. The third personality type is what is different from the previously mentioned dichotomous direction in leadership theory. The fusion oriented manager is a mediator. He represents a mixture of the task and the person orientations by solving problems through mediation between resources available and the demands placed on the organization by the environment.

Psychological Androgyny Theory addresses the dichotomy specifically. It posits that psychologically, leaders are simultaneously expressive and instrumental. When leaders express the instrumental characteristic, it reflects a problem solving orientation, and when expressive behavior is demonstrated, the leader reflects
an affective concern for the welfare of others (Yarnold, 1984).

Hollander's Attribution Theory uses the perspective of the observer to explain leader behavior:

. . . leadership is a label that can be applied to behavior. Certain inherent qualities of the actor are taken as causing both the behavior and its intended effects. Judgements about leadership are made on the basis of observed behavior. Thus leadership is an inference based on behavior accepted as evidence of leadership (House and Baetz, 1979:401).

This notion that people who act like leaders must be leaders epitomizes the trait approach to explaining leadership behavior.

The Charismatic Theory of Leadership, the last in this group, again focuses on the personal attributes of the leader. In this theory, however, the attributes in question are those that specifically contribute to the leader's personal power. This theory proposes that leaders "... by force of their personal abilities are capable of having profound and extraordinary effects on followers" (House and Baetz, 1979:399).

Social Exchange Theory

This second scheme shifts focus from the orientations or traits of the individual to the interaction between the
leader and subordinate. "Social Exchange Theory attempts to explain the reciprocal process of influence between leaders and followers over time" (Yukl, 1981:28). This scheme includes Vertical Dyad Linkage Theory, Game Theory, Operant Conditioning Theory, Idiosyncrasy Credit Theory, Theory X and Theory Y, and Social Learning Theory. My rationale for including these particular theories in the social exchange scheme is that each addresses the transactional nature of exchange based on interdependence between the leader and subordinate (Csoka, 1987a).

"Vertical Dyad Linkage Theory focuses on the development of different kinds of exchange relationships with different subordinates" (Hunt, 1985:83). The leader establishes a relationship with each subordinate,
suggesting that in a transactional nature, not all exchanges start, progress, or finish in the same manner. Yukl (1981:83) states that "... leaders establish a special relationship with a small number of trusted subordinates who function as assistants or advisors." Csoka (1987b) carries this to its logical extension by pointing out that the leader groups these one-on-one relationships into three categories of people: the in-group referred to by Yukl, an out-group characterized by a formal authority relationship, and a middle group characterized by continual negotiations between the leader and the subordinate.

Game Theory is to Social Exchange Theory what Attribution Theory is to Trait Theory:

A decision in a game involves choosing from among a number of alternatives having some specified consequences. Further, the game usually involves a two-person process that can be either cooperative or competitive. The resolution of the game clearly calls for an exchange process between the two individuals if they are to maximize their benefits, and neither can do that without giving something (Csoka, 1987a:12-5).

Scott (1977), Sims (1977) and Mawhinney and Ford (1977) turn to Operant Conditioning Theory as the best explanation of leader behavior:

... since leaders are a significant source of reward contingencies and a significant source of reward administration, leadership
can best be explained in terms of the principles of operant conditioning (cited in House and Baetz, 1979:403).

Implied in this transactional relationship is the subjective judgement on the part of the leader as to subordinate behavior that deserves a reward and subordinate behavior that does not. Also implied is the subjective judgement concerning what is and what is not a satisfactory reward.

I placed Idiosyncrasy Credit Theory here because it goes beyond group dynamics in that it is more transactional in nature. Developed by Hollander in 1969, it "... attempts to explain the emergence of leadership and the determinants of leader effectiveness within groups" (House and Baetz, 1979:375). According to the theory, members evaluate other members based on conformity to norms and roles. Status is then determined in terms of "credits," which are an accumulation of positively disposed impressions residing in the perceptions of others. The credits allow the holder to deviate from group norms in the form of emergent leadership since the leader must deviate to lead (House and Baetz, 1979). The group members award credits with which the emergent leader then "purchases" leadership in the form of deviance from group norms.
McGregor's Theory X, Theory Y does not address any particular type of transaction as much as it addresses a particular way in which transactions are conducted. How, not what. Heichberger and Pegan (1975) write that each perspective is based on certain assumptions made by the leader. The Theory X leader considers man to be inherently lazy and therefore incapable of accomplishing anything on his own. All actions by this leader are by decree. The Theory Y leader is the opposite. His actions are more democratic and considerate of subordinates since they are based on the assumptions that man is "... a proactive, growth-seeking, inquiring, confronting person" (p. 158). The communication (exchange) is open and trusting between the Theory Y leader and his subordinates.

Manz and Sims (1980) examine leadership behavior from the social learning perspective of the subordinate. They suggest that the greater degree of self-management the subordinate exercises, the less direct supervision the leader is required to exercise. The subordinate learns that the greater self-determination he exercises, the more control over the task the leader is willing to relinquish.

Theory of Group Dynamics

In a departure from the one-on-one transactional nature of social exchange between leader and subordinate
is the theory of group dynamics. The theories I have included in this scheme are those that my research showed to be directed at explaining leadership in the context of interaction by all group members. The most apparent differences between the two are the establishment of group norms and the collective marshalling of resources as I have alluded to previously. Even though either or both parties in a transaction may rely on group norms as justification for singular behavior, they are nonetheless established collectively by the group and within the context of the formal organization. An example of the collective marshalling of resources is a strike. When a machinist participates in a social exchange, he brings only those resources that are within his realm of control. If all the machinists in a given organization are engaged in social exchange for a common goal, their resources are combined, thus strengthening their collective position. In this regard, an entire element of production becomes the focal point rather than one small element. The result is Homan's in-group and out-group distinction (Crouch and Yetton, 1988). Figure 3 diagrams how I have included Role Theory, Implicit Leadership Theory, Rational Decision Making Theory, Organizational Control Theory, and Distributed Functions Theory.
My research revealed only one reference to Role Theory which pertained to an integration with leadership theory for the purposes of explaining organizational effectiveness (Frost, 1983). In an analysis of leader ability and leadership performance, Frost (1983:140) cites that "The research of Fiedler and his group established that boss stress moderates the relationship both experience and intelligence have with rated leadership performance." His position is that the stress of the leadership role impacts on the ability of the leader to perform, from the group's perspective.

Closely related to Role Theory in the manner in which Frost presents it is Implicit Leadership Theory, which suggests that people have a general theory about how leaders behave in general (Gioia and Sims, 1985). The method used for measuring respondent behavior in this
theory is the questionnaire: "... questionnaire measures of leader behavior reflect both the behavior of the ratee plus perceptual-memory processes of the rater" (Rush, Thomas and Lord, 1977:104). In a reference made to other research by Lord, Pryor and Ostrom (1987:175) are more specific, stating that "People have implicit theories of leadership which act as cognitive schemata in processing information in organizational settings." Bryman (1987) tested the effects of culture on Implicit Leadership Theory by comparing questionnaire results in the United Kingdom with those from the United States. Bryman explored whether or not implicit leadership theories operate the same way in both countries. He found that they do. This was due in large part to his finding that leadership styles of managers in the United Kingdom and the United States are very similar.

Eden and Leviatan (1975:737) question the validity of Implicit Leadership Theory studies because they attempt to show that rater response may be the "... reflections of respondent's prior conceptions and not veridical representations of empirical reality in the organizational environment." This position suggests that subordinates have preconceived role expectations for leaders and leader behavior and that the studies are not conducted effectively enough to measure implicit leadership theories.
in isolated circumstances. There may be evidence to support this in the work of Gioia and Sims (1985). They looked closely at actual leader behavior in an effort to make it as objective as possible. They used the leader behavior dichotomy of consideration and initiating structure and found a response bias toward the latter. Gioia and Sims concluded that to measure leader behavior accurately, the question must correspond to a specific behavior.

Maier developed the Rational Decision Making Theory in 1963 which was advanced ten years later by Vroom and Yetton.

The theory is intended to help managers ensure a high quality of solutions to problems they must deal with and also obtain solutions that are acceptable to subordinates, if acceptability of solutions is important to effective implementation. The theory is intended to be a diagnostic tool with which leaders can choose the appropriate decision-making methods for a given problem (House and Baetz, 1979:394).

Though this implies an interactionist orientation, this theory actually suggests a three-step cookbook approach to problem solving that is satisfactory to both leader and subordinate. If A, then B, as long as we both agree which our past experience with this problem suggests we do. The leader behavior suggested by this theory is again dichotomous in nature, suggesting that a given problem calls for a given best response. The responses
move within the range of autocratic and democratic action.

In Organizational Control Theory:

... leadership is viewed as the process of selecting the most appropriate means to achieve desired goals (cf. Vroom and Yetton, 1973). This differs from "style" in that it addresses control strategies, not general classes of leadership (Jones, 1983:160).

Jones uses this as:

... an explanatory attempt to identify a new set of leader behavior dimensions based on an analysis of the properties of the types of control strategies a leader may adopt to influence subordinate behavior (1983:159-60).

This theory represents a move away from focusing the study of leadership on human interaction to leadership as a method of controlling the resources of an organization which includes the subordinate members. This overt detachment in no way excludes the dimensions of group dynamics but looks for the explanation of leader behavior within the context of social exchange as a means of control.

Distributed Functions Theory of leadership is based on the collective abilities of the group. Even though a formal leader is acknowledged by this theory, it addresses the reality that the actual leader of the group for a given task is determined by the individual skills of the members of the group:
Any member of a group may become a leader by taking actions that serve group functions and any leadership function may be fulfilled by different members performing a variety of relevant behaviors (Johnson and Johnson, 1975:22).

This theory places the focus of leadership squarely in the midst of the group context. Leadership behavior is extrapolated from the collective performance of the group over a number of performances.

**Interactionist Theory of Leadership**

This scheme contains those theories that best demonstrate an attempt at explaining leadership in terms of the leader interacting with a situation. Subordinates, in all aspects, are included as part of the situation. The theories are Situational Theory of Leadership, Path-Goal Theory, and Contingency Theory. My research found three variations of Situational Theory which were Hersey and Blanchard's (1975) Life Cycle Theory, Vroom and Yetton's (Crouch and Yetton, 1988) Situational Theory based on levels of participation, and Tannenbaum and Schmidt's Situational Theory (Cribbin, 1981), based on forces in the environment.
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Not to be confused with situation as zeitgeist, these situational theories are based on the contention that the situational context is the salient variable of an interaction. Vroom and Yetton suggest that the leader chooses a style based on the various characteristics of the problem. A choice is made whether to be autocratic or participative based on the level of participation called for by the situation (Crouch and Yetton, 1988).

Similar to the Vroom and Yetton theory, Hersey and Blanchard (1975) are more specific in singling out subordinate behavior within the situation as the determining factor of which leadership style will produce the most effective results:
This theory will attempt to provide leaders with some understanding of the relationship between an effective style of leadership and the level of maturity of their followers (p. 139).

According to this theory, the leader moves back and forth between the concern for task and the concern for people. The leader bases his decision on the ability and desire of a particular subordinate performing a particular task. For example, if a subordinate has a high level of ability and a high level of will, leader involvement will be low and his concern will be with the task at hand. If the subordinate has low will and low ability, leader involvement will be high, with his focus on improving the subordinate to perform more effectively (Cribbin, 1981).

Tannenbaum and Schmidt's environmental approach is a move to the general in that it considers the forces in the manager, work group, and situation as equally important determinants of leader behavior. It does, however, include the added dimension of the leader's choice in behavior as also influenced by priorities among organizational objectives. This added variable gives the theory a decidedly task oriented approach to explaining leadership behavior (Cribbin, 1981).

In Path-Goal Theory, the characteristics of task, subordinate and environment are explored as moderators
in the relationship between instrumental/supportive leadership and subordinate job satisfaction. The underlying assumptions of the theory are the inherently dissatisfying nature of structured tasks and the necessity of role clarity for task accomplishment (Schriesheim and Schriesheim, 1980). Leader behavior is characterized by four types and is dependent on the situation. In the instrumental type, the leader initiates structure. For supportive, the leader is considerate, behaving in a coach-like manner and ensuring that every opportunity is taken to allow subordinates to succeed. The third is participative, characterized by group problem solving and decision making when appropriate. The last is achievement-oriented behavior where the leader sets challenging and meaningful objectives (Cribbin, 1981).

In short, Path-Goal Theory explains leader behavior in terms of providing for subordinate satisfaction through immediate contact or potential contact and clears the path for goal attainment by subordinates, resulting in increased opportunities for rewards (House and Baetz, 1979). Although leader behavior is heavily dependent on the task environment, the focus is on how the leader responds to facilitate subordinate satisfaction and goal accomplishment. The emphasis, then, is on the subordinate.
The final theory in this scheme is Fiedler's Contingency Theory, which was developed as a means of explaining leadership effectiveness. Fiedler identifies the two styles of leadership that appear repeatedly in most of the other theories. These styles are task oriented and relationship oriented:

The key idea in Fiedler's contingency model is that whether the task oriented or relationship oriented leadership style is most effective will depend on the situation the leader faces (Worchel, et al., 1988:545).

To determine which style a leader favored, Fiedler developed the Least Preferred Coworker Scale (LPC). A high score on this scale indicates a relation oriented leader and a low score indicates task orientation. The high score represents an ability to see positive attributes in a person even though working with that person was difficult, and the low score indicates a negative, stereotypic perception (Csoka, 1987b).

The second major aspect of this theory is the favorability of the situation. This is the determinant of how effective either of the two types of leader will be. It is determined by leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. The theory suggests that task oriented leaders are more effective in both highly favorable and highly unfavorable situations because of
their directive nature. When there is an intermediate range of favorableness, the relation oriented leader is more effective because of his consultative and permissive manner. However, once the situation moves from intermediate to highly favorable (characterized by the formalization of plans and a decision on course of action), the task oriented leader is again the most effective (Cribbin, 1981).

The Contingency Theory represents a change from the other interactionist theories with its particular typing of leaders. According to the theory, leaders are one or the other but not both. Thus, leaders are, in effect, locked in to a particular style and thereby highly dependent on situational variables for their effectiveness. The use of this dichotomy is not unique, but its application is. Instead of appointing any leader to any environment, Fiedler suggests fitting the environment to the leader (Worchel, et al., 1988).

**Three Recurring Themes**

I have drawn three distinct substantive themes from my review of the contemporary leadership literature that represents the major results of meta-analysis. The first and the one already discussed in the previous sections is that leadership is both primary and secondary in the
manner in which I have categorized the theories. By this I mean that the phenomenon is a focal point in some general theoretical perspective and a contributing part in others. The second finding concerns the state of academic activity in this field, and the third and most significant is the finding of a general pattern or orientation of research behavior toward explaining leadership in terms of task and person orientations. I will discuss the first two themes briefly and elaborate on the third.

As previously mentioned, the leadership theories that surfaced in my review fall into four general theoretical perspectives of social behavior. Two of these, Trait Theory and Interactionist Theory, are leadership specific. Social Exchange Theory and Theory of Group Dynamics address leadership as an element of the larger explanation. Neither Trait Theory nor Interactionist Theory present a finding of surprising nature since Interactionist Theory, as the dominant leadership perspective, evolved as a response to the shortcomings of Trait and Zeitgeist Theories. Similarly, nothing surprising exists concerning the other two general perspectives. Leadership, as this theme suggests, is appropriate in either the primary or secondary context. It represents a phenomenon that covers a wide range of social behaviors whether it is in the context of a
particular leader's abilities, Trait Theory, or the context of an exchange between two persons, Game Theory. Both are appropriate. It is, however, incumbent upon the researcher to isolate both the context and level of analysis for the purposes of his study.

The contemporary state of research in leadership could be characterized as reflecting. The literature contains studies about the theories mentioned, historical perspectives and applications of existent theories, but no new theories are offered or approached. The sources from the business discipline favored application over analysis. The focus of these works was on effectiveness and productivity and, to some degree, on the traits or characteristics that have contributed to past successes (Badaracco and Ellsworth, 1989; Kurtz, Boone, and Fleenor, 1989; and Sergiovanni, 1977). Most sources I reviewed, however, favored an analytical approach. Implicit Leadership Theory was analyzed five times (Gioia and Sims, 1985; Eden and Leviatan, 1975; Pryor and Ostrom, 1987; Rush, Thomas, and Ford, 1977; and Bryman, 1987). Situational Leadership Theory was analyzed three times by Graeff (1983), Demant and Demant (1983), and Vecchia (1987); Path-Goal Theory was analyzed twice (Schriesheim and DeNisi, 1981 and Schriesheim and Schriesheim, 1980); Contingency Theory twice (Fiedler, 1978, and Bons and
Fiedler, 1976); and Social Learning Theory (Manz and Sims, 1980) and Theory X, Theory Y (McCall and Lombardo, 1978) once. The other general trend in the literature was descriptive and contributes to understanding the existent theories rather than presenting new approaches.

My third finding and the one of greatest significance from both the meta-analytical and reflective perspectives is the pattern of explaining leader behavior in terms of task orientation, person orientation, or a manifestation of each based on situational circumstances. Not only is it pertinent to my discussion on experiences, teaching and practical application, which follows in Chapter IV, it is a theme that is carried through the entire contemporary period of my research:

Two major schools of thought in the development of research on leader behavior were the Ohio State University and the University of Michigan. Although each school of thought developed independently, they arrived at very similar conceptual dimensions of leader behavior (Csoka, 1987b:13-15).

The Ohio State school clustered leader behavior into Consideration and Initiating Structure (Csoka, 1987b, Yarnold, 1984):

Consideration reflects the extent to which the leader is likely to have job relationships characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas and consideration for their feelings (pp. 13-16).
Initiating Structure reflects the extent to which the leader is likely to define his role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment (pp. 13-16).

"At Michigan, these were called job-centered and employee-centered behaviors" (Csoka, 1987b:13-35).

I would like, at the outset of this discussion, to make a clear distinction between the two orientations. As Herzberg distinguished between satisfaction and dissatisfaction in his two-factor theory (Katz and Kahn, 1978), so too am I separating task from consideration or people. They do not represent opposite ends of a continuum. The absence of one does not necessitate the presence of the other. Numerous theories in my analysis support this position. Zaleznik's Personality Theory (Cribbin, 1981), for example, adds the concept of fusion oriented, which is a combination of the two and Operant Conditioning Theory (House and Baetz, 1979) is singularly task oriented. The pattern of the two general orientations, however, is still clear and evident in each of the four theoretical schemes I have outlined.

Personality Theory, as mentioned, adds the fusion orientation of the leader to the explanation in an effort to combine the benefits of both task and person orientations. In so doing, Zaleznik maintains the unique characteristics of all three. The fusion-oriented manager is a mediator. He marshals resources to cope with the demands of the environment (Cribbin, 1981). Fusion orientation becomes a third option that draws on the resources of the organization in the degree required to meet the demand.

In Psychological Androgyny Theory, Yarnold (1984) points out how task orientation is referred to as instrumental behavior and person orientation as expressive behavior. Instrumental leader behavior can be characterized as a function of accomplishment for the benefit it brings, and expressive behavior can be characterized by the inherent rewards derived from the interaction with others.

In the Charismatic Theory of Leadership, House and Baetz (1979) point out that leaders "... by force of their personal abilities are capable of having profound and extraordinary effects on followers" (p. 399). Charismatic leadership favors a task orientation. The leader initiates structure with qualities that are attractive and inspire a willingness in subordinates.
The dependent variables for the theory are: follower trust in the correctness of the leader's beliefs, similarity of followers' beliefs to those of the leader, unquestioning acceptance of the leader, affection for the leader, willing obedience to the leader, identification with and emulation of the leader, emotional involvement of the follower in the mission, heightened goals of the follower, and the feeling on the part of the followers that they are able to accomplish or contribute to the accomplishment of the mission (House and Baetz, 1979:399).

The interaction between the leader and follower is unquestionably present in this theory, however not from a person orientation as much as a task orientation. The distinction in this theory lies in the leader's motive, which is mission accomplishment.


Vertical Dyad Linkage Theory "... focuses on the development of different kinds of exchange relationships with different subordinates" (Hunt, 1985:83). Recall from my earlier discussion of this theory that the leader establishes a relationship with each subordinate. These relationships can be categorized, according to the theory,
in three ways. The first is the personal and close relationship. The second is the relationship based on the authority structure of the organization and supported by the distinction in position of superordinate and subordinate, and the third is a relationship under negotiation. This theory implies a person orientation in the first type of relationship, a task orientation in the second, and a mixture of both in the third. It is clear in this circumstance that the overall behavior of the leader, if effective, would necessitate movement between the three as determined by the situation.

In their discussion of Operant Conditioning Theory, House and Baetz (1979) cite Scott (1977), Sims (1977), and Mawhinney and Ford (1977) and the role of leadership as a significant source of reward contingencies and administration. If we buy into this position as a "best explanation," it follows that we also consider task orientation as the primary determinant of leadership behavior. Operant Conditioning is clearly directed at the elicitation of desired behaviors or performances of some kind. Rewards are given based on some or full degree of performance toward that desired behavior. They are not given to promote the welfare of the performer.
Heichberger and Pegan (1975) discuss how McGregor split the orientation dichotomy when he developed Theory X and Theory Y. Although a specific orientation is not stated, the implications are clear. The Theory X manager considers man to be inherently lazy, lacking in both self-motivation and self-determination. According to this theory, the success of the group is dependent on the manager's autocratic style of leadership. His orientation is specifically task oriented and achieved by conducting actions by decree. The Theory Y manager is person oriented. He sees subordinates as capable of self-determination. Under this assumption, the manager can delegate responsibility, supervise less, and reward more, which all contribute to the ego expansion of the subordinate. The result is a person orientation that contributes to the welfare of members of the group or organization.

In spite of the contentions of this theory, Friedlander and Schott (1981) found that management philosophy was closer to Theory X than Theory Y in the three years preceding their study. Kurtz, Boone, and Fleenor (1989) found that the chief executive officers (CEOs) they interviewed regarded Theory X and Theory Y in a fashion consistent with McGregor's initial contention but also added a Theory Z. As the CEOs saw it, the Theory
X manager makes all the important decisions himself, the Theory Y manager uses a participative approach, allowing lower level subordinates input in the decision making process, and the Theory Z manager seeks a consensus on goals and on the methods of meeting them. Even from this distinctly business perspective of leadership, the trend of clustering leadership behavior around the dichotomy of task and person orientation is evident.

Finally in the Social Exchange scheme is the Manz and Sims (1980) study of Social Learning Theory and self-management. They found that the greater the degree of self-management on the part of an employee (subordinate), the less personal supervision (involvement) was required by the leader. Manz and Sims interpret this as an implication of task orientation through subordinate self-motivation, because goal setting and personal criteria and standards for task completion are internalized. Conversely, the less self-management exhibited on the part of the subordinate, the greater the involvement on the part of the leader. Manz and Sims contend that this represents learned behavior for the subordinate:

A social learning theory view of employee behavior recognizes the influence of reinforcement contingencies on the behavior of employees within organizations (1980:361).
In this particular theory, the task/person orientation dichotomy can be derived from a perspective of relative autonomy. Manz and Sims believe a subordinate finds the involvement level of the supervisor either rewarding or punishing based on how much self-management the subordinate demonstrates. I see this as clearly a case of the subordinate finding expressive value in possessing the autonomy to be self-determinate and little value in losing decision making freedom. The similarity to the subordinate responses to autocratic and democratic styles of leadership behavior are apparent. So too can the task and person orientations be seen. The leader who closely supervises is concerned with task completion by a subordinate who does not demonstrate consistent proficiency. On the other hand, the supervisor who does not perceive a need to constantly supervise may shift focus to seeing to the needs of his subordinates so that impediments to their work, which they have demonstrated proficiency in, are kept to a minimum.

From the Group Dynamics scheme, I have selected Gioia and Sims's (1985) study of Implicit Leadership Theory, and House and Baetz's (1979) description of the Rational Decision Making Theory to demonstrate task and/or person orientations. It is in these theories that the dichotomy is displayed as found in the literature from my research.
In their study of Implicit Leadership Theory, Gioia and Sims question the objectivity of the questionnaire used to measure respondent perceptions concerning leader behavior. Their purpose was, through close examination, to make actual leader behavior as objective as possible, resulting in a reduction of bias in questionnaires. They used the variables consideration and initiating structure and found that clustering in this manner showed a bias in initiating structure and hence reflected in the questionnaires used to support the theory. Gioia and Sims believe their finding implies that leadership is not conducive to simple theory building and suggest moving beyond consideration and initiating structure as these are tired and outlived. They recommend questions that correspond directly to a specific behavior as the most accurate means of measuring leader behavior.

The Rational Decision Making Theory represents a systematic approach for leaders to use in narrowing down a given number of possibilities to the selection of one best choice, which is either task or person oriented, to solve a particular problem. The model consists of seven decision rules, seven problem attributes, and twenty-three problem types. The leader follows a three-step approach which results in the presentation of his best option. He first applies the seven rules and determines feasible
approaches. He then selects the single most suitable approach to the situation (House and Baetz, 1979). According to the theory, this approach will dictate how autocratic or participatory the leader's decision or type of action will be. This theory represents a familiar approach to the theme that the more autocratic a leader is, the more is suggested a task orientation, and the more participatory, the greater the suggestion of person orientation. Once again, little resolution toward the explanation of leadership is offered. What is demonstrated with this theory is a familiar theme that attempts to limit human error by limiting the number of possible choices.

Crouch and Yetton (1988) conducted a study based on existent theories that examined leadership behavior from a contact perspective. Their contention is that managers sustain different relationships with subordinates based on task performance. Where performance is low, managers are high on initiating structure and low on contact, limiting association with subordinates to the necessary instructions to accomplish the task. Where performance is high, managers are high on consideration and high on contact. Contact in this case is not social in nature. Crouch and Yetton suggest support for Homan's Theory of Group
Dynamics in that task performance contributes to the development of an in-group, out-group situation.

In the Interactionist scheme, the theories that demonstrated the dichotomy were Hersey and Blanchard's Life Cycle Theory, Path-Goal Theory, and Contingency Theory. Cribbin's (1981) description of the Life-Cycle Theory directly emphasizes the two inherent dimensions of concern for task (productivity) and concern for relationships (people). In this theory, leader behavior is a function of subordinate ability, which Hersey and Blanchard refer to as maturity. This is defined more specifically as subordinate skill level and level of willingness. Graeff (1983) examined this theory critically, citing weaknesses in application in that the model is incapable of handling all circumstances. In this regard, Graeff's position supports Gioia and Sims and their contention that the dichotomy is starting to approach the end of its usefulness.

In his discussion of Path-Goal Theory, Cribbin (1981) demonstrates how the dichotomy has been expanded. According to Path-Goal Theory, the leader engages in four types of behavior which are situation dependent. The first is instrumental, in which the leader organizes the work flow. The second is supportive, in which the leader is warm, helpful and facilitates subordinates'
efforts to achieve. The third is participative, in which the leader incorporates the participation of the group in decision making and problem solving; and the fourth is achievement orientation, in which the leader sets challenging and meaningful objectives for the group and displays confidence in his subordinates' abilities to carry them out. In spite of the differences in the four behaviors, instrumental and achievement oriented can be subsumed under task orientation and supportive and participative can be subsumed under person orientation. Here again, the general direction lies in the familiar orientations developed by the Ohio State and Michigan studies. Path-Goal Theory is another example of taking the more general dichotomy and expanding its implications.

Fielder (1978) based his Contingency Theory on the premise that leaders are basically fixed in their orientation to either task or person and that the situation determines success, not use. He found support for his theory in a follow-up study he conducted. His subjects were twenty-eight army squad leaders in a new division, general managers of consumer cooperative organizations, and elementary and secondary school principals. All started with low experience and yielded moderate situational control. When he reevaluated after a period of time in which these leaders were allowed to
become accustomed to their environments (improved situation), he found that the higher level of experience contributed to a higher level of situational control. Although Fiedler's theory is a unique approach, and probably the most comprehensive of the interactionist theories in that it clearly incorporates the trait and zeitgeist approaches, it distinctly exhibits the pattern found throughout these theories of a task or person orientation of leader behavior.
IV.
DISCUSSION

How can the theories in the contemporary literature be applied to further the study of leadership and make leaders better? To answer this question, I will discuss the results of my research in terms of my past leadership and followership experiences, the implications for teaching leadership as an academic subject and, finally, its application in future positions of leadership.

Past Experiences

As I mentioned in the preface, my experiences, for the most part, center on the time I have spent in the army. All of this time has been as a commissioned officer and included positions that have ranged from action officer (follower role only) to commander (leader and follower role). The formal training I received in leadership was virtually nonexistent. I was not actually confronted with formal instruction on the subject until I was in my fourth year of service and attending the advanced course in my branch. Even in this setting, the curriculum did not include a study of theory. In reality, it was a catchall department for course requirements that did not fit anywhere else, such as the new writing
requirement and a training management program. Ethics was the only topic that remotely approached leadership and then it was only with regard to the responsibilities of leaders. As far as leadership is incorporated in doctrinal manuals, FM 22-100 LEADERSHIP is the only one.

It is not my intent to present a negative situation where the instruction of leadership is concerned. First, where officers are concerned, most leadership subjects are covered in pre-commissioning. At the United States Military Academy, cadets receive instruction about specific theories of leadership and the implications of each.² In Reserve Officer Training Corps programs, leadership, and reference to specific theories thereof, is also taught as an academic subject. By the time a subject reaches the doctrinal manual stage, its intended use has moved from study to application. This is good reason not to have more than one manual in the field. The drawback of this approach, and a small price to pay, is that the manual must be written in such a manner as to be clearly understood by all or certainly a vast majority of its readers. FM 22-100 is not written on the college or

² See the next section of this chapter entitled Teaching.
advanced high school level but does, in this sense, allow for greater dissemination of the doctrinally based dominant perspective of leadership theory.

By far the biggest teacher for me has been experience. As I researched this thesis, I drew immediate comparisons between what I was reading in these theories and what I had experienced in twelve years' service. All of the theories were appropriate in isolated instances, but none of these explained every situation. This was never more the case than with Vertical Dyad Linkage Theory and my experiences as a battery commander. Before I studied this theory, I attributed the fact that my decisions were always popular with some, unpopular with others, and made no difference to the rest to the belief that you really cannot please all of the people even some of the time. Even when I gave the entire unit the day off, there was usually one section chief who wanted to finish something with his soldiers first. I now see the usefulness of this theory in helping explain this circumstance. The more I think about it, the more I realize that I really did establish a relationship with each soldier in the manner described by the theory. This theory, however, was not always useful for explaining my behavior.
Hersey and Blanchard's Life Cycle Theory, shortcomings notwithstanding, is the best explanation of leader behavior in my experiences. The army is extremely task oriented. Training and execution at both the individual and collective level are based on tasks specific to the individual soldier's specialty and the mission of the particular unit (support, artillery, maneuver, etc.). Leader involvement in both training and execution is a function of subordinate maturity. This maturity is expressed in four levels: high will, high skill; high will, low skill; low will, high skill; and low will, low skill. The leader's involvement, as the theory predicts, varies depending on the level demonstrated by either the subordinate or the unit or both. This holds true for all levels of leadership.

The breakdown of this theory occurs when the levels of maturity are unclear at group level and approach the margins of individual performance. It also doesn't account for an erratic motivational level on the part of the individual soldier. They don't fall into one category and move through the cycle in the somewhat ideal fashion suggested by the model. The reality of soldier behavior is much more dynamic. This results in leader behavior that is not always consistent with the dictates of the theory. Leaders in the military get close to their
soldiers and express frustrations and behaviors not unlike parents.

My experiences with effective leadership do not support Contingency Theory according to Fiedler's intent. Though his least preferred coworker rating may be accurate, his contention that our orientations are fixed and that the situation determines effectiveness has not been the case. In my case and in that of other leaders I have had and observed, effective leadership was derived by adapting to the situation. The best leaders were not excellent but solidly good in all situations. They were able to shift between the two orientations to the degree required and, in many of my situations, demonstrate both at the same time. Sometimes taking care of soldiers means kicking them in their metaphoric asses and autocratically dictating that they put their protective mask on. I seldom saw or had a leader who was primarily fixed as the theory contends.

My most vivid recollection of the living reality of the dichotomy of task and person orientation of leadership behavior and its effects on subordinates was as a Brigade Fire Support Officer. I had sixteen officers who worked for me. This group comprised half of the existent officer corps of the battalion. Before I had taken this post, these officers were exposed to a strict task orientation.
They occupied a second-class standing in an unwritten social structure that has developed as a group norm in this type of unit. Having been in their position as a junior officer, I was intent on changing their self-perception and the perceptions of those outside our organization. My plan was to work through the officers in hopes that the effect would spread to the soldiers.

Contrary to Homan's Theory of Group Dynamics, these guys did not formulate an in-group perception of themselves. They were down. In order to execute this plan, I had to reduce the amount of attention I devoted to task orientation and concentrate on person oriented items such as job enrichment for the officers and noncommissioned officers, ensure equity on duty rosters and develop activities through training that contributed to team unity. I found that this worked well. Once the focus changed from do, do, do to self-determination and equity, the tasks were not a problem. Path-Goal Theory immediately comes to mind.

I am now more certain than ever that, to date, no theory adequately explains my past experiences. Although I was previously incapable of articulating them in theoretical terms, their impact is unchanged. Having the benefit of my past experiences and this study, I am more
optimistic than ever about instruction and future applications of leadership.

**Instruction**

The results of my research and, more specifically, my findings present clear implications for the instruction of leadership. The field is sufficiently diverse to provide more than an adequate supply of information to accomplish any level of instructional objective. Leadership has been studied long enough for a number of perspectives to have formed, dominated, and faded, leaving a clear trace of what has already been accomplished and what is yet to be explored. Theories of leadership have been and are extensive enough to isolate specific aspects of human interaction attributed to leader behavior, thus allowing for instructional objectives of a very specific nature. At either the macro or micro level of analysis, the instruction of leadership is limited only by the willingness of the instructor and, where training is concerned, the imagination of the trainer.

At the macro level, the historical review of leadership theory provides a sound basis for a discussion of the phenomenon and a starting point for a move toward discussions of a more specific nature. I used this approach while teaching a leadership course. It proved
helpful from my perspective in that I was able to communicate my topic more effectively, and helpful to my students in that it provided a basis of understanding of how this phenomenon is conducive to study using the scientific method.

At the micro level, my students were able to read about first-hand application of one of the theories in the course textbook. Malone's (1983) work on leadership contains an in-depth discussion of the application of Hersey and Blanchard's Life Cycle Theory. Of special value in this work are Malone's suggestions on how to handle soldiers who demonstrate a particular level of maturity as stipulated by the theory. As an instructor or trainer, it is difficult to conceive of a more concise discussion of a theory of leadership and methods of practical application. The same is true for those in positions of leadership. Malone's work provides an example of bridging academic study with practical application.

The other implications for instruction are based on my findings. First, the finding that leadership can be either primary or secondary, depending on its use, provides parameters for keeping the phenomenon in perspective. Acknowledging the fact that the study of leadership is not in itself a task with a beginning and an
ending allows for greater acceptance and clearer understanding of the fact that the academic study of this phenomenon is by no means complete or near completion. In fact, my analysis suggests that from a theory-generating perspective, the study of leadership is taking a breather. The contemporary literature suggests that the existent theories are in a state of analysis and review. This second finding is not necessarily a delay or negative indication of the level of energy currently devoted to this subject. Quite the contrary. This reflective approach often yields the type of answer necessary for determination of the next step forward.

My third finding of a general pattern of task and person orientations in the theories provides an excellent foundation for instructing leadership. No two theories use these orientations alike, and some not at all. But in the process of teaching future leaders, what could be more valuable than the presentation of these theories as situational explanations and outlining the contentions of each with regard to leader orientation? As I look back on my experiences as a leader and an instructor of leadership, I have feelings of regret that I was not presented with and did not present this approach.
**Application**

The contemporary literature contains theories of leadership that favor a situational determination of leader behavior. This information is valuable to a leader who anticipates confronting numerous challenging situations of leadership. Forearmed with an understanding of the contemporary state of leadership study, a leader, present or future, can develop a systematic approach to the successful execution of his office and leadership of his subordinates. The first step is an environmental assessment. The interactionist theories of leadership represent a synthesis of the trait and zeitgeist theories. This implies an assessment by the leader of himself, his subordinates and the task or tasks to be accomplished (situation). In spite of individual shortcomings, a comprehensive assessment of this nature, with emphasis on the particular situation, presents a logical set of options upon which to apply a given theory. This particular method of analyzing a situation beforehand is based on the most current findings in the field and is better than guessing or reacting. Its greatest value lies in the leader's foreknowledge of predicted behavior. If the leader knows the predictions based on the theory, his chances of leading more effectively are greater. For example: predicting the response to close supervision may
or may not change how closely the leader supervises. The point, however, is that he is aware of this beforehand and is capable of effecting the outcome from a position of logic and not luck.

This process for application of leadership theories is cyclical. No situation is complete without a review of the events that have transpired. What worked and what did not? It is incumbent upon the leader to accept all feedback, constantly reflect on past performance, and refine the procedure for future use. None of these steps, however, is effective if interpersonal communication is not open and frank. As I have stated, my experiences of leadership consistently indicate that the study of this phenomenon is helpful but inconclusive. There is more work to be done. A process of application means real people are involved. There is more to an order or command than its issuance. It must be clearly understood and the subsequent action performed correctly. Without clear, concise communication, up and down between leader and subordinates, this process has little chance of success.
V.
CONCLUSION

The most effective way to conclude this analysis is once again to offer my findings and conclusions. The literature reviewed here is quite clear in presenting leadership as both a primary and secondary phenomenon of study, a field that is in a state of review, and a phenomenon with a pattern of task and person orientation as its theoretical basis of explanation. There are, however, two sides to every story. What did I miss in my analysis?

Pondy (1978) supports my finding of a dichotomous pattern and suggests a new point of departure:

I believe we have sacrificed the creative aspect of leadership for its programmatic aspects. Shouldn't we be trying to document the variety of leadership strategies, rather than trying to collapse it into a few constraining categories? (p. 90) . . . the fundamental flaw of all leadership theories--the failure to recognize the creative unboundedness of leadership acts (p. 91).

Badaracco and Ellsworth (1989) offer a conclusion based on an analysis of leadership from a business perspective:

We conclude that to be most effective, managers should avoid the seductions of the "style" school. Instead they should strive to be consistent across situations and their behavior should be constant with their
personalities, beliefs and judgements. Furthermore, managers should approach the situations they face with a specific set of predispositions or prejudices (p. 199).

Lastly, House and Baetz (1979) conclude their analysis with a summation of where they see the study of leadership leading:

Thus, the current prevailing paradigm in leadership research is a contingency paradigm. That is, it is now commonly accepted that the most fruitful approach to the study of leadership is a "situational" or contingency approach. According to this view, it is necessary to specify the conditions or situational parameters that moderate the relationship between leader behavior and criteria. Further, it has also been found that the traits associated with leadership have differential impact on the behavior and effectiveness of leaders, depending on various aspects of the situation (p. 348).

As I have stated in my analysis from the perspectives of professional leader and teacher, the contemporary state of leadership study presents a varied level of usefulness. Situational, yes. Conclusive, no. The present value in theories of leadership lies in their usefulness for present application and in presenting a viable course for the continued study of this phenomenon.

It is my hope that this thesis, in some small way, has contributed to charting that new course. My objective was to analyze the contemporary literature on leadership,
to assess its potential application for teaching and future positions of leadership and, in so doing, create a reference for continued use by me and future readers. The analysis has assisted me in preparation for my future endeavors. The only other degree of usefulness that I could ask of these theories is that they also help others in theirs.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources


References


VITA

Robert Darrell Schwartzman


In preparation for assignment in June 1990 as an instructor in the Behavioral Sciences and Leadership Department, United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, the author entered the College of William and Mary as a graduate student in the Department of Sociology. While at William and Mary, the author presented a paper entitled "The Effects of Autocratic Leadership on the Small Group in the Military" to the Southern Sociological Society in Norfolk, Virginia, April 1989 and taught a course in Advanced Management and Leadership, Fall semester 1989.

The course requirements for M.A. degree have been completed, but not the thesis: "Theories of Leadership: A Contemporary Analysis 1975-1989."