Leadership and Management

JOSEPH C. ROST

Confusing leadership and management and treating the words as if they were synonymous have a long and illustrious history in leadership studies. The practice is pervasive in the mainstream literature of leadership. It is pervasive in all academic disciplines where one can find the literature of leadership. As has been shown in the discussion of the definitions of leadership since the 1930s, leadership scholars instilled the values from the industrial paradigm into their understanding of leadership and equated leadership with good management. Many scholars and practitioners went even further and equated leadership with management.

Some scholars, including myself, have had serious conceptual problems with using leadership and management as synonymous words. These authors have written books, chapters, and articles in which they have argued that leadership is not the same as management, but these works have had little impact on the mainstream of literature or practice of leadership. The melding of these concepts and understanding leadership as good management still dominated leadership studies at the end of the 1980s (see Badaracco & Ellsworth, 1989; Bennis,

1989a, 1989b; Cohen, 1990; Conger, 1989a; De-Pree, 1989; Hunt, Baliga, Dachler, & Schriesheim, 1988; Immegart, 1988; Janis, 1989; Kotter, 1988; Nanus, 1989; Ridge, 1989; Sergiovanni, 1990; Smith & Peterson, 1988; Yukl, 1989; Zaleznik, 1989). The industrial paradigm of leadership is still holding strong.

A postindustrial school of leadership must come to terms with this issue, and that is the purpose of this chapter. After some discussion of previous attempts to distinguish between leadership and management, most of which have not been successful, I propose a new framework that uses the essential elements of the definitions of leadership and management to make a clear separation between the two concepts.

Some Attempts to Distinguish Between Leadership and Management

There were only a few serious attempts to deal with the leadership is management syndrome prior to 1978, when Burns rethought the concept of leadership, and the late 1980s, when a number of

scholars called for a different approach to understanding leadership.

The first such attempt I have found was by Selznick (1957) in his marvelous little book *Leadership in Administration*. He wrote:

> *Leadership is not equivalent to office-holding or high prestige or authority or decision-making.* It is not helpful to identify leadership with whatever is done by people in high places. The activities we have in mind may or may not be engaged in by those who are formally in positions of authority. This is inescapable if we are to develop a theory that will be useful in diagnosing cases of inadequate leadership on the part of persons in authority. If this view is correct, it means that only some (and sometimes none) of the activities of decision-makers are leadership activities. Here again, understanding leadership requires understanding of a broader social process. If some types of decisions are more closely related to leadership activities than others, we should learn what they are. To this end in this analysis let us make a distinction between "routine" and "critical" decision-making. (p. 24)

Selznick devoted an entire chapter in the book to fleshing out the distinction between routine and critical decision making, between management and leadership.

Jacobs (1970), in a very thoughtful book that was not widely read but should have been, devoted considerable space to distinguishing between leadership and management. Toward the end of this book, he wrote: "Perhaps the most important conclusion reached in this work is the importance of distinguishing between the concepts of leadership, power, and authority and of identifying superordinate role behaviors that constitute each" (p. 341). Jacobs gave one-sentence definitions of each of the terms, and they contained discrete elements that an analyst could use to distinguish among them. "Authority [management] resides in the relationships between positions in an organization, and is derived from consensually validated role expectations for the position incumbents involved" (p. 231). "Leadership is taken as an interaction between persons in which one presents information of a sort and in such a manner that the other becomes convinced that his outcomes (benefits/costs ratio) will be improved if he behaves in the

manner suggested or desired" (p. 232). "Power is defined . . . as the capacity to deprive another needed satisfaction or benefits, or to inflict 'costs' on him for noncompliance with an influence attempt" (p. 230).

Katz and Kahn (1966/1978) articulated a distinction between leadership and management that has had some currency among leadership scholars, especially psychologists: "One common approach to the definition of leadership is to equate it with the differential exertion of influence. . . . We maintain . . . that every act of influence on a matter of organizational relevance is to some degree an act of leadership. . . . We consider the essence of organizational leadership to be the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with routine directives of the organization" (pp. 302-303). Management, obviously, is the mechanical compliance of people in organizations with routine directives. A variation in this theme is that leadership is the use of influence and management is the use of authority. In the 1970s, quite a few authors actually used this distinction in their works, but they often failed to remain true to their definitions in their research and in their discussion of leadership after the definitions were given.

Graham (1988) followed up on this distinction.

> Definitions of leader-follower relationships typically draw a distinction between voluntary acceptance of another's influence, on the one hand, and coerced compliance, on the other (Graham, 1982; Hunt, 1984; Jacobs, 1971 [*sic*]; Jago, 1982; Katz & Kahn, 1966/1978). That distinction rests on the degree of free choice exercised by followers. Specific instances of obedience which stem from fear of punishment, the promises of rewards, or the desire to fulfill contractual obligations are examples not of voluntary followership but of subordination, and the range of free choice available to subordinates is relatively small. Appropriate labels for the person giving orders, monitoring compliance, and administering performance contingency rewards and punishments include "supervisor" and "manager," but *not* "leader." (p. 74)

Zaleznik (1977) attempted to distinguish between leaders and managers in a celebrated article published in the *Harvard Business Review*. In that article as well as his 1989 book, he equates man-

agement with managers and leadership with leaders, so his distinction between management and leadership is based on the personality differences of managers and leaders. "Managers and leaders differ fundamentally in their world views. The dimensions for assessing these differences include managers' and leaders' orientations toward their goals, their work, their human relations, and their selves" (1977, p. 69). Using William James's two basic personality types, Zaleznik suggested that managers are "once-born" and leaders are "twice-born." He used a trait approach to distinguish between leaders and managers, and consequently between leadership and management.

There are contextual indications in Burns (1978) that he did distinguish between leadership and management, but they are more or less hidden in the text. The index in his book does not contain an item labeled "management" or one labeled "leadership and management." There is a section titled "Bureaucracy Versus Leadership" (pp. 295-302), but the material in those pages is not helpful in trying to distinguish between leadership and management (or authority, as Burns called it).

Several commentators, including myself, have reinterpreted Burns's model of leadership to be, in reality, a model of management *and* leadership. This reinterpretation states quite simply that Burns's transactional leadership is management, and his transformational leadership is leadership, and the difference between the two is the distinction between leadership and management. Enochs (1981), in a very popular article in the *Phi Delta Kappan,* stated this reinterpretation very well: "Transactional leadership is managerial and custodial; it is competent but uninspired care-taking for a quiet time. Transformational leadership is a more lofty undertaking. It is not a trade-off for survival between leader and followers during good times, but rather a process for achieving fundamental changes in hard times" (p. 177).

The same point was made in a reaction paper by Jill Graham (1988) to Avolio and Bass's presentation on transformational leadership and charisma at a leadership symposium:

The distinction between transactional and transformational leadership in the Avolio & Bass chapter

bears a striking resemblance to what is now a well-established difference between supervision and leadership. Certainly, a transactional leader's use of contingent reinforcements is nothing more than supervision. Research on supervision, moreover, is in the same conceptual category as theories of organizational control and the operant paradigm for employee motivation (Jago, 1982, p. 330). Only transformational leadership occupies a conceptual category that is independent of these topics, that is, leadership standing alone. (pp. 74-75)

In personal conversations with Burns in 1989, he made it very clear to me that he does not agree with this reinterpretation of his conceptual framework of leadership. He has continued to hold the view that transactional leadership is leadership, not management, and his views on that subject are quite strongly held.

Dubin wrote a stinging critique of leadership research in 1979 that to some extent dealt with the distinction between leadership and management.

Another observation: 3) the ease with which the concept of *leadership* is treated as a synonym for *management and supervision.* This is amazing. My knowledge of organizational behavior has led me to the conclusion that effective organization can be managed and supervised and *not* led, while some ineffective organizations can be led into their difficulties without the benefit of management and supervision.

This leads to my first conclusion: Leadership is a rare phenomenon, not a common one in organizational behavior. Those who proposed to *observe* leadership behavior as their methodology for study to gain knowledge (an orientation I applaud), will find that tracking managers to record their every behavior will produce relatively little data on leadership. . . . The first cut at such data mass will consist of sorting it into two piles; the small stack of leadership acts, and the very large pile of acts of managing and supervising.

. . . In my view, the central problem has to do with the reluctance, or inability, to specify the dimensionality of the leadership phenomena. We have even succeeded in confusing "leadership" with other social behaviors as my predecessor in this "overview" role, Miner, did when he boldly proposed to substitute "control" for the concept of leadership (Miner, 1975). We have failed in handling the dimensionality prob-

lem by focusing on some of the wrong dimensions of leadership and ignoring others.

One major problem that has preoccupied American social science has been the formulation of leadership as an interpersonal phenomenon. This has been a major shortcoming in the study of leadership. . . . There are face-to-face relations between a leader and followers. But it should also be evident that there are situations of leadership which do not involve face-to-face relations with followers. Furthermore, there are many face-to-face relations between supporters and subordinates that *do not* involve leadership in the ongoing interaction. . . .

I believe that the primary emphasis of the work in this volume is on leadership in face-to-face relationships. I will boldly propose: There may be many significant findings among the studies [in this book], but in the broad span of human affairs, they are largely trivial findings because they fail to address leadership *of* organization. (pp. 225-227)

Tucker (1981) used the Selznick dichotomy to distinguish between leadership and management. Defining a political leader as "one who gives direction, or meaningfully participates in the giving of direction, to the activities of a political community" (p. 15), Tucker suggested that "one might argue that even in ordinary, day-to-day group life, when no great uncertainties exist, groups are in need of being directed. But such routine direction might better be described as *management*, reserving the term *leadership* for the directing of a group at times of choice, change, and decision, times when deliberation and authoritative decision occur, followed by steps to implement decisions reached" (p. 16).

Bennis has long held that leadership is different from management. In 1977 he wrote: "Leading does not mean managing; the difference between the two is crucial. I know many institutions that are very well managed and very poorly led" (p. 3). Similar statements appear in many of his other articles and books. In their 1985 book, Bennis and Nanus wrote:

The problem with many organizations, and especially the ones that are failing, is that they tend to be over-managed and underled. . . . They may excel in the ability to handle the daily routine, yet never question whether the routine should be done at all. There is a

profound difference between management and leadership, and both are important. "To manage" means "to bring about, to accomplish, to have change of or responsibility for, to conduct." "Leading" is "influencing, guiding in direction, course, action, opinion." The distinction is crucial. *Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing.* The difference may be summarized as activities of vision and judgment—*effectiveness* versus activities of mastering routines—*efficiency.* (p. 21)

Other paragraphs on other pages in the book deliver essentially the same message.

A persistent theme of the 1980s literature on leadership is an attempt to label as leadership those management processes which produce excellence in organizational outcomes and which leave the meaning of management to include all the other management processes that produce less than excellent outcomes. Leadership is excellence management; management is doing anything less than excellence. This distinction, of course, is simply a restatement of the industrial paradigm of leadership that upgrades good management to excellent management.

An Evaluation of the Attempts to Distinguish Leadership From Management

While the attempts to distinguish between leadership and management listed in the last section are admirable, and while a few scholars actually get at substantive differences, the attempts are as a whole more or less weak in giving scholars and practitioners the conceptual ability to make such a distinction. Generally, the distinctions are perfunctory and poorly constructed, and the criteria given to make the distinction are often too general and too ambiguous for people to use with any accuracy in real life or in research. Another problem is that many of the distinctions given by scholars are distinctions of personality traits and behaviors of leaders and managers, not differences in the processes or relationships that get at the nature of leadership and management. There is a pervasive tendency among these scholars to equate lead-

ership with leaders, confusing a process with a person, which, in the end, doubles the confusion present in the use of the words *leadership* and *management* as synonyms.

The other problem, of course, is that these scholars were swimming against the tide of the mainstream concept of leadership as embedded in the industrial paradigm: Leadership is good management. These authors had a very difficult time making their case. They were generally ignored, and so the distinctions were not pursued and developed. They had a difficult time gaining collaborators. And, it is important to remember that leadership as a field of study was often a sideline for these scholars; their main scholarly interest was more connected to their primary academic discipline.

Worse yet is that most of the authors mentioned have paid little attention to their own distinction. It was not uncommon for an author to make the distinction in an early chapter and then ignore it in the other chapters of the book. Using Argyris's (1976) framework to make sense of such inconsistencies, one could state that these authors developed theories of leadership that espoused a difference between leadership and management, but their theories-in-use reflected the industrial paradigm, which equated leadership with good management. Selznick and Jacobs are the major exceptions; they were able to use the words *leadership* and *management* consistently throughout their books.

Bryman (1986) noted the same tendency, and he criticized leadership scholars for not paying attention to the distinction.

It would seem important to maintain a distinction between a leader who is in a leadership position and who has power and authority vested in his or her office, and leadership as an influence process which is more than the exercise of power and authority. . . . However, . . . a great deal of leadership research rides roughshod over these distinctions. Studies abound on the subject of the behavior of leaders in which the strategy involves discerning the activities of people in positions of leadership, with little reference to how these activities might be indicative of leadership *per se* as distinct from the exercise of power and authority. (p. 4)

Unfortunately, Bryman ignored his own critique: "It is necessary to hold many of these terminological difficulties in abeyance and the remainder of the book will focus on what, in the author's view, is generally taken to be the study of leadership in organizations" (p. 16).

Wilpert (1982) did the same kind of turnaround in response to three papers at a leadership symposium.

What should be noted right at the outset . . . is the terminological uncertainty in all three contributions [papers presented at the symposium] with respect to the use of the terms "leader" and "manager." Although some difference of kind is even implied in the titles of two of the presentations (Steward; Lombard & McCall), not one of the three contributions elaborate [*sic*] the distinctions, in fact, all use the two terms synonymously. So I will follow suit and assume for purposes of discussion that managers always perform some leadership function due to their organizational position. (pp. 68-69)

Schon (1984) did exactly the same thing in his presentation at another symposium. "Leadership and management are not synonymous terms, one can be a leader without being a manager. . . . Conversely, one can manage without leading. . . . Nonetheless, we generally expect managers to lead, and criticize them if they fail to do so. Hence, for the purposes of this essay, I shall treat management and leadership as though they were one" (p. 36).

Lombardo and McCall (1982) show how much the industrial concept of leadership has penetrated even highly sophisticated centers on leadership. They worked at the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina during the 1980s. (McCall left the Center in the late 1980s.) The Center is a multimillion-dollar operation that employs some 100 professional researchers and trainers "to encourage and develop creative leadership and effective management for the good of society overall" (from the Center's mission statement).

In the early 1980s, Lombardo and McCall produced an elaborate simulation called "Looking Glass, Inc.," which has been one of the cornerstones of the Center's leadership/management training programs. The authors made a presen-

tation at the 1982 leadership symposium in which they stated:

> This chapter is based on a day in the life of a glass manufacturing company and the 30 leaders who run it. . . .
>
> It was with this inherent belief—that management or leadership only makes sense when viewed in its entirety—that a complex simulation was designed for use in leadership research. Its goals were both clear and fuzzy: to mirror as realistically as possible the demands of a typical managerial job in a complex organization, to have actual managers run the simulated company as they chose, and to bring multiple methods to bear on learning something new about leadership. By watching a day in the life of managers dealing with the complexity and chaos of organizations, we hoped to develop some more pertinent questions to guide future research on what leadership is, and how and when it matters. (pp. 50-51)

Notice the equation of leaders with managers, and the equation of leadership with what managers do. Lombardo and McCall clearly state that if a person studies a day (or several days) in the life of a manager (or several managers), he/she will certainly understand leadership better. The industrial concept of leadership has seldom been articulated more forcefully.

Actually, the brochures from the Center for Creative Leadership publicizing the Looking Glass simulation are considerably more accurate in describing the simulation.

> Looking Glass, a robust simulation of managerial action, is beginning its second decade and gaining worldwide use for one critical reason: It teaches the lessons that matter. What lessons? How managers react to constantly changing environments. How they make decisions, set priorities, network and communicate to get the job done. . . . Looking Glass puts managers in the middle of the chaos of managerial life and lets them . . . examine how well they did and how they might do better. (Center for Creative Leadership, n.d., p. 1)

Notice that the words *leader* and *leadership* are never used in the description.

The same cannot be said about the trainers who use Looking Glass in the Center-sponsored workshops. I attended a one-day, introductory session of the Looking Glass simulation in 1989, and the equation of management and leadership was pervasive. The simulation as I experienced it on that day had almost nothing to do with leadership as I define the word. The whole thing was relatively straightforward and the simulation delivered exactly what the brochure promised: insights into enlightened management. However, the trainers had a different view entirely. They thought that they were delivering insights into enlightened leadership (since they were imbued with the industrial view that leadership is good management), and they definitely wanted the workshop participants to take home the idea that the Looking Glass simulation was about leadership.

Allison (1984) took another strategy in articulating the industrial view of leadership. He rejected outright the notion that scholars need to distinguish leadership from management, and then proceeded to ignore any definitional problems that position might have on his understanding of leadership. After discussing five "leadership" authors who claimed to have discovered "the essence of the concept" of leadership, Allison opined that "one might conclude that 'administrative leadership' is, in fact, an oxymoron—a contradiction in terms" (p. 215). Then, he concluded: "I find the claims of these authors to have isolated the 'real thing' ultimately unpersuasive" (p. 217). So what does Allison do?

> For the purpose of this discussion, I cannot hope to surmount these formidable obstacles [definitional problems]. Thus, this paper will attempt to circumvent them by taking a less abstract, more simplistically empirical path: focusing on people playing lead roles in administrative settings. . . . Following Webster I will use the term "lead" to mean "to show the way by going in advance; to conduct, escort, or direct." Those who lead in administrative settings, I will call managers. Again, following Webster, I will use the term "management" to mean the "purposive organization and direction of resources to achieve a desired outcome." (p. 218)

The upshot of these approaches to the concepts of leadership and management is a cultural acceptance in the research community (and ultimately in

the popular press and among practitioners) of sloppy scholarship and practice, which produce conceptual frameworks that use different terms interchangeably. In a very real sense, the culture of permissiveness goes like this: "Since other scholars and practitioners confuse leadership and management, since other scholars have not come up with a definition of leadership that distinguishes it from management, I am free to do the same thing. I will also use the words *leadership* and *management, leader* and *manager,* as synonymous terms. I will also equate *leadership* with *leader* and *management* with *manager,* so there are four terms that I will equate with one another."

Some scholars defend this practice by calling it diversity of thought or academic freedom. I once challenged Fiedler at an Academy of Management conference about his view that leaders and managers are the same, a view he has consistently held since the 1960s. I asked: "How can you be sure that the managers you study in your research are actually leaders?" His answer went something like this: "My definition of a leader is as good as your definition or that of any other researcher. I believe that managers are leaders and so the managers in my studies are leaders."

Schriesheim, Hunt, and Sekaran (1982) ended the leadership symposium of that year with a ringing defense of definitional diversity. "We cherish diversity and see it as needed for our collective endeavor. . . . Our values and beliefs suggest that . . if we are to advance the field . . . we should . . . encourage diversity. . . . We want to be able to enjoy our enterprise and, at the same time, to serve constituencies of our own choosing, with products compatible with their own needs and ours" (pp. 297-298). While this statement is a stirring defense of the free market of ideas, scholarship brings with it the responsibility to critically analyze the ideas in the free market. It seems that Schriesheim, Hunt, and Sekaran want to be able to use the words *leadership* and *management* interchangeably so as to serve the self-esteem needs of the corporate manager, who, they seem to think, need to view themselves as leaders simply because they are managers. Such a position is equivalent to accepting the age-old assumption undergirding the free market framework: Let the buyer beware. I

believe that scholars have more responsibility than that.

So do practitioners. Burack (1979) summarized the interviews he had with four executives, and the interviews indicate they had some of the same difficulties with leadership research.

> Past SIU symposia, whatever their academic and intellectual merits, have been so far removed from the pressure on the practitioner as to be useless to anyone running training programs or to anyone in leadership positions. (p. 27)
>
> The implications of this observation [given in previous paragraphs, that only 25 percent of the people in any group have leadership skills] should be quite clear by now. . . . It leads to Moses' Commandment which is . . . "Thou shalt study leaders who are first *accurately identified* as leaders before attempting to build theories of leadership behavior."
>
> . . . much of our research is based on available (translate that to mean the easiest to obtain) measures. . . . There does not seem to have been a serious effort to obtain adequate samples of leaders in most of the research studies purporting to be evaluating leaders. Rather, one studies what is available. Sometimes these are college sophomores, sometimes these are managers—rarely, however, are the subjects of intensive analysis evaluated to determine if they have the skills we are trying to study. (p. 32)

The leadership research reported in the 1982 symposium did not pass the Bill and Barbara test developed by Mintzberg (1982) from the feedback of two practitioner colleagues. What bothered Barbara the most, she wrote, "was the gnawing suspicion that the research was being carried out as an end in itself. Hence relevance was really a side issue." Bill concluded that the researchers "seemed more interested in studying the subtleties of a particular research approach—or even worse, studying other studies—than they are in contributing to a real understanding of leadership itself" (p. 243).

Evidently Barbara and Bill, as well as the four executives on whom Burack reported, thought that leadership researchers had a professional responsibility which included more than enjoying themselves and serving their own self-interests. At the same time, they stated very strongly that the products of these researchers did not meet their needs,

which goes to the heart of the argument Schriesheim, Hunt, and Sekaran (1982) used to support the free market of ideas approach to leadership studies.

Hosking and Hunt (1982) delivered a stinging critique of leadership literature at the end of the symposium. "A pervasive . . . theme [of the speakers at the symposium] concerned the meaning of the terms 'leaders' and 'leadership.' It was very apparent that people used them to mean totally different things but on the whole . . . did not seem to see this as a problem. Indeed we saw little evidence of any desire to develop a common language." On the other hand, a few other speakers "felt it was essential to distinguish clearly different aspects of leadership and between such related terms as leadership and management" (p. 280).

Later in this chapter, Hosking and Hunt summarized the approaches of the U.S. scholars to the study of leadership. First, "there seems very little interest in developing models or theories of leadership. . . . Second, when theoretical propositions are tested, they are typically concerned with the distribution of control and decision-making authority within organizations, little or no reference being made to 'leadership.' Third, there is relatively little concern with getting down to definitional problems: by not studying leaders and leadership it is possible to focus on members of organizations (usually appointed officials)" (p. 288). The coauthor of these words is the same Hunt who argued for diversity in leadership studies in the concluding chapter of the same book (Schriesheim, Hunt, and Sekaran, 1982) wherein leadership studies is likened to an ice cream manufacturer who serves up different flavors of ice cream to satisfy the varied needs of the customers. The only trouble with the metaphor is this: Ice cream manufacturers know the differences between ice cream and sherbet or frozen yogurt, but I see no evidence, even by 1990, that leadership researchers know the differences between leadership and management. The differences are in the natures of the processes (such as the differences in the nature of ice cream, sherbet, and frozen yogurt) and not in the people—their traits, styles, and behaviors—who do the processes

(not in the colors and flavors of the ice cream, sherbet, and frozen yogurt).

Increasingly, however, scholars have insisted that the old order is not good enough. Foster (1986b) flatly stated that "leadership is a construct which must be dismantled and rebuilt. The dismantling is necessary because it would appear that the future of leadership studies in social science research is bleak" (p. 3). In another book, Foster (1986a) wrote: "The concept of leadership often receives poor treatment from scholars and educators alike. Often, it is mistaken for the ability to manage small groups in accomplishing tasks; at other times, as a means for improving production. We shall argue that both views adopt a fundamentally mistaken approach to leadership insofar as they identify leadership with aspects of management" (p. 169).

Two British researchers have taken the bull by the horns, so to speak. Hosking and Morley (1988) made a serious attempt to reconstruct the concept of leadership, as Foster insisted we must do:

Our opening argument was for taking the concept of leadership seriously. This requires an explicit definition that can be employed to interpret existing literature and to direct subsequent research and theory. We argue for a definition of leaders as those who consistently contribute certain kinds of acts to leadership processes. More precisely, we define participants as leaders when they (1) consistently make effective contributions to social order and (2) are both expected and perceived to do so by fellow participants. . . . This conceptualization has three general and important implications. The first is that we prefer *not* to follow the common practice of using the terms *leader* and *manager* interchangeably. . . . In our view, studies of managerial behavior should not be assumed necessary to inform our understanding of leadership. Of course they may; however, it is always necessary to establish that the managers concerned were also leaders in the sense the term is used here. . . .

The second and related point is that the only sure means of identifying leaders is through the analysis of leadership processes. The reason, quite simply, is that leaders achieve the status as a result of their contributions, and the ways these are received, relative to the contributions of others. . . . In other words, to study leaders must be to study leadership, that is,

the process by which "social order" is constructed and changed.

Third, and last, our conceptualization recognizes that significant leadership contributions may come from a minority, including a minority of one; equally, they may be expected and contributed by the majority. (p. 90)

By our definition, it is necessary to study the processes by which particular acts come to be perceived as contributions to social order, and therefore come to be perceived as leadership acts. . . . Our conceptualization implies that these processes are endemic to leadership whether or not there are appointed managers involved. In other words, the position taken here is that leadership, properly conceived, is emergent. (p. 91)

The entire chapter must be read by anyone interested in reconstructing leadership by taking it out of its industrial moorings. This short quotation shows how differently leadership can be conceptualized when one takes the concept seriously by distinguishing between leadership and management and then putting that distinction to work consistently in a conceptual framework of leadership.

Denigrating Management to Ennoble Leadership

In 1985 I wrote a paper (Rost, 1985) called "Distinguishing Leadership and Management: A New Consensus," in which I suggested that there was a new consensus among the leadership scholars of the 1980s, namely, that leadership is fundamentally different from management and that the two words should not be used synonymously. Then I explicated a conceptual model that contrasted leadership and management according to twelve different criteria. In each case, I suggested that there is a fundamental difference between the two processes.

I presented the paper for the first time at the Organizational Development Network National Conference in 1985, and I received a largely positive response from an overflow crowd. I gave the paper at several other national conventions, and I received the same positive response. I also used it in my leadership classes, and the doctoral students generally approved of the model, many of them using it in their own training activities in various organizations.

Unfortunately, the paper was problematic on both of its major points. As the 1980s wore on and the leadership literature continued to pour off the presses, it became increasingly obvious that the predictive force of the paper was in error. A new consensus was not developing around the reinterpretation of Burns's model of leadership (transactional leadership is really management and transformational leadership is leadership). If anything, as suggested in Chapter 4, the 1980s consensus developed around a very old idea of leadership, the great man/woman theory of leadership (do the leader's wishes), and not a reconstructed notion of leadership as transformation.

Second—and the leadership doctoral students were the first to identify this problem—the twelve differences between leadership and management developed in the paper were different more in degree than in fundamental nature. Several of the twelve contrasting elements did hit upon essential elements of each process, but the overall model gave the impression that the people practicing leadership were the "good guys in white hats" and the people practicing management were the mediocre types bungling the job, the "bad guys in black hats." (*Guys* is a slang expression that in common practice is used to refer to both women and men.)

The model has a third problem. Traits and behaviors were used to explain some of the differences between leadership and management. I was very conscious of using them in writing the piece. While I didn't like using them, I didn't know of any way around that problem. This feature of the model, however, did not bother the large majority of those who read the paper because traits and behaviors were what they were used to reading about in leadership books and articles.

The good guy/bad guy scenario, however, did bother some thoughtful critics a great deal, and in the end it caused me to completely rethink the model and eventually to reject it. I had written the piece with the express purpose of not raising up

leadership and putting down management, but the paper ended up giving that impression anyway, mostly in covert ways. Such is the nature of deeply held background assumptions, even when a person expresses the opposite view to him/herself and consciously believes the opposite view.

Indeed, the good guy/bad guy view of leadership/management is pervasive in the 1980s literature on leadership. The most recent and overtly stated example of this view is in Zaleznik's (1989) book. The title of the book states the point succinctly: *The Managerial Mystique: Restoring Leadership in Business.* The managerial mystique is the bad guy, the cause of U.S. business problems in the 1980s. Leadership is the good guy, and restoring leadership is the solution to the United States' business problems. Zaleznik's book is only the most recent of such tracts. Leadership was consistently viewed as excellent management in the 1980s. That, in a nutshell, is what the excellence movement is all about.

United Technologies stuck a responsive chord with an advertisement published in numerous magazines in 1984. It was titled: "Let's Get Rid of Management," and its message was that "people don't want to be managed, they want to be led." (The advertisement was reprinted in Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 22.) H. Ross Perot is quoted in Kouzes and Posner (1987, p. xv) as expressing the same thought: "People cannot be managed. Inventories can be managed, but people must be led." The view of leadership and management presented in the advertisement and in the Perot quotation are great for symbolic mythmaking, but as a conceptual framework for understanding both leadership and management, it is dead wrong.

First of all, the universal human experience, at least in the Western world in the last few centuries, is that people do like to be managed—as long as management is not equated with dictatorship. If you want to find out how much people love management, try these simple strategies:

- Deliver the payroll checks late.
- Decrease the supplies people need to do their jobs.
- Stop any utility service people need to live or work.
- Have the buses, trains, airplanes run late.

- Eliminate stop lights on city streets.
- Deliver unworkable products to consumers.
- Tie promotions or salary raises to idiosyncratic criteria such as pleasing the whims of a supervisor.

The list could go on to include thousands of items that people have come to expect from being managed. We literally live in a managed society; management is what the industrial era is all about, and much of it is not going to change in the postindustrial era. Our civilization is so complex, it has to be managed. We have no other choice. As the saying goes, "We want our trains to run on time." And that epitomizes what managers and subordinates do when they manage.

Effective managers are a joy to behold and a pleasure to work with in any organization. People love to work for well-organized managers who facilitate getting the job done by coordinating the work of various people, and they hate to work for managers who are ineffective, uncoordinated, or incompetent. Most human beings crave order, stability, well-run programs, coordinated activity, patterned behavior, goal achievement, and the successful operation of an organization. They take pride in their ability to produce and deliver quality goods and services to consumers, and they are generally unhappy when the opposite conditions prevail. People generally like some predictability in their lives concerning the basic elements of living. That is the attraction of having the trains run on time. On the other hand, people become frustrated when they encounter poor or ineffective management, when the proverbial trains do not run on time. They vent their frustrations in many ways, from passivity and anomie to sabotage and revolution.

An example of this frustration with poor management can be seen in the revolutions in Eastern Europe in 1989-1990. The major causes of these revolutions will probably be debated for years to come. I heard a persuasive argument recently that the root cause of all the yearning for democracy was ethnic unrest. The Eastern European nations under Communist rule have never succeeded, this professor suggested, in gaining a real commitment to national unity from the various ethnic groups

through some kind of melting pot strategy. The peoples in these countries identify with their ethnic group first and with their nation second. The cry for democracy has been a cry for ethnic freedom.

Another explanation may be just as persuasive. Despite, or maybe because of, the Communist belief in a planned economy and centralized (even dictatorial) control of society and business organizations, the Eastern bloc countries were badly managed. As a result, quality goods and services wanted and needed were not delivered at all. Thus, the revolution against the Communist system could be interpreted as a revolt against bad management and the effects that it has on people's lives and work. Under the Communist system, the people had no alternatives, since everything was strictly controlled by a few people at the top. Thus, they could not replace bad managers with good managers, nor could they replace a bad system of management with a good one. The cry for freedom, then, was a cry for the freedom to select, among other things, the managers and the system of management that would provide them with the basic goods and services they had come to expect from life (and that they could easily see on television that the people of neighboring countries enjoyed). With freedom came the ability to choose one management system over another, rather than being forced to accept a management system that obviously has not been working.

If that analysis is even somewhat accurate, it shows that effective management is highly valued by people. If people are willing to risk life and limb to get rid of bad management, if people believe that the ability to obtain wanted goods and services from the effective management of business and government organizations in their societies is essential to the good life, and if they engineer revolutions, in part, to throw out bad managers and a bad management system and to have the freedom to replace them with good managers and a better management system, then management is indeed a useful process in our societies. Management is highly valued by people who do not have it operating effectively and do not have the power to change either the managers or the management system. Effective management is so widely expected as normal operating procedure in highly devel-

oped countries that it is often taken for granted. The people in Eastern Europe found they could not take it for granted.

It is time to stop the denigration of management and begin to rethink the nature of management and its necessity to the operation of our complex societies and the organizations that help make these societies function. The view that management is less than satisfactory if it is not infused with leadership is unacceptable as a conceptual framework to understand either management or leadership. That view contributes to the confusion over what leadership is and what management is. If we cannot manage effectively without leading, then certainly there is no fundamental distinction between leadership and management.

Scholars do not have to glamorize the concept of management by equating it (or good management) with the more popular concept of leadership. Management, pure and simple, is necessary and essential to the good life as we have come to experience it, and as such it has as much going for it as leadership does. It should be highly valued for what it is, not for what some authors want to make of it. Devaluing management in favor of leadership has disastrous effects in the everyday world of work and play. Human beings depend on the effective and efficient management of organizations hundreds of times every day, and that basic fact of life alone should make us want to understand the essential nature of management so as to promote and foster its widespread use in operating our organizations effectively and efficiently. Down with management and up with leadership is a bad idea.

Thus, I want to say quite forcefully that I reject the following views of leadership and management.

1. Management is ineffective unless it is equated with or infused with leadership.

2. Management is bad, leadership is good.

3. Management is a necessary but inadequate process in operating organizations. Leadership is needed at all times to operate any organization effectively.

4. Management is okay, but leadership is what makes the world go round.

5. Management is what got the United States into the mess that it is in vis-à-vis Japan and Germany and

other international go-getters. Leadership is what will get the United States out of the mess. Or, management is what got the federal government into the mess that it is in with regard to the budget deficit, and leadership is what will get the federal government out of the mess. Or, management is what got the public schools into the mess they are in regarding low student learning, dropouts, and so on, and leadership is what will get the public schools out of the mess. And so on.

The difficulty with all of these statements is that they, one and all, denigrate management and ennoble leadership. Leadership is not the answer to all the ills of our societies or their institutions and organizations. Leadership may, in some cases, be part of the answers. (Note the plural!) But management, properly understood, is also part of the answers. Any concept of leadership that dignifies leadership at the expense of management has to be defective. Exalting leadership by casting aspersions on management is an inherently flawed approach to understanding the nature of either concept.

The second problem with these statements is that they assume leadership is always good, effective, and helpful. There is, according to this view, no such thing as bad or ineffective leadership. Bad leadership is an oxymoron. Again, this approach to leadership may be adequate for symbolic myth-making, but it does not square with the lived experience of human beings since the word *leadership* came into common usage. Including an effectiveness dimension in our understanding of leadership creates all kinds of conceptual and practical problems in any attempt to come to terms with the nature of leadership. The same is true of management, except that most people do not automatically equate management with being good or effective. In both the scholarly and the popular press and among practitioners, there *is* a notion of bad management. There is no similar notion of bad leadership in most of the leadership literature and among practitioners, especially in the 1980s.

The practical results of requiring leadership to be effective or good are readily apparent. It does not work when we try to make sense out of the distinction between leadership and management.

The conceptual result of such a view is that either (1) management cannot be effective, since whenever it becomes effective, it turns into leadership, or (2) leadership must include management because leadership is management that is good. At the very least, management becomes a necessary but inadequate element in defining leadership. What, then, happens to the definition when people experience leadership in a relationship wherein no one is a manager and the process of management is not occurring? The definition quickly loses its validity.

The practical result of such a view is to require every manager to be a leader because leaders are an absolutely essential element in all notions of leadership. Being only a manager means that one is relegated to being an ineffective professional person. Thus, being a leader becomes essential to the self-concept of every manager; clearly an impossible task, if not an inhuman requirement, for many people.

Finally, such a view in effect makes leadership as a concept redundant. If leadership is good management, the concept of leadership is superfluous because management as a construct had a lengthy and illustrious linguistic history long before people started talking and writing about leadership. As we have seen, leadership as a concept is relatively new, whereas the concept of authority or management is ages old. There must be something more to leadership as a concept than redundancy.

Defining Management

If leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes, what is management? Taking a cue from the four essential elements of the definitions of leadership, I would like to suggest a corresponding definition of management. *Management is an authority relationship between at least one manager and one subordinate who coordinate their activities to produce and sell particular goods and/or services.*

From this definition, a person can identify four essential elements for a phenomenon to be labeled management:

...agement is an authority relationship.
...people in this relationship include at least one
...manager and one subordinate.
...manager(s) and subordinate(s) coordinate
...their activities.
...manager(s) and subordinate(s) produce and
...sell particular goods and/or services.

...discussion of each of these essential ele-
...follows. Since my purpose is to explicate the
...rence between leadership and management,
...explicate a full-blown model of manage-
...the discussion is limited to what is necessary
...tinguish between leadership and manage-
...

...ority Relationship

...first element is that management is a rela-
...ship based on authority. This element contains
...points.
...agement is a relationship. Many manage-
...scholars do not view management as a rela-
...ship but conceive of it as either (1) a manager
...certain behaviors, such as organizing, plan-
...staffing, communicating, motivating, con-
...ing, and decision making, or (2) the process
...reby a manager gets the job (whatever that job
...done efficiently and effectively. In both of these
...dels of management, as well as others that could
...cited, management is what the manager does.
...agement is not what both the manager and
...ordinate do, only what the manager does.
...behavior of managers is a necessary but
...ufficient explanation of the nature of manage-
...ent as a concept. The behaviors of managers
...ke no sense without the corresponding behav-
...of subordinates, and so I view management as
...elationship.
...the distinguishing feature of this relationship is
...it is based on authority. Authority is a con-
...tual (written, spoken, or implied) relationship
...erein people accept superordinate or subordi-
...ate responsibilities in an organization. By its very
...ture, authority includes the use of both coercive
...noncoercive actions. The contract allows the
...agers to tell the subordinates what to do, and
...me of the telling is coercive. Management as a

concept is built on such telling: "Sell this product for $3.95"; "Put a half-inch nut on this bolt on this part of the product"; "Do these five problems for homework tonight"; "Be at work at 7:30 A.M."; "Stop at all stop lights when they are red"; "Pay a percentage of your income for Social Security"; "Take this patient to the lab for an X-ray"; "Enter the name of the product in these 25 spaces on the bill of sale"; and so on.

Not all the behaviors in any management relationship are coercive. The point is that many of them are (while many of them may not be), and the second point is that coercive behaviors are perfectly acceptable to both managers and subordinates. While subordinates may resent some coercive behaviors—for instance, a police officer giving a person a ticket for running a red light—most subordinates accept the general pattern of coercive action in the management of organizations—for instance, a law requiring everyone to stop at red lights and police officers to enforce the law.

Manager and Subordinate

The people in the relationship called management are at least one manager and one subordinate. This is the second essential element in the definition.

Both words are in the singular because it takes at least two people to have a relationship, and we know from information readily available to anyone who looks for it that some organizations are actually managed by only two people, one being a manager and the other being a subordinate. Such organizations are not very typical any more, but they are a reality. If management actually happens in such organizations, and I believe it does, the definition must be worded to include them.

Generally speaking, however, most management relationships include one manager and several subordinates or, even more typical, numerous managers and even more numerous subordinates.

Both of these words (manager and subordinate) indicate positions within an organization. It is easy to identify who is a manager and who is a subordinate in an organization because they are positions identified on the organization chart or in a contract.

A manager is a person who is contracted to manage an organization or some part of one; a subordinate is a person who reports to the manager and is contractually required to obey the manager. To make things complicated, some people are both managers and subordinates in an organization. Teachers, for instance, are subordinates in relationship to the principal or superintendent, but they are managers in relationship to the students.

If both the manager and the subordinate are part of the relationship called management, it follows that they both are involved in management. A relationship cannot exist unless both parties contribute to it.

The contributors, however, are not necessarily equal. In fact, in management the component parts of the relationship are inherently unequal, with the manager having the dominant part and the subordinate—as the name indicates—having the subordinate part. Management is a two-way relationship that is primarily top-down as to the directives given and bottom-up as to the responses given. In more democratic or flat organizations, the two-way relationship may be more horizontal than hierarchical.

Coordination of Activities

The third essential element in the definition of management is that manager and subordinate coordinate their activities. The coordination of activities is necessary if the relationship is to achieve its purpose—the production and sale of goods and/or services. Coordinating their activities is the means whereby the manager(s) and subordinate(s) achieve their goal. Without some coordination, goods or services could not produced or sold. The goods and/or services are the result of the coordinated activities of the manager(s) and subordinate(s) who enter into the authority relationship.

Production and Sale of Particular Goods and/or Services

The manager and subordinate are in a relationship to produce and sell particular goods and/or services.

Producing and selling are the raison d'être of management. They are the heart of the relationship called management. Both are essential. Producing is the expense, and selling is the income. While some people in public organizations may think that selling is not part of the management of their organizations, since many clients or consumers might not pay for the services specifically rendered to them, such a view of public management is inaccurate. Public management involves the selling of services to the public because income to cover the expenses of the services is required for the organization not only to exist but also to prosper.

Producing and selling are the purpose of the relationship that is management. They are why people enter into the relationship. They are what the people in the relationship do. They identify what the relationship is all about. Management is a relationship established in organizations so that people can produce and sell particular goods and/or services.

Goods and/or services are also what the people in the relationship produce by their coordinated activities. Management is essential to their production. However, the relationship goes further than just production. The people in the relationship also sell these goods and/or services because they understand that focusing only on production will get them nowhere. Thus, the relationship is incomplete unless the products are sold.

The word *particular* precedes goods and/or services in the definition because the manager(s) and subordinate(s) coordinate their activities to produce and sell only certain goods and/or services, not any or all goods and services.

And/or is used in the definition because I am not certain that all managerial relationships involve both goods and services. Its use allows for some managerial relationships to produce and sell one or the other, not both. My guess is that the large majority of managerial relationships involve both.

Leadership and Management

The definition given above does not require management to be effective or ineffective, good or bad, efficient or inefficient, excellent or mediocre, and so on. All of these words are adjectives that people can apply to particular managerial relation-

ships when they evaluate the management of an organization according to stated criteria. These evaluative criteria are different from the essential elements analysts should use as criteria to determine if the phenomenon is management. Thus, there is a two-step process. First, one must determine if the phenomenon is management. Second, the analyst can then determine if the relationship that is management is effective or ineffective, good or bad, efficient or inefficient, excellent or mediocre.

The same statement can be made about leadership. The definition of leadership given in Chapter 5 does not require leadership to be effective or ineffective, good or bad, efficient or inefficient, excellent or mediocre, and so on. All of these words are adjectives that people can apply to a particular relationship that is determined to be leadership when they evaluate that relationship according to predetermined criteria. That evaluation comes after the analyst determines if the phenomenon is actually leadership. The two-step process is the same as that for evaluating management.

The essential nature of management as a relationship and that of leadership as a relationship are neutral to all such evaluative criteria. Management that is ineffective, bad, inefficient, or mediocre is still management. Leadership that is ineffective, bad, inefficient, or mediocre is still leadership. Management that is effective, good, efficient, or excellent is still management. These qualities do not transform management into leadership. The idea that good management is leadership destroys any possible clear definition of both leadership and management. Leadership as good management mixes both management and leadership into a mishmash of conceptual confusion. Out of that confusion comes our inability to distinguish leadership from management (and vice versa) and our inability to intelligently understand either concept.

Distinguishing Between Management and Leadership

Using the essential elements of the two definitions, four substantive differences between leadership and management can be ascertained. The first

TABLE 10.1 Distinguishing Leadership From Management

Leadership	Management
Influence relationship	Authority relationship
Leaders and followers	Managers and subordinates
Intend real changes	Produce and sell goods and/or services
Intended changes reflect mutual purposes	Goods/services result from coordinated activities

[handwritten annotations: "4 Attribute", "power - structure", "Influence Mechanism", "Object", "Outcome Purpose Result"]

three are clear and distinct, and scholars and practitioners can easily use them to distinguish between leadership and management. The last difference is perhaps less distinctive and is, therefore, more difficult to use in distinguishing leadership from management.

Table 10.1 presents the four differences between leadership and management in short statements. A discussion of each of these differences follows.

Influence vs. Authority Relationship

The difference is that leadership is an influence relationship and management is an authority relationship. The differences in these two kinds of relationships have to do with (1) use of coercion and (2) directionality of the attempts to impact on people.

Influence requires that coercion not be used, at least as a regular and patterned form of behavior. Authority allows the use of coercion as a regular and patterned form of behavior.

Attempts to influence other people in a leadership relationship are multidirectional. Leaders influence other leaders and followers while followers influence other followers and leaders. Attempts to use authority in a managerial relationship are unidirectional and top-down. Managers use authority to impact on subordinates, who then respond to the authoritative directive, producing the two-way relationship. While there may be more democratic relationships between managers and subordinates

these days, the basic and fundamental relationship remains top-down.

Leaders and Followers vs. Managers and Subordinates

Leaders and followers are the people involved in a leadership relationship. Subordinates can be leaders, as can managers. Managers can be followers, as can subordinates. Leaders and followers can have a relationship that includes no managers and no subordinates.

Managers and subordinates are the people involved in a managerial relationship. Followers can be managers, as can subordinates. Leaders can be subordinates, as can followers. Managers and subordinates can be involved in a relationship that includes no leaders and no followers.

The two sets of words are not synonymous. Leaders are not the same as managers. Followers are not the same as subordinates. Managers may be leaders, but if they are leaders, they are involved in a relationship different from management. Subordinates may be followers, but if they are followers, they are involved in a relationship different from management. Leaders need not be managers to be leaders. Followers need not be subordinates to be followers.

People in authority positions—presidents, governors, mayors, CEOs, superintendents, principals, administrators, supervisors, department heads, and so on—are not automatically leaders by virtue of their holding a position of authority. Being a leader must not be equated with being in a position of authority. The definition of a leader cannot include a requirement that the person be in a position of authority. Such a definition of a leader is totally inconsistent with the definition of leadership given in Chapter 5.

On the other hand, people in authority positions are automatically managers because that is the definition of a manager: a person who holds a position of authority. Being a manager must not be equated with being a leader. The definition of a manager cannot include a requirement that the person be a leader. Such a definition of a manager is totally inconsistent with both the definition of

leadership presented in Chapter 5 and the definition of management given above.

A distinction between leadership and management requires that the words *leader* and *manager,* *follower* and *subordinate,* be defined differently. The two sets of words cannot be used interchangeably.

Intending Real Change vs. Producing and Selling Goods and/or Services

Leaders and followers intend real changes, while managers and subordinates produce and sell goods and/or services.

Leadership involves an intention on the part of leaders and followers. Management involves the production and sale on the part of managers and subordinates. Intending is very different from producing and selling.

Leadership involves (intending) real changes. Management involves (producing and selling) goods and services. Leaders and followers join forces to attempt to really change something. Managers and subordinates join forces to really change the ways they produce and sell their goods/services, or really change the kind of goods/services they produce and sell, those managers and subordinates may have transformed their managerial relationship into a leadership relationship. (I say *may* because the three other essential elements must be present for there to be leadership.)

Mutual Purpose vs. Coordinated Activities

The intended changes must reflect the mutual purposes of the leaders and followers. The goods and/or services result from the coordinated activities of the managers and subordinates.

There is nothing in the definition of management about mutual purposes, so when one sees mutual purposes being forged in a relationship, that is a cue that leadership is happening. (Again, the three other essential elements have to be present.) Mutual purposes are more than independent goals mutually held. They are common purposes developed over time as followers and leaders interact in

a noncoercive relationship about the changes they intend. Leaders and followers are constantly in the process of developing mutual purposes, and their commitment to that development makes the leadership relationship different from the management relationship.

Coordinated activities, on the other hand, allow for independent goals mutually agreed upon by managers and subordinates in order to get the job done, in order to produce and sell particular goods and/or services. Coordinated activities include negotiated agreements, exchanges, transactional accommodations, and compromises. They also include telling subordinates what to do: "Barbara and Bill will watch the children eating in the cafeteria while John and Jane monitor them on the playground and Mary and Mark organize games for them in the field so that six other faculty members can eat lunch." Coordinated activities include staffing and other ways of deploying resources, making decisions about how goods are going to be made and sold and about how services are going to be delivered and sold.

None of those activities are necessary to leadership as a relationship, primarily because leadership is not about producing and selling goods and/or services. Some of these activities may not even be helpful to particular leaders and followers who intend real changes. The leadership relationship allows for a great many activities that would not be classified as coordinated activities in the ordinary sense of the term: revolution, reform, demonstration, rallies, breaking unjust laws, charismatic behaviors, intuitive decisions, behaving according to new governing assumption, ad hoc committees, disrupting coordinated activities, unplanned actions, and so on. These kinds of activities may be clues that leadership is happening and that management is not.

Of course, a leadership relationship may involve coordinated activities, but the crucial point is that these coordinated activities are not essential to leadership. They are, however, essential to management. It is impossible to conceive of people in a management relationship producing and selling goods and/or services without coordinated activities.

References

Allison, G. T. (1984). Public and private administrative leadership: Are they fundamentally alike in all unimportant respects? In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Crobally (Eds.), *Leadership and organizational culture* (pp. 214-239). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Argyris, C. (1976). *Increasing leadership effectiveness.* New York: Wiley.

Badaracco, J. L., Jr., & Ellsworth, R. R. (1989). *Leadership and the quest for integrity.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Bennis, W. G. (1977, March-April). Where have all the leaders gone? *Technological Review,* pp. 3-12.

Bennis, W. G. (1989a). *On becoming a leader.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W. G. (1989b). *Why leaders can't lead.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategy for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row.

Bryman, A. (1986). *Leadership and organizations.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Burack, E. H. (1979). Leadership findings and applications: The viewpoint of four from the real world—David Campbell, Joseph L. Moses, Paul J. Patinka, and Blanchard B. Smith. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Crosscurrents in leadership* (pp. 25-46). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Center for Creative Leadership. (n.d.). *Looking Glass, Inc.: A management simulation of a day in the life of top management.* Greensboro, NC: Author.

Cohen, W. A. (1990). *The art of the leader.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Conger, J. A. (1989a). *The charismatic leader.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art.* New York: Doubleday.

Dubin, R. (1979). Metaphors of leadership: An overview. In In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Crosscurrents in leadership* (pp. 225-238). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Enochs, J. C. (1981, November). Up from management. *Phi Delta Kappan,* pp. 175-178.

Foster, W. F. (1986a). *Paradigms and promises.* Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Foster, W. F. (1986b). *The reconstruction of leadership.* Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Graham, J. W. (1982, August). *Leadership: A critical analysis.* Paper presented at the 42nd annual meeting of the Academy of Management, New York City.

Graham, J. W. (1988). Transformational leadership: Fostering follower autonomy, not automatic followership. In J. G. Hunt, B. R. Baliga, H. P. Dachler, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 73-79). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Hosking, D. M., & Hunt, J. G. (1982). Leadership research and the European connection: An epilogue. In J. G. Hunt, U. Sekaran, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership: Beyond establishment views* (pp. 278-289). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hosking, D. M., & Morley, I. E. (1988). The skills of leadership. In J. G. Hunt, B. R. Baliga, H. P. Dachler, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 89-106). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Hunt, J. G. (1984a). *Leadership and managerial behavior.* Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Hunt, J. G., Baliga, B. R., Dachler, H. P., & Schriesheim, C. A. (Eds.). (1988). *Emerging leadership vistas.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Immegart, G. L. (1988). Leadership and leader behavior. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 259-277). New York: Longman.

Jacobs, T. O. (1970). *Leadership and exchange in formal organizations.* Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization.

Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Science, 28,* 315-336.

Janis, I. L. (1989). *Crucial decisions: Leadership in policymaking and crisis management.* New York: Free Press.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley. (Original work published 1966)

Kotter, J. P. (1988). *The leadership factor.* New York: Free Press.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lombardo, M. M., & McCall, M. W., Jr. (1982). Leaders on line: Observations from a simulation of managerial work. In J. G. Hart, U. Sekaran, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership: Beyond establishment views* (pp. 50-67). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Miner, J. B. (1975). The uncertain failure of the leadership concept: An overview. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers* pp. 197-208). Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Mintzberg, H. (1982). If you're not serving Bill and Barbara, then you're not serving leadership. In J. G. Hart, U. Sekaran, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership: Beyond establishment views* (pp. 239-250). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Nanus, B. (1989). *The leader's edge.* Chicago: Contemporary Press.

Ridge, W. J. (1989). *Follow me.* New York: AMACOM.

Rost, J. C. (1985, October). *Distinguishing leadership and management: A new consensus.* Paper presented at the Organizational Development Network National Conference, San Francisco.

Schon, D. A. (1984). Leadership as reflection in action. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), *Leadership and organizational culture* (pp. 36-63). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Schriesheim, C. A., Hunt, J. G., & Sekaran, U. (1982). Conclusion: The leadership management controversy revisited. In J. G. Hunt, U. Sekaran, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership: Beyond establishment views* (pp. 290-298). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation.* Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). *Value-added leadership.* San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Smith, P. B., & Peterson, M. F. (1988). *Leadership, organizations and culture.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Tucker, R. C. (1981). *Politics as leadership.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Wilpert, B. (1982). Commentary on part 1: Various paths beyond establishment views. In J. G. Hunt, U. Sekaran, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership: Beyond establishment views* (pp. 68-74). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Yukl, G. A. (1989). *Leadership in organizations* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review, 15*(3), 67-84.

Zaleznik, A. (1989). *The managerial mystique: Restoring leadership in business.* New York: Harper & Row.