

# Debunking the false dichotomy of leadership idealism and pragmatism: Critical evaluation and support of newer genre leadership theories

SEAN T. HANNAH<sup>1</sup>, JOHN J. SUMANTH<sup>1\*</sup>, PAUL LESTER<sup>2</sup>  
AND FABRICE CAVARRETTA<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, U.S.A.

<sup>2</sup>Research Facilitation Team, Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army, United States Army, Monterey, California, U.S.A.

<sup>3</sup>ESSEC Business School, Paris, France

## Summary

Leadership theories have shifted over the last few decades from a focus on managerial functions and economic leader–follower exchanges toward greater focus on the interpersonal dynamics occurring within the leadership process. Theories such as transformational, ethical, authentic, and other “newer genre” theories were created to address neglected topics such as leader vision and inspirational messages, transparency, emotional effects, morality, individualized attention, and intellectual stimulation. Critiques of these theories, however, have been raised. In this paper, we address five of those critiques and argue for the validity and practical effectiveness of the new genre theories. Further, we describe how newer genre leadership research should be viewed as a performative epistemology, entailing a process of co-creation involving scholars and practitioners. Finally, from this view, we provide general ideas for leader development. Copyright © 2014 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

**Keywords:** leadership; transformational; ethical; authentic; servant; spiritual; moral; performative

Over the last 30–40 years, leadership theories have shifted from a focus on managerial tasks and functions and economic-based leader–follower exchanges toward a focus on the interpersonal dynamics occurring within the leadership process (Bass & Bass, 2008). This came from a growing recognition that the existing theories of leadership did not adequately account for the ways leaders can engender individual and group performance beyond task and structure-related approaches. Bryman (1992) commented that

there was considerable disillusionment with leadership theory and research in the early 1980s. Out of this pessimism emerged a number of alternative approaches, which shared some common features...collectively referred to as the new leadership (Bryman, 1992, p. 21).

These “new” approaches began to focus on determining what drives “followers”<sup>1</sup> to go beyond managers’ performance expectations, display high levels of effort, make pro-social contributions to the group, contribute to group maintenance and well-being, infuse creativity into their work, provide recommendations and ideas to benefit the organization, and similar actions. This need for a new approach to leadership was fueled, in part, by a greater recognition of the active role followers play in leadership processes (Bass, 1985; Dvir & Shamir, 2003; Hollander, 1958, 1992a; Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014). The emerging theories acknowledged that although followers can be *managed* to accomplish tasks and reach acceptable performance levels, they also have significant

\*Correspondence to: John J. Sumanth, Assistant Professor of Management & Organizational Behavior, Faculty Fellow, Center for Leadership & Character, School of Business, Wake Forest University, Suite 388, Farrell Hall, Building 60, Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109, U.S.A. E-mail: sumanthj@wfu.edu

<sup>1</sup>In this paper, we use the term “follower” for parsimony and in our usage it includes anyone the leader is attempting to influence, whether in a hierarchical leader–follower relationship, peer relationship, or otherwise.

determination over whether they will be *led* and thereby more fully open themselves to the leader's influence and more fully engage in their work (DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Hollander, 1992a, 1992b; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Consequently, scholars developed and tested various theories that attempt to determine the forms of leader behaviors that engage followers and create positive effects that extend beyond task compliance. These include theories such as charismatic and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; House, 1977; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993), authentic leadership (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004; Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005; Neider & Schriesheim, 2011), various theories of ethical or character-based leadership (Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005; Craig & Gustafson, 1998; De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2008; Moorman, Darnold, & Priesemuth, 2013), spiritual leadership (Fry, 2003; Fry, Vitucci, & Cedillo, 2005), servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1973; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008), and others, such as shared or participative leadership (e.g., Pearce & Sims, 2002). Bryman (1992) and others (e.g., Avolio, Reichard, Hannah, Walumbwa, & Chan, 2009) have collectively called these theories the "newer" theories of leadership in contrast to the "traditional" leadership models (e.g., situational, contingency, or path-goal leadership theories), which focused more on leader-follower exchange relationships and providing support and direction. Although each newer theory has important differences, in this article, we attempt to address certain aspects of their commonality. Following Bryman (1992), we will call these theories as a whole the "newer genre" for ease of discussion.

Given this shift in focus in leadership theory and research over the last few decades, it is prudent as a field to reflect on the basis for the newer genre theories and ask whether they are theoretically sound, ecologically valid, and practically useful. Some scholars have argued, for example, that the newer genre theories are largely ideological prescriptions merely reflecting researchers' philosophical views of what leadership "ought to be" and may not be ecologically valid in the practice of leadership. The authors of this paper are scholars who also have more than six decades of combined practical leadership experience outside of academics, across a span of sectors and organizational levels, to include senior positions at the strategic levels of large organizations. With this in mind, we intend to place a critical scholar-practitioner eye on the newer genre theories, and more importantly, on the ways in which these theories have been employed by researchers. We surmise that these theories have made important contributions to both the literature and practice. Yet we highlight areas in which our theories can be refined, our operationalizations of these theories improved, and integrations across theories made. Although we recognize that there are specific strengths and weaknesses related to each of the newer genre theories, the purpose of this paper is to assess themes across these theories more so than assessments of any individual theory(s).

This paper is organized in three parts. First, we address a series of five critiques that have been levied against the newer genre leadership theories. We take a balanced approach to assessing the validity of each of those critiques and, where needed, make counter-arguments. In the second part of the paper, we introduce the possibility that leadership theorizing might aim at a performative epistemology whereby theories become self-fulfilling because, through their expression and promulgation, they can form future reality. We thus discuss the symbiotic interplay between theory, values, and practice. Finally, in the third part of the paper, on the basis of the preceding sections, we provide some general ideas for leader development.

To limit our scope, we address only limited critiques concerning methodology related to the newer genre theories and limit ourselves to methodological concerns related only to the five points below. Overall, our interpretation is that most of the methodology critiques levied against these new genre theories are in fact applicable to the broader leadership and organizational literatures and are thus less germane to the current discussion.

The critiques we will address in the first section of this paper include statements that the newer genre leadership theories present the following:

- an overly normative and ideological focus, envisioning some ideal leader that is detached from the daily demands and practice of leadership;
- an overly humanistic approach that somewhat ignores the functional demands of leadership and task accomplishment;
- an arbitrary inclusion of morality into conceptualizations of what constitutes leadership;

- an over-emphasis on the needs, feelings, and desires of the follower, to the neglect of the organization and its goals;
- a lack of discrimination between leadership ratings on these theories and general positive affective responses to the leader such as liking.

## Critiques of Newer Genre Leadership Theories

### *Disentangling “types” of leadership from “types” of leaders*

One critique of the newer genre leadership theories is that they are overly normative and ideologically based, envisioning some ideal or “super leader” that is detached from the daily demands and practice of leadership. We believe that this stems largely from the improper anthropomorphization some researchers have promoted when employing the newer genre theories in their research—often contrary to the original conceptualization of those theories. At their core, these theories were conceptualized and operationalized primarily as behavioral theories, not trait theories. They largely prescribe the way leaders should act or interact with their followers. To attempt to reinforce this with future researchers, the predominant measures for transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2000) and authentic leadership (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008), for example, were both designed using frequency scales for their items, to reflect how often the leader being rated enacts each listed behavior. Other theories use agreement scales, asking respondents to report their level of agreement that a leader acts in a certain way. Despite this behavioral focus, researchers using these theories in their work, including ourselves, too often write theory to support hypotheses using language that tends to describe “types” of leaders (i.e., who transformational [or authentic, participative, etc.] leaders “are” or what they “possess”) versus types of behaviors they enact (i.e., what leader actions are transformational [or authentic, participative, etc.]). There are meaningful differences in stating “transformational leaders are charismatic individuals who...” versus stating “when leaders act in ways perceived by followers as charismatic...” The former tends to anthropomorphize a “super leader,” whereas the latter focuses on ways a leader can act and be perceived by followers.

There are certainly unique knowledge, skills, orientations, identities, attributes, and other individual factors that promote or enable a leader to act transformationally, authentically, and so forth; and we believe that it is critical to identify those factors in order to inform effective leader development. From a theoretical standpoint, however, these individual factors are properly modeled as antecedents of leader behaviors in the nomological network of each behavioral leadership theory and should not be entangled with the behaviors themselves (DeRue, Nahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey, 2011; Van Iddekinge, Ferris, & Heffner, 2009). Further, as leader behaviors are more proximal to leadership effectiveness outcomes than are the more distal antecedents to those behaviors, behaviors have been shown to be more predictive of leadership effectiveness (DeRue et al., 2011). Therefore, to properly specify theory, it is critical to distinguish the *leader* from enacted *leadership*, particularly as observers/raters can normally only observe the latter. Ethical leadership behaviors, for example, may be exercised more regularly by a leader with certain values, type of moral identity, levels of moral awareness, and levels of moral development; yet those important antecedents should be considered separate from the ethical leadership (e.g., ethical decisions and actions) the leader enacts, as observed by followers and other raters.

When researchers improperly anthropomorphize these theories and focus on a “type” of leader, it lends itself to descriptions of some ideal prototype of an individual who is *always* charismatic, servant-oriented, inspiring, and otherwise exemplary. Such a framing is overly normative and limits our appreciation for the complexities and contextualization of leadership. The management field generally embraces the fact that leadership is contextualized, but our theories and operationalizations too often fail to explicitly incorporate context (Johns, 2006; Porter & McLaughlin, 2006). Yet, as Osborn, Hunt, and Jauch (2002) noted, leadership is “socially constructed” (p. 798) and “leadership and its effectiveness, in large part, are dependent upon the context. Change the context and

leadership changes” (p. 797). Context thus creates contingencies that influence which forms of leader behaviors are most effective in any given situation, which suggests that leaders should be complex and have an adaptive “toolkit” of behaviors that they can flexibly match to the context (Lord, Hannah, & Jennings, 2011).

Despite these dynamics, when scholars take an overly normative approach to theorizing about leadership, this promotes the false impression that a given theory, such as ethical or transformational, is the “best” way to lead. Such a prescriptive approach, however, was rarely the intent of the seminal theorist. For example, when Bass (1985) conceptualized transformational leadership theory, and as elaborated in his and colleagues’ later writings on the topic (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003), transformational behaviors were described as operating along with, not in place of, transactional behaviors. In fact, the theory was based, in part, on a hierarchy of needs which assumed that leaders must first meet followers’ basic needs through transactional leadership before transformational leadership could be fully leveraged to tap into followers’ higher order motives and needs (Burns, 1978). Thus, it was always envisioned that to be effective, leaders would need to enact a range of behaviors, as deemed appropriate for the situation (Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1985). Despite this early theorizing, the vast majority of research concerning transformational leadership has tested models that explore transformational leadership alone, without assessing the complementary or interactive effects of other leader behaviors, or how leaders practice differing behaviors over time. This practice can implicitly signal that the researchers have assumed that the one leadership style they are investigating is the best way to lead, reinforcing a normative mindset about the theory. Too often neglected is the fact that the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was intended to measure nine separate forms of representative leader behaviors, and that the underlying full range model of leadership (FRL; Avolio, 1999) describes effective leadership as utilizing all nine forms of behaviors in different levels of frequency across time, on the basis of the contextual demands. Frankly, most day-to-day organizational contexts do not require leaders to provide continuous inspiration and other transformational behaviors, nor do followers need to perform above expectations at all times. This suggests that transformational leadership should only be used when appropriate, or it can become routinized and diminished in its effects (Trice & Beyer, 1986; Weber, 1952). Followers, for example, do not want or need their leader to continuously coach them or to always discuss values with them at every turn or to attempt to involve them in every decision being made. These theories never suggested that they should. In fact, although never tested to our knowledge, the FRL allows for the possibility that in some situations, it may be entirely appropriate and even desirable for the leader to give some “tough love.”

Furthermore, the scholars who developed other theories, such as authentic or ethical leadership, similarly make no claim that the specific leader behaviors their theories propose should be utilized in exclusion or at all times. In fact, in some cases, they explicitly stated the opposite. In developing authentic leadership theory, for example, Avolio et al. (2004) explicitly described it as a “root construct” that is compatible with other theories (cf. Walumbwa et al., 2008). As proposed by Bass and Steidlmeier (1999), a leader can use transformational leadership behaviors either authentically or pseudo-authentically, whereby they seek to use transformational behaviors to manipulate followers for self-serving ends, such as by “acting” considerately in order to gain a follower’s favor or support (cf. Avolio & Gibbons, 1988). This example suggests that transformational and authentic leadership could work in tandem or have interactive effects. From our review of the literature, we conclude that researchers rarely test forms of leader behaviors from multiple theoretical models in the same study. Further, longitudinal or repeated measures research that assesses the varying levels of effectiveness of multiple leadership styles employed across time and contexts is lacking (Bluedorn & Jaussi, 2008; Shamir, 2011). These are limitations in choices of models and designs, however, not limitations in the conceptualization of the theories themselves. Yet these omissions remain a critical issue, because a theoretical contribution requires both theory building and theory testing (Colquitt & Zapata-Phelan, 2007).

There are numerous other problems with failing to disentangle “types” of leaders from “types” of leadership. The most obvious is that researchers too often describe in their theorizing constructs that are actually antecedents, when in fact they are only measuring leader behaviors. For example, a researcher may argue that “...authentic leaders are highly morally developed which engenders within followers...” and yet not directly measure the leader’s level of moral development. This creates a lack of conceptual clarity and deters a proper understanding of the constituent

constructs and their placement within the nomological network of a given leadership theory. It also creates inconsistencies between the theory and its operationalization, due to theorizing unmeasured constructs. Further, followers cannot directly observe many antecedents, such as leaders' levels of moral development, and can only infer such through leaders' decisions and behaviors. This also suggests a mediated effect (e.g., whereby leader behaviors mediate the effects of moral development), which is normally untested and un-theorized.

The proper separation of antecedents from leader behaviors also has relevance for responding to critiques that the newer genre of leadership theories fail to adequately reflect aspects of leaders' cognition and affect. In fact, we argue that they should not, because as outlined earlier, cognition and affect should be modeled as antecedents to leader behavior. Research shows, for example, that leader efficacy is related to transformational leadership behaviors (Hannah, Avolio, Chan, & Walumbwa, 2012); the personality dimensions of agreeableness and conscientiousness are positively related to ethical leadership behaviors (Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009); and psychological capital (Jensen & Luthans, 2006) and self-monitoring (Tate, 2008) are both related to authentic leadership behaviors. Separating these antecedents from their resultant behaviors serves to enrich our models of leadership as well as help identify the antecedent factors that should be targeted in leader development programs. Further, through identifying these antecedents, we can begin to see which are unique in predicting one theoretical form of leadership and which might predict multiple forms. It would be hard to imagine that self-awareness, for example, would not support multiple forms of leadership—and more importantly, help leaders better understand how they are influencing their followers and thereby adjust their leadership as needed, drawing from *multiple* forms of leadership. Yet other antecedents may be more unique to certain newer genre leadership styles.

In summary, it is important for researchers to properly specify the nomological networks for leadership theories in ways that discriminate leader behaviors from the antecedent factors that enable and motivate a leader to enact those behaviors. Viewing each of these theories as forms or types of leader behaviors, instead of “types” of leaders, facilitates research that contextualizes leadership and creates a better understanding of how leaders can draw from a host of potential behaviors from multiple models of leadership, and how these models are more or less effective across time and context. Such an approach takes the emphasis off of an overly idealized vision of a leader as some constellation of traits and attributes and, instead, places it on the development of leaders who can enact a flexible set of behaviors. Human behavior is much too complex to fully model, and there are always unmeasured variables in any model of leadership. Yet, our pursuit ought to be toward more integrative and multi-theoretical frameworks.

### *Integrating leadership and management*

Another critique made against the newer genre theories is that they overly focus on followers versus the functional demands of leadership and task accomplishment. To the extent that they are valid, these critiques likely stem from the limited ways researchers have employed these theories in their research and the models and criteria they choose to test. Researchers, to include us, have often created a false gulf between leadership and management when developing models and operationalizing theories of leadership. This has led to conceptual confusion and, in our opinion, limited the practical usefulness of various leadership theories. Several scholars have noted important differences between what constitutes “leadership” and “management” (e.g., Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; Kotter, 1990). Although these differences exist from a conceptual perspective, investigating one in the absence of the other limits the ecological validity and practical usefulness of research. For example, leaders in practice do not do finance, accounting, marketing, and ethics, as if “ethics” is a separate function. Instead, leaders do finance, accounting, and marketing *ethically* (or not) and, through such actions and other reinforcing mechanisms, establish more or less of an ethical culture over time. From the perspective of spiritual leadership, leaders do not seek to establish calling and purpose in followers about random things, but about *specific* things that their work tasks and the organization's performance goals entail. Leaders who use individualized consideration to coach followers do so in relation to the functional tasks and demands those followers face in their work. Thus, it is incomplete to assess different forms of leadership without considering the functional tasks the leader-led group is performing and the goals they seek to achieve. Also,

leadership is often executed in parallel to management and can enhance managerial success. While managing a planning process, for example, a leader can be more or less transparent with followers and demonstrate more or less balance in processing the information provided to and received from followers (two of the four components of authentic leadership). In this way, leadership can be looked at, in part, as *the way* (e.g., style or approach) a leader manages, and thus, the two can and perhaps should be looked at in tandem.

This promulgated false separation between leadership and management is thus not ecologically valid and can promote perceptions in the casual observer that leadership is just about the “soft stuff” and making followers feel good, and so forth, as if that is an end unto itself. Instead, leadership should be viewed as being functional and a “multiplier” of managerial functions and effectiveness. For example, when performing a classical management function such as *planning*, a manager can lay out their goals and objectives in ways that are more or less inspiring, charismatic, or visionary and that emphasize the ethical implications in the planning criteria to a greater or lesser extent. When performing the classical management function of *organizing*, a manager can show varying levels of individual consideration when accounting for followers’ talents, needs, and desires. When assigning tasks and working relationships, managers can more or less consider the extent to which each potential form of structure and organizing promotes or deters the sharing of leadership. Thus, leadership, in part, reflects the way in which management is enacted, and it is a false dichotomy to separate the two. We believe that the various newer genre leadership theories, if employed commensurate with the functional demands of the context, are highly effective in enhancing organizational functioning and performance, and we believe the evidence supports this determination, as we will further describe in another section later.

Further, this false separation of management and leadership is not just driven by a lack of integration in theory development but more so by a lack of integration in empirical research, which typically relies on survey work and the testing of limited models. Perhaps the field needs more research such as Luthans, Hodgetts, and Rosenkrantz’s (1988) *Real Managers* study, which showed a gulf between successful and effective management behavior in practice. Of note here is that Luthans’ study was an observational study where researchers were embedded within the managers’ environment and able to observe the functional performance of leaders. Unfortunately, to the detriment of the field, such research methods are seemingly underutilized despite the deeper richness of insight they offer compared with more traditional methodologies.

In summary, as researchers, we commonly fail in adequately assessing leadership within the context of the managerial roles and functions that individuals perform. This omission can lead to a misinterpretation that the newer genre theories of leadership are merely some ideological versus functional endeavor—merely how a “good person” would act when leading others—neglecting whether “doing good” leads to higher performance (i.e., “doing well”). These critiques are not an indictment of these theories themselves but of the limited and isolated way we as researchers typically test them. In sum, we need to better articulate what it means to *manage* followers as compared with *leading* followers and devote greater focus to exploring the synergies that exist between the two and even determine whether they are in fact separable.

### *Is leadership by definition moral?*

Another possible critique of these normative views of leadership is that although character/morality/ethics are nice to have, they are not a basic, definitional component of leadership because influence can be wielded in other ways. This is a core ontological question. Is leadership nothing more than influence? Can that influence be gained through any means and still rightly be called leadership? Are there some forms of influence that should not be called leadership but instead something else, such as threat, coercion, abuse, or manipulation? We suggest that even if one were to include unethical or anti-social behaviors under the umbrella term of “leadership,” there would at least be a general consensus in the field that we would qualify such behaviors as “*bad* leadership.” Negative behaviors by those assigned to formal management positions are of course studied in our field (e.g., abusive supervision, Tepper, 2007; or supervisor social undermining, Duffy, Ganster, Shaw, Johnson,

& Pagon, 2006), but these researchers have chosen, rightly in our opinion, to not label such behaviors “leadership” but instead use terms such as “supervision.” We argue that morality is an inherent component of leadership and outline our logic for this position in the following sections.

### **The ontological argument**

Burns (2003) boldly stated that “If it is unethical or immoral it is not leadership.” It is an accurate observation that each of the theories comprising the newer genre includes some level of ethical or character-based content, and thus, in this way, they are ideological in nature. It is therefore important to assess the validity of including ethics as part of the ontological basis for leadership. It is our opinion that morality is a necessary, but certainly not a sufficient criterion for leadership. Specifically, morality is required for leadership, but morality alone cannot constitute leadership.

To assess whether morality is a necessary component for leadership, one can conduct a typical philosophical thought experiment where morality is totally removed and assess what means are acceptable to call “leadership.” For example, are we willing to accept withholding a follower’s paycheck until they increase performance as a form of leadership? If the answer to this or any similarly extreme example is no, then we have to conclude that leadership does inherently have some ethical component—the only question is how much and what type of morality. Upon recognition that leadership does have a moral component, there are then more nuanced and difficult questions to be addressed related to the subjective nature of morality.

### **Operationalizing morality in leadership**

Although it is an accurate observation that the newer genre leadership theories include some level of ethical or moral orientation, it is not accurate to say that these theories are prescriptive as to the form or nature of that morality. The research to date has censored itself from excessive prescription and has instead been descriptive as to the form and nature of the included morality. Specifically, measures operationalizing these theories (consistent with behavioral ethics measures more generally) assess the perceived ethical behavior of the leader grounded in the context in which the research takes place. The Ethical Leadership measure of Brown et al. (2005), for example, asks questions such as whether the leader “sets an example of how to do things the right way in terms of ethics” and “conducts his/her personal life in an ethical manner” (Brown & Treviño, 2006). Items from the moral perspective dimension of the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (Walumbwa et al., 2008), ask respondents, for example, the frequency with which the leader “Makes difficult decisions based on high standards of ethical conduct” and “Makes decisions based on his or her core values.” Example items from the transformational leadership component of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2000) ask the frequency with which the leader “Talks about their most important values and beliefs” or “Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.” Such items are descriptive as they either ask about whether a leader performs an action (such as talks about their beliefs—while being silent on what those beliefs are or should be) or completely leave it to the rater’s ethical perspective to determine what is “ethical,” “moral,” “right,” and so on when assessing the leader. These items offer evidence that although the authors of these theories and measures prescribe that morality is a component of their theory, the form or nature of that morality is left to the respondent, grounded in the normative context within which the research takes place.

A critique could thus be levied against the newer genre theories that although they include a clear and overt element of morality, perhaps they are not prescriptive enough. Specifically, the subjectivity of leadership measures being placed “in the eye of the beholder” could potentially create dysfunctional outcomes. Members of an inherently unethical group, such as a gang, could rate their leader’s actions as being ethical because they meet the codes and mores of the group, despite the fact the general populace outside the group largely deems those actions unethical. Indeed, unethical and even criminal groups still talk about concepts such as “codes” and “honor,” using their distorted conceptualizations of such terms.

The primary alternative to such a descriptive approach is for the researcher to explicitly declare what is “ethical” and to create a normative measure that assesses the absence or presence of those specific normative leader actions. For example, instead of asking whether the leader “conducts his/her personal life in an ethical manner” in general, the researcher would need to prescribe what specific behaviors constitute living one’s personal life in an “ethical

manner” (e.g., specifically defined charitable acts or self-sacrificing acts). This would not only be overly prescriptive but unfeasible, as it would be difficult to generalize across contexts. This is because what constitutes ethical behavior varies across groups, communities, and even societies (Parsons & Shils, 1951; Power, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989; Selznick, 1992).

### Is leader influence bolstered by morality?

In assessing the appropriateness of incorporating morality into the components of leadership, we have to first ask the broader question, *so what?* Is there a functional purpose to incorporating morality? To answer these questions, we believe we need to ask another. To exercise *leadership influence* (as opposed to coercion or other forms of influence), do leaders have to establish credibility? If so, then we argue that some sufficient level of leader morality is required, as assessed by others within the context the leader operates within, on the basis of the shared mores of the collective. We propose that leaders have to *earn* the right to lead through demonstrating that they are worthy to do so—that is, through demonstrating socially worthy character (Hannah & Avolio, 2011; Hannah & Jennings, 2013; Hollander, 1958). Bass and Bass (2008) stated that the “character of a leader involves his or her ethical and moral beliefs, intentions and behaviors” (p. 219) and proposed that leaders’ character is linked to behaviors that reflect integrity, justice, and fairness. Such character is thought necessary to give the leader credibility (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

In considering what underpins leader influence, Hannah and Jennings (2013) recommended that we consider the three required elements of influence as espoused by Aristotle in *Rhetoric: ethos, logos, and pathos* (Hyde & Schrag, 2004). Ethos is based on the trustworthiness of the individual’s reputation—their known character. Logos represents the extent to which the individual is logical and compelling (e.g., expertise). Pathos represents the extent to which the individual arouses emotion and passion and makes a personal connection with others. We believe that it is intuitive that a leader’s influence will be greatly diminished if he or she is deficient in any one of the three elements of influence, which easily map onto classic conceptualizations of expert and referent power (French & Raven, 1959). Aristotle, however, argued that ethos is the most necessary and powerful of the three modes of influence, because it is the one upon which the others depend (Hyde & Schrag, 2004; Solomon, 1992). It is difficult for someone to be influenced by the logic or expertise of a leader, for example, if they cannot trust the basis of that logic or the information provided because of flawed character.

It is of note that the three elements of *ethos, logos, and pathos* also map quite cleanly onto the three elements of trustworthiness: integrity-based, competence-based, and benevolence-based trustworthiness (Colquitt, Scott, & LePine, 2007; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). Thus, we can draw from the strong base of empirical trust research to confirm the importance of these facets. The act of trusting a leader requires that trustors (followers) willingly place themselves in a position of vulnerability in relation to the trustee (leader). Thus, for followers, trusting a leader involves accepting significant personal risks as well as uncertainty about the leader’s credibility (Colquitt et al., 2007; McAllister, 1995). From a practical perspective, whether a follower establishes trust in their leader has functional importance, given that followers’ trust in their leader is related to individual and team performance (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Peng, 2011; Schaubroeck, Peng, & Hannah, 2013).

In summary, we argue that not all influence is or should be called *leadership*. In fact, if leadership is merely “influence by any means” then we do not need a term to label it beyond “influence.” “Leadership” is therefore a qualifying term for certain forms of influence: positive and socially acceptable forms. We thus argue that morality is part of the ontological basis for leadership. Finally, as described earlier, it is our opinion that leaders’ credibility, and subsequent ability to influence, will be diminished unless their actions are deemed socially acceptable.

### *Does followers’ active involvement in the leadership process really matter?*

Another possible critique of the newer genre theories is that they are too focused on the needs, feelings, and desires of the follower, to the detriment of the organization. Our discussion thus far has inferred our position that to achieve organizational effectiveness and performance, followers cannot simply be managed or led as if they are passive

components of the leadership system. To be explicit, our position is that organizational performance is, in large part, predicated on the active engagement of followers. Aligned with our thinking, a distinguishing feature of the newer genre leadership theories is that all maintain an underlying assumption, some more explicit than others, that followers are active parts of this process and maintain some self-determination. It is therefore important that we challenge this assumption by evaluating both the theoretical and empirical bases for its validity.

### Leaders' ability to influence across time and situations

Hollander (1958, 1992a, 1992b) proposed that as leaders demonstrate their competence and behave in a socially worthy manner, they earn "idiosyncrasy credits" from their followers, which can then be "spent" through influence attempts. Using this metaphor, leaders must continue to earn credits at a rate equal to or greater than those they "spend" on influence, or they will become "overdrawn" and their ability to influence followers will be depleted. Individuals, therefore, have great say on whether and how they will be led and the level of influence they grant the leader (Hollander, 1958, 1992a, 1992b; Lord & Maher, 1993). This is because leadership is a social construction and volitional process that requires *both* a leader attempting to influence *and* a target of that influence accepting and granting the leader with influence over them (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). Whether the target grants such influence is affected by their cognitive constructions of leadership. These include their implicit theories about that particular leader and their implicit theories about leaders and leadership in general, which together provide the "lens" through which they interpret leaders' actions (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984; Lord & Maher, 1993). These lenses, as well as the social comparisons that followers make between their leader's attributes and those of other leaders they have observed, greatly influence the leadership process (Hogg, 2001; Oc & Bashshur, 2013). What constitutes effective leadership is thus not limited to what the leader determines to be effective in a given situation but also what followers perceive to be effective leader behavior in that context on the basis of their mental models of what constitutes acceptable or desired leadership. These perceptions in turn influence responses to the leader, such as whether an individual will support the leader's directives and vision (Haslam & Platow, 2001).

This research suggests that no matter how competent a leader is, their influence will be limited if those they attempt to influence do not see them as credible and withhold support for their leadership. Research has shown that the social constructions individuals have of "good" leadership typically include expectations of competence, benevolence, integrity, attentiveness to followers' well-being and development, and support for their autonomy and engagement in their work and the organization's purpose (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & de Hoogh, 2013; Kouzes & Posner, 2011); and these aspects of individuals' implicit leadership theories appear to be common across cultures (Bass & Bass, 2008; Den Hartog et al., 1999; Koopman et al., 1999). These empirical findings have prompted researchers to include such components when developing the newer genre leadership theories, suggesting these dimensions are more than just researchers' normative beliefs as to what leadership should be, but rather, empirically grounded and practically relevant tenets of what behaviors constitute effective leadership practice.

It is also important to note that leadership does not occur in an isolated episode but, rather, in a series of episodes through which leaders interact with others and, through these episodes, foster relationships, develop a shared history, and establish their reputations (Shamir, 2011). Leadership episodes are thus *entrained* whereby followers' perceptions of, attributions toward, and reactions to the leader's influence attempts are affected by prior episodes with that leader (Bluedorn & Jaussi, 2008). An effective leader is thus someone who not only understands the dynamics and functional demands of the current situation but, before acting, also foresees how each of the potential actions they are considering will promote or deter their leadership effectiveness and group performance in future leadership episodes (Bluedorn & Jaussi, 2008; Hollander, 1992a, 1992b; Shamir, 2011). A leader, for example, may determine that withholding information from followers is functional in the current situation and may even be in the *immediate* best interests of followers or the group but conclude that once the deceit is discovered by followers, it makes that action imprudent, as it reduces trust and diminishes their ability to influence those followers in the future. A purely short-term, functional approach to leadership is therefore inadequate unless the leader also understands the entrained nature of their actions and forecasts the long-term effects of those actions on followers' responses to their leadership.

Assessing the appropriateness of any of the potential actions leaders can take in a given situation requires a set of normative frameworks with which to identify and select behaviors from. That is, leaders need some standard model from which to determine what constitutes acceptable and effective leader behavior. Further, leader-developers need some form of leadership models to teach, as we describe in a later section. Providing such models, as noted earlier, is a primary contribution of the newer genre theories. Although each theory within this genre is imperfect, in different forms, each one provides a set of behaviors thought effective within or across various contexts, and each considers the active role of followers.

### **Leaders' behavioral inconsistency**

There is an additional weakness of leaders ignoring followers' expectations, and instead taking a purely functional approach to leadership. Doing "whatever it takes" in the near term to reach group goals will create great inconsistencies in leaders' behaviors across time. The empirical literature suggests that consistency of leader behavior significantly benefits both the follower and the organization. For example, Simons (2002) stated that a leader's behavioral integrity is the follower-attributed alignment between the leader's words and deeds. Indeed, Dineen, Lewicki, and Tomlinson (2006) found a significant positive relationship between supervisors' behavioral integrity and followers' organizational citizenship behavior. Other empirical research suggests that there is a strong positive relationship between leader behavioral integrity and follower commitment and performance (Palanski & Yammarino, 2011; Simons, Friedman, Liu, & McLean-Parks, 2007). Conversely, inconsistent leader behavior is problematic for a host of reasons. For instance, inconsistent behavior can lead to negative attributions of the leader, such as being a high impression manager, inauthentic, or emotionally unstable (Cha & Edmondson, 2006; Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002; Martinko, Harvey, & Douglas, 2007). Highly varied leader behavior can also deleteriously influence followers' information processing, such as their ability to sense-make regarding the leader, thereby depleting their cognitive resources away from task accomplishment (Hobfoll, 1989; Lord & Maher, 2002). Inconsistent leadership also creates negative psychological effects, such as emotional labor and stress in followers (De Cremer, 2003; LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005) and deters the formation of high quality leader-follower relationships (Glasø & Einarsen, 2008; Sparrowe, Soetjito, & Kraimer, 2006). These and similar proximal effects on followers can have more distal negative effects such as reducing followers' satisfaction, engagement, citizenship behaviors, and performance.

Together, this theorizing and evidence suggests that followers are active participants in the leadership process and that leaders must gain and maintain perceptions of credibility with their followers or see their influence suffer. It is important to note that followers have implicit models of effective and desirable leadership through which they judge leader credibility and the appropriateness of the leader's behaviors within as well as across entrained situations. Leaders act contrary to these expectations at their own peril and can do so for only short periods before their stored up "credits" will expire. Leaders thus need to consider the entrained nature of their actions and "downstream" negative effects if they are to take a near-term functional view or become overly self-aggrandized in their perceived leadership capabilities or ability to control the leadership process. A value of the newer genre of theories is that they seek to determine which leader actions are consistent with followers' implicit theories of good leadership and thus provide some guidance to leaders as far as effective behaviors, while also informing leader-developers as to the leadership models to be used in development.

We need to reinforce, however, our statements earlier in this paper that none of the newer genre theories were ever intended in our opinion to be a "be all-end all." A theorist's position that a leader should act transparently, ethically, or inspirationally does not in any way mean that a leader should refrain from acting in different ways, such as using economic exchanges, when the situation calls for it; nor should a scholar championing a theory of personality be misconstrued as signaling that they do not think intelligence is also important. Finally, none of the newer genre theories imply that functional tasks, such as strategy formulation, are irrelevant and unimportant. Rather, the newer genre theories complement each other and other leadership theories by filling parts of a vast theoretical space. Thus, any arguments of whether the traditional or new genre theories are "better" are needlessly futile.

### Does it really pay to meet followers' expectations?

Although it seems clear that these newer genre theories tend to meet follower expectations, to support their further promulgation into practice, we must also determine whether they produce tangible, relevant outcomes. The canon of research makes a compelling case that although the newer genre theories more than make followers feel good, satisfied, motivated, inspired, and so on, they also impact numerous subjective and objective practical outcomes within and across contexts too numerous to overview here (for reviews, see Avolio et al., 2009; Bass & Bass, 2008; Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, & Cogliser, 2010; House & Aditya, 1997; Lowe & Gardner, 2001). For instance, meta-analyses and reviews have evidenced the positive effects of transformational leadership on both team- and organizational-level performance (Dumdum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002; Wang, Oh, Courtright, & Colbert, 2011). Recently, DeRue et al. (2011) found meta-analytical support for transformational leader behaviors accounting for 28.5 percent of the total explained variance in group performance and 22.8 percent of the explained variance in overall leader effectiveness. Transformational leadership has also been positively related to ethical behavior (Hannah, Jennings, Bluhm, Peng, & Schaubroeck, 2014). Similarly, authentic leadership (see review of the authentic leadership literature by Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011) has been positively linked to outcomes such as increased follower and firm performance (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang, & Avey, 2009; Wong & Cummings, 2009). Ethical leadership has also been shown at the group level to be positively associated with organizational citizenship behavior and ethical behavior, while being negatively associated with workplace deviance (Mayer, Kuenzi, Greenbaum, Bardes, & Salvador, 2009; Schaubroeck et al., 2012; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009), and at the individual level, to be positively associated with ethical behavior (Hannah et al., 2014). At the highest levels, ethical leadership of top management teams (TMT) is positively associated with perceived TMT effectiveness and TMT member optimism (De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2008). Last, a review of the servant leadership literature shows servant leadership as a positive predictor of leader and organizational trust, team and leadership effectiveness, organizational citizenship behavior, procedural justice, and collaboration between team members (Parris & Peachey, 2013). In a meta-analysis of all intervention-based leadership research since the 1930s, Avolio et al. (2009) found that the newer genre and the more traditional leadership theories had similar overall effect sizes but varied in their effects when different dependent variables were considered. This reinforces that one genre is not necessarily better than the other but are perhaps more or less appropriate across outcome types and, as we argued, situations. Taken together, these and other studies testing the effects of these and other newer genre theories demonstrate that they yield numerous and important subjective and objective practical outcomes.

### *Are the newer genre theories more than affective responses?*

We have attempted to establish earlier that followers are active participants in the leadership process and that individual, group, and ultimately organizational outcomes, such as performance, are based on the extent to which followers willingly grant their leader influence over them and support their leader's guidance, goals, and visions. We proposed that influence is shaped by the levels of trustworthiness and credibility that a leader establishes based not just on their competence (*logos*) but also their character (*ethos*) and ability to create passion and emotion (*pathos*). However, even if one accepts these propositions, critiques can still be levied that the newer genre leadership theories merely reflect more global affective responses to the leader, such as liking. Even the links demonstrated between these leadership theories and performance could ostensibly be explained by affective responses to the extent that followers better comply with, put in extra effort for, and are more dedicated to leaders they "like." Although it is well known that that authentic, transformational, and other newer genre theories lead to liking and other positive affective responses in followers, the bigger question is whether these leadership theories produce more than this in followers, and whether the newer genre theories have discriminant validity from one another. To analyze this possible critique, we (i) assess the formative basis for such affective responses; (ii) consult studies that have assessed the discriminant validity between the various newer genre theories; (iii) describe studies that have assessed the

cascading or trickle down effects of leadership; and (iv) review studies in which constructs such as leader–member exchange (LMX) or liking have been used as moderators.

First, although some affective responses can occur automatically *in situ* (Brief & Weiss, 2002), the more durable affective responses occurring in ongoing, interdependent relationships, such as between leaders and followers, are formed in large part on the basis of diagnostic processes (Brief & Weiss, 2002; Rusbult & Van Lange, 2003). Specifically, phenomena such as liking, friendship, or affect-based trust are not vacuous but rather, created through a series of role episodes wherein leaders and followers interact with one another. Through observing, interpreting, and appraising the motives of each other's actions, members and leaders form relevant attitudes and associated affect (Lazarus, 1984; Rusbult & Van Lange, 2003; Scherer, 1982). As an example of such a process, in a study using a cross-lagged design, Schaubroeck et al. (2013) established that affective-based trust—a deeper emotional attachment to the leader that reflects confidence in the leader's concern for the follower's personal welfare (McAllister, 1995)—is formed only *after* cognitive-based trust in the leader is established, where cognitive-based trust refers to confidence in the leader's competence, reliability, and dependability. Colquitt, LePine, Piccolo, Zapata, and Rich (2012) suggested that this affect-based trust is an “exchange deepener,” in which the trustor forms “a deeper sense of obligation in the relationship” (p. 2). Importantly, however, this deeper level of trust is not formed until the follower first appraises the leader as competent, reliable, and dependable and associated cognitive-based trust is established.

There is thus a diagnostic process occurring whereby followers consider the credibility and trustworthiness of the leader (Colquitt et al., 2012; Kouzes & Posner, 2002), on the basis of the leader's *behaviors*, and *subsequently* forms affective bonds with the leader over time. It is thus incomplete, if not erroneous, to suggest that these newer genre theories merely reflect affective responses. Rather, we believe it is more accurate to say that the leader behaviors reflected in each of these theories warrant diagnostic assessment as to the leader's credibility and trustworthiness, which then over time may additionally promote the formation of affective bonds between the follower, his or her leader, and the organization. Authentic leadership, for example, has been positively related to follower emotions (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2005), as has charismatic leadership been linked to positive follower mood states (Bono & Ilies, 2006). Also, there is empirical evidence suggesting authentic leadership influences followers' perceptions of their leaders' behavioral integrity, which in turn influences their organizational commitment (Leroy, Palanski, & Simons, 2012). Similarly, research shows that LMX (which includes both cognitive aspects and affective components such as liking) is an outcome of transformational leadership (Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005) and enhances its effects (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). Further, recent empirical work by Omilion-Hodges and Baker (2013) suggests that workgroup members are acutely aware of differences in leader–member relationships, and this tacit knowledge manifests itself in differential resource sharing amongst members, who look to their own LMX, the LMX of their coworkers, and the perceived justice of their respective LMX levels to base their decisions. In these ways, these cognitive and affective responses to the leader are related to important workplace outcomes. However, in all cases, there are important diagnostic processes occurring in which the leader's behavioral style is being evaluated, suggesting more than a simple affective response is at work.

Second, if positive ratings of leaders across the newer genre theories merely reflect general affective bonds such as liking, from a methodological perspective, we would not expect to find discrimination amongst the various theories, which is not the case. For example, Walumbwa et al. (2008) established the discriminant validity of authentic leadership from both ethical leadership and transformational leadership, while also noting that authentic leadership predicted important work attitudes and behaviors even after accounting for the effects of these other leadership styles. Similarly, Brown et al. (2005) established discriminant validity of ethical leadership from leader consideration and idealized influence behaviors, as well as incremental predictive validity beyond idealized influence in predicting leader effectiveness. Most recently, Liden et al. (2008, p.161) used multi-level modeling to find that “servant leadership is a multidimensional construct and at the individual level makes a unique contribution beyond transformational leadership and LMX in explaining community citizenship behaviors, in-role performance and organizational commitment.”

Third, multi-level leadership research suggests that these theories reflect more than affective responses and that followers' ratings of their leaders are not excessively conflated with affect. If followers rate their leaders highly on a leadership measure simply because they like them, for example, it is unreasonable to think we would find consistency in followers' leadership ratings across organizational levels. A follower who rates their leader high on ethical leadership out of liking does not explain why that leader would then rate their own leader (second level) higher on ethical leadership, and why that second-level leader would rate their leader (third level) higher on ethical leadership. Yet research has shown that ethical leadership (Mayer et al., 2009; Schaubroeck et al., 2012) and transformational leadership (Bass, Waldman, Avolio, & Bebb, 1987; Chun, Yammarino, Dionne, Sosik, & Moon, 2009; Yang, Zhang, & Tsui, 2010) correlate across levels, even when using distinct rating sources at each organizational level (e.g., Schaubroeck et al., 2012). Additionally, it seems somewhat implausible that just because a leader likes their higher level leader, the lower level leader's subordinates will hold similarly positive attitudes of him or her, as well as of the higher level leader. Thus, although multi-level leadership studies show consistency in leadership across levels as it cascades downwards, taking into account the multiple sources of leadership ratings within any organization and the varying popularity that leaders at different levels are likely to possess, suggests there are other psychological factors at play beyond mere affective responses, such as social learning, normative influence, and other effects.

Further, research has assessed liking and similar relationally oriented constructs (e.g., LMX) as moderators of the relationship between the newer genre leadership theories and organizational outcomes. In testing these interactions, researchers implicitly make an argument that liking and leadership contribute unique variance to explaining important organizational phenomena and, thus, should not be considered one and the same. For instance, in exploring the conceptual overlap between transformational leadership and LMX, Hughes (1997) found empirical support that transformational leadership and LMX are distinct constructs and that liking and similarity do not moderate the impact of transformational leadership on individual performance and satisfaction. In addition, Piccolo and Colquitt (2006) found that LMX moderated the effects of transformational leadership on followers' job behaviors. First, their measurement models first established that LMX and transformational leadership were distinct constructs. Further, their structural models demonstrated that LMX moderated the effects of transformational leadership on core job characteristics perceptions, task performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. It is important to note that although common method variance (which would occur if followers viewed LMX and transformational leadership similarly) can reduce the observed size of an interaction, it does not produce spurious interactions (Evans, 1985; Siemsen, Roth, & Oliveira, 2010). This suggests therefore that common method variance did not explain these findings and supports our assertion that these constructs, while positively correlated, are conceptually distinct. Taken together, this evidence suggests that liking and similarity, while clearly important in helping to foster better workplace relationships between leaders and followers, are not the primary force behind the wealth of positive outcomes that are associated with the newer genre leadership theories.

## Leadership as a Performative Science

Even with all the arguments earlier that demonstrate how the newer genre theories are valid, effective, and complementary to other leadership perspectives, these theories could still be rightly viewed as being somewhat ideological as they do encapsulate prescriptive values (e.g., justice, honesty, transparency, and inclusion) for leaders. However, we should still ask, even if assuming the possibility of a fundamental "taint" by such positive values, does this make a theory automatically less valid? Does the acceptance and implementation of these values by practicing leaders provide evidence of their utility? What is the proper process through which new leadership theories should emerge? We address such questions here using the lenses of epistemology and performativity to describe the emergence of new paradigms of leadership, such as those of the newer genre, as a natural

process of evolution for and acceptance of thought—a process that includes the active involvement of both scholars and practitioners.

### *Performativity: When theories take a life in the field*

For a moment, let us consider that theories have performative potential (MacKenzie, 2003), that is, they can become self-fulfilling when, --through their expression and promulgation--, they form future reality. Performativity arises when theories that were originally built in a prescriptive manner become descriptive because practitioners (i.e., leaders and leader-developers in this case) become trained on these theories, enact them, and finally make observable phenomena consistent with them (Callon & Muniesa, 2005).

In such a performativity framework, the separation between prescriptive and descriptive science becomes blurred over time because it becomes difficult to untangle the expression of a theory from the emergence and enactment of the phenomena it describes. Interestingly, performativity was not conceptualized originally in social science, where this possibility would seem the most intuitive as it embodies the idea of a socially constructed reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Rather, it was first documented in laboratory sciences (Latour & Woolgar, 1979), a domain where the causation from reality to its description would appear the most robust. Yet, it becomes visible to the keen observer that scientists influence their objects of study. Recently, performativity has generated fruitful epistemological questioning in the social sciences, including forays into management scholarship with Ferraro, Pfeffer, and Sutton (2005) stating that expressing and teaching economic theories in business schools infuse economic “values” into managerial practices, and hence, the observed phenomena comes to fit with theory.

Performativity matters even more when considering the cognitive limitations of managerial actors. In particular, leaders exhibit bounded rationality, as seminally expressed by Simon (1947 [1997]). Their enactment of theories of the world, such as related to leadership, will therefore be subject to cognitive constraints. Bounded rationality implies that practitioners cannot enact the full range of the theories of the world and, therefore, have to choose a subset of possible theories to guide their attitudes, beliefs, and actions. However, choosing the most efficient set of theories amongst numerous “true” theories is incredibly challenging.

In practice, leaders resolve this problem by selecting a small subset of theories from the large number available, use that subset, and exchange them with others (either vicariously by acting in visible ways or by communicating their ideas and beliefs). This implies that smaller sets of theories get reassembled permanently through such interchanges, and that some theoretical clusters can emerge, consistent with typical institutionalization phenomena (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Such evolutionary selection results in a convergence of shared cognitions related to the phenomenon, or what has been called a collective calculation (Callon & Muniesa, 2005). For instance, the commonality of positive values that embody the current newer genre theories makes it practical to perpetuate a worldview of leadership where the need for trust, respect for subordinates, and so on cluster together and become easily communicated amongst practitioners. However, to assume that practitioners of leadership could infinitively grasp complete knowledge about all possible relationships of cause and consequence would be illusionary.

Because such clusters of theories emerge out of an evolutionary process, they have the characteristics of *paradigms* (Kuhn, 1970), where leaders play the role of “naïve scientists,” agreeing on a worldview that becomes true because others agree with it. In particular, as reported by Kuhn, parsimonious theories of the world exhibit punctuated equilibrium (Eldredge & Gould, 1972), whereby such sets of beliefs are stable for long periods over large populations and then greatly change briefly before coalescing once again on a radically different set of beliefs. Applied to the field of leadership, one might say that the movement from more transactional-oriented theories of leadership (i.e., Taylorism) to the newer genre—beginning with the Hawthorne studies and HR movement and becoming more pronounced in the late 1970s and 1980s with the advent of the neo-charismatic theories—reflected such punctuated equilibrium. This shift followed the “considerable

disillusionment” and “pessimism” with leadership theory that Bryman (1992, p. 21) noted took place in the 1980s and precipitated the paradigm shift toward the newer genre.

### *Leadership theory: Formal versus paradigmatic*

Theorizing on leadership can therefore be considered at two epistemological levels: theories as an accumulation of “true” facts about the world (predominantly descriptive) and theories as a compact worldview that happen to be enactable by practitioners (a *paradigm*), and compatible with leaders’ cognitive limitations and the institutions they lead. Even though each approach has a different epistemological objective, both are equally valuable theoretically. On the one hand, a formal accumulation of “facts,” which is currently the dominant epistemology of our field, better fulfills the imperatives outlined by Popper (1934, [2002]) that science should rely only on the verification of true versus false facts. Paradigmatic theorizing, however, better describes reality in that the theory is enactable by the actor (i.e., the leader) in his or her current environment. This latter argument is not a judgment against those theories that have limited practical application, but rather, that theories of the world can be interpreted by thinking actors as scripts for describing the world as it can be. Thus, the production of paradigmatic theories, such as those described in the newer leadership genre, matters to organizational scholars as they properly describe their object of study—namely the leader in his or her environment with its unique set of constraints.

These distinct approaches to studying leadership phenomena could potentially form two somewhat parallel epistemologies, but it would not be accurate to conclude that one is simply about science and the other about practice. Nor is one inferior to the other. Although an ongoing accumulation of facts is necessary to provide a deeper and richer understanding of the intricacies of leadership phenomena, accumulating facts alone is not epistemologically perfect. This is because unbounded theorizing significantly ignores the key constraints leaders face in practice, such as limited cognitive and affective resources and contextual complexity. For this reason, theories that are socially and cognitively absorbable by practitioners—even if some view them as intellectually inferior—can serve as useful, gifted descriptions of what the practice of leadership truly entails, thereby enhancing their epistemological value. Consequently, neither interpretation is accurate as both approaches have their noted limitations and strengths. Instead, it is the dual processes of considering both epistemologies that creates performative potential and improves theories (MacKenzie, 2003).

This logic offers a potential response to those who criticize the newer genre theories as being *ideological* and overly *simplistic* because of their dominant skew toward positivity, morality, and inclusivity of followers’ needs and desires in the leadership process. In response, we posit that the newer genre could be interpreted as a performative theoretical body: formulated frameworks that are easily understood and adopted by practitioners, and consistent with current institutional and societal norms. Such performative frameworks possess an interesting duality of being rigorously rooted in the scientific method (i.e., its facts being scientifically established and verified), and yet still compact enough and revolving around a few core societal values that they are found applicable and easily implemented in the “real” world. If we take transformational leadership as an example, paradigm emergence reflected in the writings of McGregor, Maslow, and others led over time to Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) proposing the concept of transformational leadership, which was validated in research, and then led to the development of training programs of leaders (e.g., Avolio & Bass’s (1991) Full Range Leadership Program). There are likely few business leaders with an MBA, for example, that have not at least been briefly exposed to transformational leadership theory in a leadership or organizational behavior course in graduate school. Such training and education programs then result in such leadership being practiced and, if found to be sufficiently effective, to promulgate further training courses. Transformational leadership theory, and the FRL more specifically, is thus a clear example of a performative process.

This does not mean that alternative, or even more complex, models are “wrong” or “right” compared with the dominant new genre theories in the current paradigm. It does mean, however, that the current behavioral models of leadership have wider and greater acceptance until better ones emerge. This inherent tension is not specific to

the study of leadership but arises in other epistemological fields as well. For instance, critical theorists have observed that gender issues could call for the development of a performative science (Spicer, Alvesson, & Karreman, 2009), that is, a science that fully acknowledges the reflexive nature of theory and practice. Whether the newer genre theories started out as researchers' idealized visions of the world, or whether they were in reaction to signals from practitioners of leadership, is unclear. Regardless, those ideas, and the theoretical frameworks that stemmed from them, have reached the maturity of a paradigm, have been promulgated to (or perhaps back to) practice, enacted, and found to be both practically useful and effective and have reinforced further theoretical development and the promulgation of associated leader development and training programs. In summary, science is better served when all epistemological layers are properly explored: The current newer genre theories embody a theoretical *paradigm* instead of focusing only on an accumulation of facts that practitioners might not adequately be able to, or see value to, execute.

## Implications for Leader Development

Our discussion thus far has led us to a more concrete point: Given the state of the field, how should we *develop* leaders? What are our roles as scholars in the creation of leadership as practiced? Should we merely teach our audiences how most leaders are or how the "average" leader is leading (a descriptive approach), or should we focus on what leaders *ought* to be and how they *should* lead (a normative approach)? Should we integrate management and leadership processes as enacted in operational settings? Our discussion earlier on performativity suggests these nuances might be difficult to untangle but are important discussions for the field to have.

As leadership scholars, we have little value if we are merely surveying what leadership is practiced in organizations and then simply describing that phenomenon and creating training programs to promulgate those practices. Amongst many possible perils, such an approach makes a dangerous assumption that the leadership being practiced in any particular sample is "good," which is particularly problematic given the relatively small, idiosyncratic samples used in most research studies. Instead, whether using inductive or deductive methods, our value as scholars, if we are to embrace our role as thought-leaders, is in seeking to locate and describe "good" leadership and use that knowledge to create or refine theories; or we may even envision a model of effective leadership and then go test it to see if it actually exists and is in fact effective. In doing so, we not only explain the present but may even help envision the future. If carried out with scientific rigor and solid evidence, performative processes will carry those ideas into existence through influences on leader training, education, and development.

We often see calls that the field of management needs to better connect with practice, that we are too self-insulated, a "self-licking ice cream cone" that consumes its own products. Although this has pockets of truth across the field, as a general statement, it sells the field well short. A plethora of leader development and college programs are using frameworks appropriated from the academic literature. As many of our ideas do find their way into and influence the practice of leadership, we have to face issues of social responsibility. What kind of leadership should we help to create? Do we ignore social responsibility altogether and create visions of leadership behavior that promulgates the notion that performance comes first and foremost, regardless of the consequences? Or, do we create visions of leadership that reflect the nexus of morality, humaneness, and a leadership process employed toward some "noble" gain? The former risks creating a corps of leaders perhaps destined for infamy characterized by a rapid rise and an almost certain catastrophic fall, causing great harm along the way. The latter risks creating a cadre of leaders that are too Pollyannaish and fail to see that some tasks, although lacking nobility, are still critical to the success of the organization. Thankfully, this "either/or" debate is a false dichotomy because choosing a single approach lacks ecological validity. Rather, exploration of both visions is part and parcel of leader development.

If anything, our models of leader development often lack balance between education, which our business schools do fairly well, and practical expertise and training, which our business schools too often ignore. Stated differently, we may consider that progress might be necessary to reach beyond the debates discussed earlier (e.g., ideological

focus and on humanistic values). In particular, our academic field has been grounded in the logic of business schools, with a model of leader development that relies on building a most perfect set of theories, to be delivered in a classroom setting. However, successful alternative models do exist. Similar to medical schools where research and teaching are grounded in clinical practice, some broader fields, such as the military, rely on a balanced model of leader development. In this setting, the transfer of leadership theories to students plays a coequal or lesser role compared with the experiential aspect of leader development, even though the concepts within those theories provide the framework for the training itself. For example, a squad leader responsible for 10 soldiers may not be exposed to the tenets of transformational leadership explicitly in a classroom setting. However, during an arduous training exercise, he or she may need to provide inspiration to the squad, particularly if they have not slept or eaten recently, and the leader's responsibility to enact such behavior is then highlighted by trainers as part of the after action review process that militaries commonly use as part of their leader development systems today. Or, a lieutenant may be exposed to ethical leadership and decision-making theory in the classroom, where topics are presented in a very "black and white" context, only to later be presented with a "gray" training scenario that calls for the leader to make the best ethical decisions possible in a "wrong versus wrong" situation. Here, there may be no right or wrong answers given, merely decisions made and, later, a structured review of the experience conducted to aid in development.

Carrying a balanced developmental approach forward, fields such as the military, law enforcement, and medicine do not solely rely on antiseptic classrooms or canned training scenarios to develop leaders. Rather, leadership development is engrained in the day-to-day context itself—referred to as the "practice context" by Day (2001), who boldly stated that "academic researchers need to first transcend the outdated notion that leadership development occurs only through the specially designed programs held in particular locations" (p. 586). In the practice context, leaders develop in the same way that an aspiring doctor does a surgical residency rotation; both expectations and stakes are high, but mistakes are also expected and learned from. Here, more senior leaders provide mentorship and guidance, while also underwriting the junior leader's mistakes because they are seen as part of the junior leader's developmental process. Without this underwriting function, very few leaders would survive, but the process itself is efficient insofar as it helps leaders learn to apply leadership behaviors *in situ*, where it matters the most. If scholars were to better observe these processes, it may help them reduce the false separation of management and leadership that we noted earlier in the paper and assist them in developing more ecologically valid theories of leader development.

Thus, a practice approach to leader development requires less from leadership scholars because it is already occurring in organizations every day. Those who carry the mantle of leadership *educators*, however, should consider a few key points that we have made throughout this paper. First, we espoused a deeper integration of the management and leadership functions. Every author on this paper has served in organizations that tout the importance of leadership, but at times this can mistakenly be taken to the extreme because it is easy to use leadership as a scapegoat for bad management. For example, the popular adage "when you have a hammer, everything looks like a nail" comes to mind, and in these cases, every problem seemingly is traced back to a lack of leadership. Yet, the proximal causes of poor management are often related to a leader's inability to effectively plan, organize, direct, or control. Second, we must educate emerging leaders on *how* to establish credibility with followers by first focusing attention on the tandem of *ethos* (trustworthiness) and *logos* (expertise), whereas third, teaching them when, where, and how to tap into *pathos* (emotion) when it is truly called for. As previously touched on, high energy and positive affect can have a powerful, yet proximal impact on reaching performance outcomes, yet the cost of overuse is emotional fatigue. Importantly, and as highlighted throughout this paper, all three prescriptions earlier are supported by empirical research.

It is also important that leadership educators not fall victim to the notion that there is one best way to lead or that one particular theory captures it all, without considering how contextual influences might impact the suitability and effectiveness of various leadership approaches. To guard against this possibility, weaving the context into leader education and training can help to build programs that provide leaders with a leadership "toolkit" that can be deployed as needed. With this understanding and approach to theory building and testing, we can more fully advance our understanding of leader adaptability and integrate leadership research and development moving

forward. Fortunately, this logic is not merely supposition. As stated in the literature, leadership is dynamic and characterized by the collision of organizational, interpersonal, task, and performance demands, creating a highly complex (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001), multi-faceted and multi-level (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000; Yammarino & Dansereau, 2008) context within which many leaders must perform. For this reason, researchers have long argued that leaders themselves should be highly complex and able to adapt their behaviors to meet varying situational demands (Hooijberg, Hunt, & Dodge, 1997; Lord et al., 2011), a notion supported by recent empirical research using both psychometric and neuroscience measures (Hannah, Balthazard, Waldman, Jennings, & Thatcher, 2013).

Finally, we must ask whether the newer genre forms of leadership can be developed. In their meta-analysis of leadership interventions across all theory types, Avolio et al. (2009) found an overall effect size of  $d = 0.60$  across 37 developmental interventions, suggesting that leadership can be developed. Yet with only 36 studies conducted over a 77-year period, they noted a dearth of research that attempted to develop leadership. Within the limited number attempted, specific to the newer genre theories, there is evidence that transformational leadership can be developed (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996; Crookall, 1989; Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002; Kelloway, Barling, & Helleur, 2000), but more research is clearly needed to fully understand how other newer genre behaviors (e.g., ethical and authentic) may be cultivated in leaders.

It is of note that we distinguished these newer genre leadership styles from their antecedents. There are certainly skills associated with each of these behavioral theories that can be trained, such as interpersonal skills that would facilitate individualized consideration as described by transformational leadership theory. Yet, it would be hard to “act” convincingly with individual consideration, for example, if a leader truly does not care about developing his or her followers. Similarly, we noted earlier that morality is one of the underpinnings of these newer genre theories, and research suggests that cognitive moral development can be developed (Bebeau, 2002; Hartwell, 1995). For example, a review of 23 ethics programs reported by Rest and Thoma (1986) showed those using group moral dilemma discussions had an average 0.41 effect size in raising levels of cognitive moral development versus 0.09 for those without moral discussion. Training programs have even reported success in developing moral courage (Jonas, Boos, & Brandstätter, 2007), as well as leader efficacy (Lester, Hannah, Harms, Vogelgesang, & Avolio, 2011), a known antecedent to transformational leadership (Hannah et al., 2012). These examples suggest that a strategy targeting development of the antecedents to newer genre forms of leadership may be effective. However, in order to realize the dramatic, positive impact these leadership development efforts can bring about, skill development is but one part of the equation. As described by Lord and Hall (2005), developing leaders aligned with the newer genre theories requires not just the training of skills but also a greater focus on changes in leaders’ identities, values, perspectives, and other “deep structures” to support those skills. Thus, we suggest that the most fruitful leader development efforts should be geared toward developing such deep structures (e.g., moral identity) rather than simply surface skills.

## Conclusion

We have attempted to highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of the newer genre leadership theories and, despite some noted shortcomings, have shown that there is as much a place for this genre of theories in leadership research and development as there is for others, such as the more traditional genre described by Bryman (1992). Theories such as transformational, ethical, authentic, and other “newer genre” leadership theories have helped to address previously neglected topics, such as leader visionary and inspirational messages, transparency, emotional effects, morality, individualized attention, and intellectual stimulation. Yet, we also underscored several shortcomings across the leadership research and development fields that could be shored up, namely a renewed focus on developing leader adaptability so that our leaders can be ready for the ever-changing and oft ignored contexts they will be a part of. This will require the use of *both* the new genre and the more traditional leadership theories. And,

perhaps most importantly, we proposed that leadership is a performative science, a process within which scholars and practitioners socially create leadership phenomenon. Yet, if we in this field are to contribute rather than merely critique, then perhaps the field should start as we have here by questioning if better alternatives exist. Stated differently, we need to ask ourselves, if not these theories, then which? What serves our field better, a wholesale retool of our theories or, instead, a more rigorous application of the scientific process in testing our theories? We have argued that the majority of the weaknesses within our field are not with our core theories and frameworks (although there are certainly room for improving those also), but largely with limitations concerning how scholars have chosen to operationalize these theories. With this, perhaps, we should examine how we apply research methodology toward testing leadership theory and take a more multi-theory perspective toward theory building. If leadership is indeed a performative science, will continued empirical testing of current theories amount to much or make a difference when translated into practice? Our position is that questions of this nature will better serve our field than those that ask, “what’s the best way to lead?”

## Author biographies

**Sean Hannah** is a Professor of Management and the Tylee Wilson Chair of Business Ethics at the Wake Forest University School of Business and is a retired Army Colonel. He researches exemplary leadership and has over 50 publications including in *AMR*, *AMJ*, *JAP*, *OBHDP*, *JOB*, *Personnel Psychology*, and other top journals.

**John Sumanth** is an Assistant Professor of Organizational Behavior at the Wake Forest University School of Business. His research focuses on upward communication, leadership, trust, and power and status in organizational hierarchies. John’s work has appeared in several top-tier outlets, such as in *ASQ*, *JAP*, *Personnel Psychology*, and *Organizational Psychology Review*.

**Major Paul Lester** is the Director of the U.S. Army’s Research Facilitation Team in Monterey, California. He research interests are leadership, psychological resilience, and courage. He has published in the *American Psychologist*, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *The Leadership Quarterly*, and elsewhere. He can be reached at paul.b.lester.mil@mail.mil.

**Fabrice Cavarretta** is an Assistant Professor of Management and Entrepreneurship at ESSEC Business School. He received his PhD from INSEAD. His research explores the links between organizational factors (team composition, resources) and extreme organizational outcomes, and the paradigms used by entrepreneurs when developing new ventures.

## References

- Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Incorporated.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). *The full range of leadership development: Basic and advanced manuals*. Birmingham, NY: Bass, Avolio, & Associates.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gibbons, T. G. (1988). Developing transformational leaders: A life span approach. In J. A. Conger, & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 276–308). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 801–823.
- Avolio, B. J., Reichard, R. J., Hannah, S., Walumbwa, F. O., & Chan, A. (2009). 100 years of leadership intervention studies: A meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, *20*, 764–784.
- Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 827–832.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *MLQ: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (2nd ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and application*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 181–217.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 207–218.
- Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., Avolio, B. J., & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. *Group & Organization Management*, *12*(1), 73–87.
- Bebeau, M. J. (2002). The defining issues test and the four component model: Contributions to professional education. *Journal of Moral Education*, *31*, 271–294.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality*. New York: Doubleday.
- Bluedorn, A. C., & Jaussi, K. S. (2008). Leaders, followers, and time. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 654–668.
- Bono, J. E., & Ilies, R. (2006). Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(4), 317–334.
- Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*, 279–307.
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 595–616.
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *97*(2), 117–134.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London, UK: Sage.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership: The new pursuit of happiness* (Vol. 213). New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Callon, M., & Muniesa, F. (2005). Peripheral vision: Economic markets as calculative collective devices. *Organization Studies*, *26*(8), 1229–1250.
- Cha, S. E., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). When values backfire: Leadership, attribution, and disenchantment in a values-driven organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(1), 57–78.
- Chun, J. U., Yammarino, F. J., Dionne, S. D., Sosik, J. J., & Moon, H. K. (2009). Leadership across hierarchical levels: Multiple levels of management and multiple levels of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*(5), 689–707.
- Clapp-Smith, R., Vogelgesang, G. R., & Avey, J. B. (2009). Authentic leadership and positive psychological capital: The mediating role of trust at the group level of analysis. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *15*(3), 227–240.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2007). Trends in theory building and theory testing: A five-decade study of the Academy of Management Journal. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(6), 1281–1303.
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., Piccolo, R. F., Zapata, C. P., & Rich, B. L. (2012). Explaining the justice–performance relationship: Trust as exchange deepener or trust as uncertainty reducer? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*(1), 1–15.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 909–927.
- Craig, S. B., & Gustafson, S. B. (1998). Perceived leader integrity scale: An instrument for assessing employee perceptions of leader integrity. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *9*, 127–145.
- Crookall, P. S. (1989). Leadership in the prison industry. Doctoral Dissertation: University of Ontario, London, CA.
- Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). Emotion and attribution of intentionality in leader–member relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(5), 615–634.
- Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2005). Follower emotional reactions to authentic and inauthentic leadership influence. In W. L. Gardner, B. J. Avolio, & F. O. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and development* (pp. 281–300). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.
- Day, D. V. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(4), 581–613.
- De Cremer, D. (2003). Why inconsistent leadership is regarded as procedurally unfair: The importance of social self-esteem concerns. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*(4), 535–550.
- De Hoogh, A. H., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*(3), 297–311.
- Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 219–256.
- DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*(4), 627–647.

- DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, *64*(1), 7–52.
- Dineen, D. R., Lewicki, R. J., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2006). Supervisory guidance and behavioral integrity: Relationships with employee citizenship and deviant behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 622–635.
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(4), 611–628.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., Shaw, J. D., Johnson, J. L., & Pagon, M. (2006). The social context of undermining behavior at work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *101*, 105–126.
- Dumdum, U. R., Lowe, K. B., & Avolio, B. J. (2002). A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: An update and extension. *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead*, *2*, 35–66.
- Dvir, T., & Shamir, B. (2003). Follower developmental characteristics as predicting transformational leadership: A longitudinal field study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 327–344.
- Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*, 735–744.
- Eldredge, N., & Gould, S. J. (1972). Punctuated equilibria: An alternative to phyletic gradualism. In T. J. M. Schopf (Ed.), *Models of paleobiology* (pp. 82–115). San Francisco, CA: Freeman, Cooper and Co.
- Evans, M. G. (1985). A Monte Carlo study of the effects of correlated method variance in moderated multiple regression analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *36*, 305–323.
- Ferraro, F., Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. (2005). Economics language and assumptions: How theories can become self-fulfilling. *Academy of Management Review*, *30*(1), 8–24.
- French, J., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in Social Power* (pp. 150–167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 693–727.
- Fry, L. W., Vitucci, S., & Cedillo, M. (2005). Spiritual leadership and army transformation: Theory, measurement, and establishing a baseline. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*, 835–862.
- Gardner, W. L., Cogliser, C. C., Davis, K. M., & Dickens, M. P. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(6), 1120–1145.
- Gardner, W. L., Lowe, K. B., Moss, T. W., Mahoney, K. T., & Cogliser, C. C. (2010). Scholarly leadership of the study of leadership: A review of The Leadership Quarterly's second decade, 2000–2009. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(6), 922–958.
- Glasø, L., & Einarsen, S. (2008). Emotion regulation in leader–follower relationships. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *17*(4), 482–500.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1973). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, IN: Center for Applied Studies.
- Hannah, S., & Avolio, B. J. (2011). Leader character, ethos, and virtue: Individual and collective considerations. *Leadership Quarterly*, *22*, 989–994.
- Hannah, S. T., & Jennings, P. L. (2013). Leader ethos and big-C character. *Organizational Dynamics*, *42*, 8–16.
- Hannah, S., Avolio, B. J., Chan, A., & Walumbwa, F. (2012). Leader self and means efficacy: A multi-component approach. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *118*, 143–161.
- Hannah, S. T., Balthazard, P. A., Waldman, D. A., Jennings, P. L., & Thatcher, R. W. (2013). The psychological and neurological bases of leader self-complexity and effects on adaptive decision-making. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*(3), 393–411.
- Hannah, S. T., Jennings, P. L., Bluhm, D., Peng, A. C., & Schaubroeck, J. M. (2014). Duty orientation: Theoretical development and preliminary construct testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *123*, 220–238.
- Hartwell, S. (1995). Promoting moral development through experiential teaching. *Clinical Law Review*, *1*, 505–539.
- Haslam, S. A., & Platow, M. J. (2001). The link between leadership and followership: How affirming social identity translates vision into action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*(11), 1469–1479.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, *44*(3), 513.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *5*(3), 184–200.
- Hollander, E. P. (1958). Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review*, *65*, 117–127.
- Hollander, E. P. (1992a). Leadership, followership, self, and others. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *3*, 43–54.
- Hollander, E. P. (1992b). The essential interdependence of leadership and followership. *American Psychology Society*, *1*, 71–74.
- Hooijberg, R., Hunt, J. G., & Dodge, G. E. (1997). Leadership complexity and development of the Leaderplex Model. *Journal of Management*, *23*, 375–408.
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt, & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189–204). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis?. *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409–473.
- Hughes, S. (1997). Transformational leadership, leader–member exchange, and the effects of leader/member similarity and liking. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58.
- Hyde, M. J., & Schrag, C. O. (2004). *The ethos of rhetoric*. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.
- Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader–follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 373–394.
- Jensen, S. M., & Luthans, F. (2006). Relationship between entrepreneurs' psychological capital and their authentic leadership. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 18, 254–273.
- Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 386–408.
- Jonas, K., Boos, M., & Brandstätter, B. (Eds.). (2007). *Training moral courage: Theory and practice*. Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe.
- Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & de Hoogh, A. B. (2013). Ethical leadership and followers' helping and initiative: The role of demonstrated responsibility and job autonomy. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22(2), 165–181.
- Kelloway, E. K., Barling, J., & Helleur, J. (2000). Enhancing transformational leadership: The roles of training and feedback. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21(3), 145–149.
- Koopman, P. L., Den Hartog, D. N., Konrad, E., Akerblom, S., Audia, G., Bakacsi, G., ... Wunderer, R. (1999). National culture and leadership profiles in Europe: Some results from the GLOBE study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(4), 503–520.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force of change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2011). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it* (Vol. 244). San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Klein, K. J. (2000). A multilevel approach to theory and research in organizations: Contextual, temporal, and emergent processes. In K. J. Klein, & S. W. J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions* (pp. 3–90). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed., Chp 2,3,4,5, ps, 210). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory life: The social construction of scientific facts*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1984). On the primacy of cognition. *American Psychologist*, 39, 124–129.
- LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 764–775.
- Leroy, H., Palanski, M. E., & Simons, T. (2012). Authentic leadership and behavioral integrity as drivers of follower performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107, 255–264.
- Lester, P., Hannah, S., Harms, P., Vogelgesang, G., & Avolio, B. J. (2011). Mentoring impact on leader efficacy development: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 10, 409–429.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 161–177.
- Lord, R. G., & Hall, R. J. (2005). Identity, deep structure and the development of leadership skill. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 591–615.
- Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1993). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (2002). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. New York: Routledge.
- Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & De Vader, C. L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 34, 343.
- Lord, R. L., Hannah, S. T., & Jennings, P. L. (2011). A framework for understanding leadership and individual requisite complexity. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 1, 104–127.
- Lowe, K. B., & Gardner, W. L. (2001). Ten years of The Leadership Quarterly: Contributions and challenges for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 459–514.
- Luthans, F., Hodgetts, R. M., & Rosenkrantz, S. A. (1988). *Real managers*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- MacKenzie, D. (2003). An equation and its worlds: Bricolage, exemplars, disunity and performativity in financial economics. *Social Studies of Science*, 33(6), 831–868.
- Marion, R., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leadership in complex organizations. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 389–418.
- Martinko, M. J., Harvey, P., & Douglas, S. C. (2007). The role, function, and contribution of attribution theory to leadership: A review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 561–585.

- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734.
- Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. (2009). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108, 1–13.
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 24–59.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363.
- Moorman, R. H., Darnold, T. C., & Priesemuth, M. (2013). Perceived leader integrity: Supporting the construct validity and utility of a multi-dimensional measure in two samples. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(3), 427–444.
- Neider, L. L., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2011). The authentic leadership inventory (ALI): Development and empirical tests. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(6), 1146–1164.
- Oc, B., & Bashshur, M. R. (2013). Followership, leadership and social influence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(6), 919–934.
- Omilion-Hodges, L. M., & Baker, C. R. (2013). Contextualizing LMX within the workgroup: The effects of LMX and justice on relationship quality and resource sharing among peers. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(6), 935–951.
- Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(6), 797–837.
- Palanski, M. E., & Yammarino, F. J. (2011). Impact of behavioral integrity on follower job performance: A three-study examination. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(4), 765–786.
- Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2013). A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113, 377–393.
- Parsons, T., & Shils, E. A. (1951). Values, motives, and systems of action. In T. Parsons, & E. A. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action* (pp. 47–275). New York: Harvard University Press.
- Pearce, C. L., & Sims, Jr., H. P. (2002). Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 6(2), 172.
- Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 327.
- Popper, K. R. (1934 [2002]). *The logic of scientific discovery*, *Routledge classics*: 27–47, 513. London, New York: Routledge.
- Porter, L. W., & McLaughlin, G. B. (2006). Leadership and the organizational context: Like the weather. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 559–576.
- Power, F. C., Higgins, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1989). The habit of the common life: Building character through just community schools. In L. Nucci (Ed.), *Moral development and character education: A dialogue* (pp. 125–143). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Rest, J. R., & Thoma, S. J. (1986). Education programs and interventions. In J. R. Rest (Ed.), *Moral development: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 59–88). New York: Praeger.
- Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. (2003). Interdependence, interaction, and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54(1), 351–375.
- Schaubroeck, J. M., Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Kozlowski, S. W., Lord, R. G., Treviño, L. K., ... Peng, A. C. (2012). Embedding ethical leadership within and across organization levels. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(5), 1053–1078.
- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S., & Peng, A. C. (2011). Cognition-based and affect-based trust as mediators of leader behavior influences on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 863–871.
- Schaubroeck, J., Peng, A. C., & Hannah, S. (2013). Developing trust in leaders and peers, relational identity, and the acceleration of organizational identification during entry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(4), 1148–1168.
- Scherer, K. R. (1982). Emotion as process: Function, origin and regulation. *Social Science Information*, 21, 555–570.
- Selznick, P. (1992). *The moral commonwealth: Social theory and the promise of community*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Shamir, B. (2011). Leadership takes time: Some implications of (not) taking time seriously in leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 307–315.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577–594.
- Siemsen, E., Roth, A., & Oliveira, P. (2010). Common method bias in regression models with linear, quadratic, and interaction effects. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13, 456–476.
- Simon, H. A. (1947 [1997]). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan.
- Simons, T. L. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus. *Organizational Science*, 13, 18–35.

- Simons, T. L., Friedman, R., Liu, L. A., & McLean-Parks, J. (2007). Racial differences in sensitivity to behavioral integrity: Attitudinal consequences, in-group effects, and “trickle down” among black and non-black employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 650–665.
- Solomon, R. C. (1992). *Ethics and Excellence*. New York: Oxford.
- Sparrowe, R. T., Soetjijto, B. W., & Kraimer, M. L. (2006). Do leaders’ influence tactics relate to members’ helping behavior? It depends on the quality of the relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(6), 1194–1208.
- Spicer, A., Alvesson, M., & Karreman, D. (2009). Critical performativity: The unfinished business of critical management studies. *Human Relations, 62*(4), 537–560.
- Tate, B. (2008). A longitudinal study of the relationships among self-monitoring, authentic leadership, and perceptions of leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 15*, 16–29.
- Tepper, B. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 33*, 261–289.
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1986). Charisma and its routinization in two social movement organizations. In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 8, pp. 113–164). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(1), 83–104.
- Van Iddekinge, C. H., Ferris, G. R., & Heffner, T. S. (2009). Test of a multistage model of distal and proximal antecedents of leader performance. *Personnel Psychology, 62*, 463–495.
- Walumbwa, F. O., & Schaubroeck, J. (2009). Leader personality traits and employee voice behavior: Mediating roles of ethical leadership and work group psychological safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1275–1286.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and analysis of a multidimensional theory-based measure. *Journal of Management, 34*, 89–126.
- Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., & Chen, Z. X. (2005). Leader–member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers’ performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(3), 420–432.
- Wang, G., Oh, I., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group and Organization Management, 36*(2), 223–270.
- Weber, M. (1952). The routinization of charisma. In T. Parsons (Ed.), *The theory of social and economic organization, translated by AM Henderson and Talcott Parsons* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1947) (pp. 363–386). New York: The Free Press.
- Wong, C. A., & Cummings, G. G. (2009). The influence of authentic leadership behaviors on trust and work outcomes of health care staff. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 3*, 6–23.
- Yammarino, F. J., & Dansereau, F. (2008). Multi-level nature of and multi-level approaches to leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*, 135–141.
- Yang, J., Zhang, Z. X., Tsui, A. S. (2010). Middle manager leadership and frontline employee performance: Bypass, cascading, and moderating effects. *Journal of Management Studies, 47*(4), 654–678.