

Oxford Handbooks Online

Leadership, the Old, the New, and the Timeless: A Commentary

John Campbell

The Oxford Handbook of Leadership

Edited by Michael G. Rumsey

Print Publication Date: Nov 2012

Online Publication Date: Dec
2012

Subject: Psychology, Personality and Social Psychology

DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195398793.013.0024

Abstract and Keywords

This chapter investigates the conflicting theories through the prism of leader job performance. Its basic assertion is that much of the confusion and conflict subsides if leadership theory and research is interpreted within a general model of performance itself, including its determinants and its outcomes. The models of leadership are described and interpreted within such a model of performance, and are found to be complementary, not in conflict. The revised Campbell model states eight major substantive factors at the highest level of generality that appear to be useful. The labels for the eight factors are: technical performance, communication performance, effort and initiative, counterproductive work behavior, peer leadership, hierarchical leadership, peer management, and hierarchical management. These factors address the substantive content of individual work performance when performance is defined. Authentic leadership seems not in competition with, or an alternative for, transformational leadership.

Keywords: leadership theory, Campbell model, technical performance, communication performance, effort and initiative, counterproductive work behavior, peer leadership, hierarchical leadership, peer management, hierarchical management

The literature dealing with leadership theory, research, and practice is compelling, complex, and confusing. It is filled with hope, despair, and rambunctious energy. Without doubt, leadership functions are major determinants of organizational effectiveness, for better or for worse. If only we knew, and could concretely specify, what the critical leadership functions are, how they can be nurtured, and how they affect organizational performance and effectiveness. The chapters in this section attempt to do that, and they represent what Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber (2009) called the new(er) genre of leadership models.

However, the objective of this chapter is not to critique the concepts of authentic transformational leadership, charismatic leadership in organizations, or leader motivated excellence (LMX). The contributors to the *Leadership Quarterly* do that repeatedly among themselves. Instead, the aim here is to locate each of the three in a broader framework of performance itself, in an attempt to point out their similarities and differences. Historically, the leadership literature has sometimes portrayed different models as competing explanations of leadership effectiveness when they are in fact complementary. For example, "trait" models speak to various sets of independent variables, whereas "behavioral" models tend to focus on the dependent variable (e.g., performance).

The Nature of Performance

The broader framework is the model of performance offered by Campbell, et al (1993) and subsequently revised and elaborated by Campbell (2012). First, the definitions of behavior, performance, and effectiveness (Campbell, et al 1970) still hold. That is, individuals enter the work setting and they do things. Some, hopefully a lot, of the things they do are directed toward the achievement of organizational goals. These actions must be at least potentially observable. For example, sometimes it takes a great deal of covert thinking before the individual (p. 402) does

something. Performance is the action, not the thinking that preceded the action. This has nothing to do with the cognitive psychology versus behaviorism debate. That debate focuses on what controls the actions. Some say it's our reinforcement histories, some say it's our cognitions. However, someone must identify those actions that are relevant for the organization's goals and those that are not. For those that are (i.e., performance), the level of proficiency with which the individual performs them must be scaled. Both the judgment of relevance and the judgment of level of proficiency depend on a specification of the important *substantive* goals of the organization, not content-free goals such as "make a profit."

Nothing in this definition requires that a set of performance actions be circumscribed by the term "job" or that they remain "static" over a significant length of time. Neither does it require the goals of an organization remain fixed, or that a particular management cadre is responsible for determining the organization's goals (aka "vision"). Neither does it say actions or goals must be described at a certain level of specificity. However, for performance assessment to take place, the major operative goals of the organization, within some meaningful time frame, must be known; and the methods by which individual actions are judged to be goal relevant, and scaled in terms of what represents high and low proficiency, must be legitimized. Consequently, it is not a violation of this definition of performance for individual organization members to decide themselves what actions are most relevant for what they think the goals of the organization are, or should be. That is, they can be quite active (Frese, 2008), or proactive (Griffen, Neal, & Parker, 2007) in this regard. However, these goal choices, and decisions about what actions best serve them, must be legitimized by the stakeholders empowered to do so by the organization's charter. Otherwise, there is no organization.

The distinction between performance and effectiveness (aka: organizational outcomes, the bottom line, organizational goal achievement) is that effectiveness is not solely determined by the performance of a particular individual, even if that individual is one of the organization's critical "leaders." For example, indicators judged to be valid measures of a unit's effectiveness, such as sales volume, number of windows installed in new housing, number of on-time arrivals along a bus route, dollar value of research grants, or standardized test scores of middle-school students are not solely a function of the individual performance of the salesperson, carpenter, bus driver, researcher, or public school teacher. If these indicators represent the goals of the organization, then individual performance should certainly be related to them (if not, the specifications for individual performance are wrong and need changing or, conversely, the organization is pursuing the wrong goals). However, by definition, effectiveness indicators have other determinants as well, for which the individual should not be held responsible. If the variability in an effectiveness indicator is *totally* under the control of the individual, then it is a measure of performance. These issues are particularly important for leadership theory and research, in which the distinction between performance and its outcomes is frequently blurred.

Similar definitions apply to team performance, but team performance is not a simple aggregation of the individual performance of team members. Virtually by definition, team performance requires some form of collective *interdependent* actions on the part of the team members (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006). However, the analogous distinction between team performance and team effectiveness is a real one, if variance in measures of team effectiveness is determined by sources (e.g., resource availability) not under the control of the team itself (see Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008).

Modeling Performance

Since the mid 1980s there have been several efforts to specify the "dimensionality" of performance, in the context of the latent structure of the actions required by a particular occupation, job, position, or work role (see Borman & Brush, 1993; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, & Sager, 1993; Griffen et al, 2007; Murphy, 1989; Organ, 1988; Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002). These have become known as performance models, and they seem to offer differing specifications for what constitutes the nature of performance as a construct. However, Campbell (2012) has argued that, when differences in labeling terminology are set aside, and the actual specifications for the different "appearing" constructs are considered, there is virtually total correspondence. All this permits specification of a composite picture of performance dimensionality that *could* be used for identifying appropriate dependent variables for specific research or HR management purposes, and for locating leadership performance within the broader picture of work role performance.

Some Issues

Proceeding along this path raises some important issues. First, proposing models of performance (p. 403) seems quite normative. That is, the models seem to stipulate that performance in any job or work role of the moment is composed of the same set of components, or dimensions. How can that be if performance is characterized as a set of actions relevant for a particular organization's goals? Doesn't that make the substantive content of performance unique to a particular time and place? The only legitimate answer must be that, at a particular level of specificity/generality, research has shown that particular sets of actions (e.g., refraining from substance abuse, showing consideration for co-workers, setting goals with subordinates) contribute to goal accomplishment in virtually any organization. The story is not quite the same for what is called the "technical performance" factor in each of the models, but more about that later.

A second issue arises because there are really two different kinds of performance models in the literature. The first kind specifies performance as a set of *substantive* content factors (e.g., flying an airplane, delegating responsibilities to subordinates) and the second focuses on sets of cognitive/behavioral processes, such as "active" performance (Frese, 2008), or performance "adaptability" (Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000). Although not always perfectly clear, there are major distinctions to be made between these two kinds of models. It is argued later that they are complementary, and not competing, renditions.

A third issue is whether the models are, or should be, hierarchical in nature (i.e., performance components are identified at more than one level of specificity). That is, can major factors be decomposed into subfactors; and if they are, are the different levels fully nested? The argument below is that, yes, they are hierarchical and are fully nested, even after different models are aggregated into a composite.

The Campbell Model (Revised)

The revised model (Campbell, 2012) posits eight major substantive factors at the highest level of generality that seems useful. That is, each factor describes a specifiable content domain of goal relevant actions such that aggregating them into a smaller number of higher-order factors would tend toward adding apples and oranges. The revised performance model is based on a comprehensive review of the performance literature from approximately 1990 to the present. The labels for the eight factors are: technical performance, communication performance, effort and initiative, counterproductive work behavior, peer leadership, hierarchical leadership, peer management, and hierarchical management. Each of the eight factors is discussed in more detail next.

The Leadership Components

Because four of the eight factors involve leadership and management performance, they deserve special attention, given the objectives of the current chapter. The position taken here is that leadership and management each involve a distinct set of functions to carry out, or roles to perform. That is, each has its own set of performance dimensions that can be differentiated, to a degree that is useful, for selection, training, and development, job design, and performance assessment purposes. Most often, these two sets of functions are, to some degree, the responsibility of one individual, who usually carries the title of supervisor, manager, or executive (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2005). However, individuals with other job, occupation, or work-role titles can perform these functions as well, and the composition of a particular work role can change dramatically, as regards management and leadership functions, when the goals of the organization or unit change.

For present purposes, the overall distinction between these two sets of performance dimensions is that leadership involves direct interpersonal influence. That is, actions taken in the name of leadership attempt to influence the behavior of other people such that their performance is enhanced, both individually and collectively. Individual performance can be enhanced by other processes as well (e.g., online training), but direct interpersonal influence is, by definition, the domain of "leadership." This definition was not handed down from some higher authority. It simply seems to be very useful.

As distinct from leadership, management involves activities that best use (i.e., manage) the organization's resources to achieve its goals. They involve cognitive and communicative processes that influence others, but they do not rely, again by definition, on interpersonal influence. For example, developing a budget is a

management function that will have important effects on others. However, selling it to other individuals may take interpersonal influence (i.e., leadership).

Again, there is no one best way to define leadership and management. The definitions just offered are simply those that seem to be useful for developing a comprehensive substantive model of individual performance at work. (p. 404)

Modeling Leadership and Management

The literature on leadership is of course voluminous (e.g., Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2010). A part of this literature is concerned with describing the substantive content of leader performance. It is also true that the substantive specifications for leader performance are almost always embedded within a model or theory of leadership dynamics, although not all models are perfectly clear about what they mean by leader performance itself. It is certainly not the intent here to attempt a review of leadership theory. Bass (1990) Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2009), Yukl (2010), and the *Yearly Review of Leadership* issues of the *Leadership Quarterly* do that quite thoroughly. However, over the last 60–70 years, a succession of leadership theories have incorporated specifications for the actions (behaviors) that comprise leader performance. A brief summary is as follows. The somewhat disdainful criticisms of this literature are discussed later.

Beginning soon after WWII, a series of “behavioral” leadership models attempted to describe what high-performing leaders do. The results of the Ohio State studies (Fleishman, 1983) and research at the University of Michigan’s Survey Research Center, the Research Center for Group Dynamics (Cartwright & Zander, 1960), and the Institute for Social Research (Likert, 1961) converged on a four-factor description, which was summarized in the classic paper by Bowers and Seashore (1966), both of whom were at Michigan. The four factors are given below. The equivalent titles from the Ohio State studies are shown in parentheses.

1. Support (Consideration).

Behavior that enhances someone else’s feeling of personal worth and importance and shows mutual trust and respect.

2. Interaction facilitation (Sensitivity).

Behavior that encourages members of the group to develop close, mutually satisfying relationships and shows awareness of potential conflict and stressors.

3. Goal emphasis (Production emphasis).

Behavior that stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting the group’s goal or achieving excellent performance.

4. Work facilitation (Initiating structure).

Behavior that helps achieve goal attainment by such activities as scheduling, coordinating, planning, providing ways to get the job done, and by providing resources such as tools, materials, and technical knowledge. Note that the factor does not refer to being unilaterally directive and “telling people what to do.”

From the 1960s to the present, these basic factors occur again and again in leadership theory and research. Sometimes, only two of the factors are emphasized (i.e., consideration and structure) and sometimes more fine-grained subfactors are used, as in the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-12; Stogdill, Goode, & Day, 1962) or the Managerial Behavior Survey (Yukl & Nemeroff, 1979; Yukl, Wall, & Lepsinger, 1990). Virtually all the “contingency” models of leadership such as Fiedler’s (1967) LPC (Least Preferred Co-worker) and Path-Goal theory (House, 1971; House & Mitchell, 1974) incorporate the same factors. For example, leaders acting in a high-LPC environment were said to rely on consideration and participation, whereas leaders acting in a low-LPC environment were said to rely on being structured and directive. The House and Mitchell (1974) version of the Path-Goal model uses four factors that are virtually identical to the four factors described by Bowers and Seashore (1966). What is characteristic of the contingency models is that the effectiveness of high scorers on particular performance dimensions is influenced by (i.e., contingent on) certain characteristics of the situation, including the characteristics of the followers. However, the research support for major interactive effects in this regard, after various artifacts are accounted for, is very sketchy (Yukl, 2010).

The models discussed so far essentially deal with leadership as a one-on-one process. Another group of models frame leadership influence in the group context. That is, the concern is how leadership performance influences work group effectiveness. Certainly this was the orientation early on at the University of Michigan Institute for Group

Dynamics (e.g., Bales, 1958; Cartwright & Zander, 1960), when the collective concerns of both leaders and group members in high-performance groups were with behaviors directed at achieving the group's goals and behaviors directed at group maintenance (i.e., keeping people involved, interested, feeling rewarded, and committed), which are the group centered analogs to structure and consideration at the individual level. Blake and Mouton (1964, 1983) incorporated these same two dimensions in a model of group leadership known as the managerial grid. The two dimensions were labeled production centered and employee centered and the grid stipulated that it was most advantageous for a leader/manager to be proficient on both. (p. 405)

The group and one-on-one perspectives are essentially merged in the original Leader-Member-Exchange (LMX) theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) which emphasizes that the influence process is reciprocal. That is, a leader develops a distinct relationship with each of his or her subordinates because of a mutual influence process that moves through several stages to a relatively stable psychological contract that essentially specifies who will do what for whom under what circumstances. The nature of the contract (i.e., the quality of LMX) can vary widely across leader-member pairs, as a function of the performance capabilities and reward preference of each, and the success of mutual-influence attempts that are based on, in so many words, high consideration, mutually satisfying initiating structure, agreement on important goals, and sensitivity to sources of conflict and stress in the LMX relationship.

Currently, the leadership literature seems dominated by leader performance and effectiveness descriptions incorporated in the concepts of charismatic leadership and transformational leadership (Hunt, 1999). Charismatic behavior has been characterized by Weber (1947), House (1977), Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993), Conger and Kanungo (1998), and Yukl, 1999, 2010) as articulating important and "visionary" goals for the organization, communicating the vision in a very expressive and positive emotional way, showing a willingness to take risks to accomplish the goals, communicating high expectations for followers, expressing optimism and confidence in followers, and empowering followers to participate in decision making associated with achieving the visionary goals.

The specifications for transformational-leadership performance were first articulated by Burns (1978) after studying the careers of widely recognized national leaders. Transformational leadership was brought into the I/O Psychology mainstream by Bass (1985) and his colleagues (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003). In general, transformational-leadership performance is seen as less emotional and less hero-centered than charismatic leadership, but no less visionary, and it is focused on future goals of great importance. The measurement of transformational and transactional leadership has been facilitated by the development of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1990) The scales pertaining to transformational-leadership performance include individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence, although the item assignments to factors are not without ambiguity (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). Some of the items also assess the follower's reactions to the leader (i.e., without reference to things the leaders did), which makes them assessments of effectiveness outcomes, and not leader performance actions. Given these ambiguities, the item content for the first three scales bears a striking resemblance to consideration, structure, and production emphasis from the Ohio State studies and to the support, work facilitation, and goal emphasis factors from the Bowers and Seashore (1966) synthesis. As part of the MLQ description, the high-performing transformational leader also communicates confidence, enthusiasm, and the importance of collective interests regarding the goals to be accomplished. Consequently, idealized influence might also be referred to as "modeling" the attitudes and behaviors desired from others.

From this brief examination of current and past attempts to specify the behaviors on actions that comprise leadership performance, one major conclusion stands out. There is simply an amazing degree of consistency across models and theories stretching from 1950 to the present, in terms of the basic dimensions that constitute the latent structure of leader performance when performance is defined as this chapter defines it. The literature is not helter-skelter; it converges. Further, as will be subsequently discussed, the same latent structure seems to be applicable to any organizational level, and to peer leadership as well.

To some degree, there has been a separate literature devoted to identifying the performance dimensions comprising management that parallels the leadership literature. For example, there have been intensive case studies of a small number of managers (e.g., Kotter, 1996, Mahoney, Jerdee, & Carroll, 1963; Mintzberg, 1973), several critical incident data collections intended to identify categories of management performance (see Borman

& Brush, 1993), and several research programs that developed questionnaire assessments of management performance behavior (e.g., Hemphill, 1959; Mahoney, Jerdee, & Carroll, 1965; Page & Tornow, 1987; Wilson, O'Hare, & Shipper, 1990; Yukl & Nemeroff, 1979; Yukl, Wall, & Lepsinger, 1990).

There is also a parallel literature on management theory (see Carroll & Gillen, 1987, for a review) which provides specifications for critical management functions such as planning, coordinating resources, negotiating, monitoring and evaluating, and staffing. Prescriptions for the formal functions of management go back to Weber (1947), Fayol (1949), Urwich (1952), and others, and can be found in virtually any management textbook. (p. 406)

Table 23.1. Six Basic Factors Comprising Leadership Performance

1. *Consideration, Support, Person-Centered*: Providing recognition and encouragement, being supportive when under stress, giving constructive feedback, helping others with difficult tasks, building networks with and among others.
2. *Initiating Structure, Guiding, Directing*: Providing task assignments, explaining work methods, clarifying work roles, providing tools, critical knowledge, and technical support.
3. *Goal Emphasis*: Encouraging enthusiasm and commitment for the group/organization goals, emphasizing the important missions to be accomplished.
4. *Empowerment, Facilitation*: Delegating authority and responsibilities to others, encouraging participation, allowing discretion in decision making.
5. *Training, Coaching*: One-on-one coaching and instruction regarding how to accomplish job tasks, how to interact with other people, and how to deal with obstacles and constraints.
6. *Serving as a Model*: Models appropriate behavior regarding interacting with others, acting unselfishly, working under adverse conditions, reacting to crisis or stress, working to achieve goals, showing confidence and enthusiasm, and exhibiting principled and ethical behavior.

Within industrial/organizational (I/O) psychology there have been two major efforts to provide a composite picture of management-performance dimensions, and they each used a very different approach. However, comparing where they ended up and how they relate to the leadership-performance models previously discussed is instructive.

Borman and Brush (1993) analyzed the results from seven published and 19 unpublished critical incident studies of management performance by first aggregating the distinct dimensions identified in each study, the total of which was 187, and then asking an SME sample of 30 I/O psychologists to sort the 187 dimensions into homogeneous categories. The resulting matrix of similarities was factor analyzed, and an 18-factor solution seemed the most appropriate.

In contrast, Yukl et al. (2002) developed a composite set of 12 leadership-management performance dimensions by reviewing all available measures of management-leadership performance, from the Ohio State Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to his own Managerial Practice Survey (Yukl et al., 1990) to the Bass and Avolio (1990) Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), and categorizing the dimensions from each into the 12 factors.

Looking at the results of the Borman & Brush (1993) and Yukl et al., (2002) efforts suggests the following:

1. There is a great deal of overlap, but some dimensions found in one were not identified in the other.
2. Both sets contain dimensions that some call leadership and some might call management (e.g., planning and organizing).
3. Some dimensions seem to be neither (e.g., technical proficiency, persistence in reaching goals).
4. Some dimensions (e.g., representing the organization, organizational commitment) seem reminiscent of contextual or organizational-citizenship behavior (OCB) factors (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Organ 1988).

A Synthesized Taxonomy

Given the previous working definitions of leadership and management, and based on the accumulated research summarized earlier that attempts to specify the latent structure of leadership and management performance, a proposed synthesis is presented in Tables 23.1 and 23.2 Given that the world of work can never be carved up

quite so neatly, a set of caveats and conditionals follows.

Tables 23.1 and 23.2 are intended to be a distillation of all previous taxonomic, or taxonomic appearing, research on the substantive-performance content of leadership and management. There are six leadership and eight management factors, written at a fairly high level of generality. Both higher-order and more-specific subfactors can be found in the literature (see Yukl, 2010). The level of generality/specificity was chosen because 60 years of theory and research seems to converge on it. Using fewer higher-order factors would seem to cover up some useful distinctions. Using more specific factors would be both possible and useful for specific research or application purposes, such as determining training needs or investigating particular kinds of performance dynamics.

Again, no jobs, occupations, or work roles would be comprised of only leadership factors or only management factors. Many positions might incorporate substantially all of them, but many would not. The 14 factors are meant to represent leadership and management wherever they might occur. It is intended that the same factors could be used (p. 407) to describe executive, management, supervisory, or peer leadership and management, although the criticality or relative emphasis of the factors might change significantly across different levels.

Two factors that are not in Table 23.2 but that do appear in the management literature are *communication* performance and performance in the appropriate *technical* specialty. These two factors appear as separate dimensions in most performance models and they have no exclusive link to leadership and management. Consequently, they are omitted from Table 23.2 but included in the general model to be discussed subsequently.

It is noteworthy that virtually all the performance dimensions discussed under the headings of Contextual Performance and OCB also appear as major dimensions in the leadership/management literature. For example, helping and cooperating with others, organizational courtesy, and altruism have specifications that are very similar to the leader consideration factor. The external representation factor in the management taxonomy is very similar to the contextual factor of endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives and to the civic virtue factor of OCB. Both the contextual performance taxonomy and the OCB taxonomy have factors reflecting compliance with organizational policies, regulations, work rules, and norms. Theory and research dealing with management performance also produced such a factor. A study by Conway (1999) also supports the convergence between leadership and OCB.

The considerable overlap between the content of contextual/OCB and leadership/management performance lends credence to the previous assertion that peer leadership and peer management performance can be described with the same factors as supervisor/manager/executive leadership and management performance. Whether such dimensions are in-role or extra-role is a separate issue (e.g., see Vey & Campbell, 2004).

In the Campbell et al. (1993) model, Effort appears as a separate factor, even though performance on every substantive factor is in part a function of effort. This seems to confuse performance and its determinants. Again, Campbell et al. (1993) tried to avoid this conundrum by defining effort in observable substantive terms, such as working extra hours or working under extreme conditions of weather or risk, that would contribute independently to the organization's goals. Specifying the "content" of effort in terms of such observables serves to make effort at least somewhat independent of the other substantive factors. It is noteworthy that contextual performance and OCB, as well as the management performance literature (see Table 23.2) include a factor labeled "Persistence," or "Extra Effort," or "Individual Initiative" defined much as Campbell et al. (1993) defined Effort. Consequently, this factor does not appear in Tables 23.1 or 23.2 because it is not specific to a leadership or management role, regardless of the organizational level at which the role is located. It appears as part of the revised overall model of individual performance described in Campbell (2012).

Criticism Anticipated

Asserting that six decades of theory and research have produced a virtual consensus regarding the latent structure of leadership and management performance, when performance is defined as it is in this chapter, may not sit well with the current community of leadership scholars and researchers in organizational behavior. Such an assertion will be labeled by some as naïve, simple minded, and mired in static, out-of-date overly positivist leadership models that focus on one-on-one leader/follower relationships at only one organizational level (e.g., see

Drath et al., 2008). It seems not to take into account multilevel effects, the myriad interactions with the complex features of the context in which leadership takes place, and the dynamic complexity of organizational functioning in the 21st century (e.g., see Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelvey, 2007). Further, some make the argument that there has been a genuine paradigm shift in leadership theory that has revitalized that field, and markedly reduced the usefulness of Tables 23.1 and 23.2. To be specific, the argument is that the introduction of transformational leadership theory, and the reformulation of charismatic leadership and LMX speak to issues that excite scholars, researchers, and practitioners (Hunt, 1999). Tables 23.1 and 23.2 do not.

Campbell (2012) argues at some length that there is really no need to worry. Tables 23.1 and 23.2 are quite compatible with all previous models of performance in general, and leadership models in particular, so long as performance is defined as it is here. Tables 23.1 and 23.2 need not be confined to one-on-one interactions, superior-subordinate relationships, or one organizational level. They can indeed be reciprocal and might even be performed by leadership “substitutes” (or maybe not). Tables 23.1 and 3.2 are also relevant for team leadership. What is different about leadership in teams is not that the latent structure of leadership performance capabilities are different but that team members take on leadership and management responsibilities, and leadership is (p. 408)

Table 23.2. Eight Basic Factors Comprising Management Performance

1. *Decision Making, Problem Solving, and Strategic Innovation*: Making sound and timely decisions about major goals and strategies. Includes gathering information from both inside and outside the organization, staying connected to important information sources, forecasting future trends and formulating strategic and innovative goals to take advantage of them.
2. *Goal Setting, Planning, Organizing, and Budgeting*: Formulating operative goals; determining how to use personnel and resources (financial, technical, logistical) to accomplish goals; anticipating potential problems; estimating costs.
3. *Coordination*: Actively coordinating the work of two or more units, or the work of several work groups within a unit. Scheduling operations. Includes negotiating and cooperating with other units.
4. *Monitoring Unit Effectiveness*: Evaluating progress and effectiveness of units against goals: monitoring costs and resource consumption.
5. *External Representation*: Representing the organization to those not in the organization (e.g., customers, clients, government agencies, nongovernment organizations, the “public”); maintaining a positive organizational image: serving the community; answering questions and complaints from outside the organization.
6. *Staffing*: Procuring and providing for the development of human resources. Not one-on-one coaching, training, or guidance; but providing the human resources the organization or unit needs.
7. *Administration*: Performing day-to-day administrative tasks, keeping accurate records, documenting actions. Analyzing routine information, and making information available in a timely manner.
8. *Commitment and Compliance*: Compliance with the policies, procedures, rules, and regulations of the organization. Full commitment to orders and directives, together with loyal constructive criticism of organizational policies and actions.

often shared across levels (Burke, et al, 2006; Day, et al, 2006; Hiller, et al, 2006). Also, Tables 23.1 and 23.2 do not preclude the existence of context effects (i.e., Mumford, et al, 2008; Osborn, Hunt, & Jauch, 2002). That is, individuals who are high scorers (i.e., very proficient) on such dimensions may or may not be effective, depending on the context. However, without a model of what constitutes performance and specifications for what constitutes effectiveness, it is difficult to investigate context effects. Finally, in contrast to the terminology used by some (e.g., Schriesheim, Wu, & Scandura, 2009; Lord, & Hall, 2005), the dimensions portrayed in Tables 23.1 and 23.2 are not “styles.” They are substantive specific performance capabilities that have multiple antecedents and may be quite difficult to learn. They are the crux of what leaders and managers must be able to do.

A General Model of Individual Performance

As noted earlier, leadership and management performance can be located within a more general model of

performance itself. The following is a synthesis derived from all work on individual performance modeling over the last 25 years. It is intended to be compatible with all previous models, after adjusting for differences in terminology and emphasis. A more detailed explanation can be found in Campbell (2012). Again, there are eight basic factors at the highest level of generality that seem useful. Briefly, the eight factors are: *Factor 1—Technical performance*. All models acknowledge that virtually all jobs or work roles have technical components. Such requirements can vary by substantive area (driving a vehicle versus analyzing data) and by level of complexity or difficulty within area (driving a taxi versus driving a jet liner; tabulating sales frequencies versus modeling institutional investment strategies). By definition, such performance content does not involve interpersonal influence relative to subordinates, superiors, or co-workers, or general management functions.

The subfactors for this dimension are obviously numerous, and the domain could be parsed into large or narrow slices. For example, the Occupational Information Network (O*NET; Peterson, Mumford, Borman, Jeanneret, & Fleishman, 1999) is based on the Department of Labor's Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) structure, which currently uses 821 occupations for describing the distinctions of technical task content across the entire labor force and the 821 occupations are further aggregated into three higher-order levels consisting of 449, 96, and 23 occupational clusters, respectively.

Factor 2—Communication. The Campbell et al. (1993) model is the only one that isolated communication as a separate dimension. More typically, it is part of the technical factor or it appears as a facet of management (Yukl et al., 2002). It remains in this composite picture because it does "seem" to be part of many occupations ranging from teaching, to research, to the arts, to sales, to customer service, to management. Again, it refers to the proficiency with which one conveys information (p. 409) that is clear, understandable, and well organized. It is independent of subject-matter expertise. The two major subfactors would be oral versus written communication.

Factor 3—Initiative, persistence, and effort. This factor emerged from the contextual performance and management performance literatures, as well as the OCB literature in which it was referred to as individual initiative. To make this factor conform to the definition of performance used in this chapter, it must be composed of substantive observable actions. Consequently, it is typically specified in such terms as working extra hours, voluntarily taking on additional tasks, and working under extreme or adverse conditions.

Factor 4—Counterproductive work behavior (CWB). CWB refers to a category of individual actions or behaviors that have negative implications for accomplishment of the organization's goals. Although such counterproductive actions as theft on the job, absenteeism, and freeloading have been studied as single phenomena, the first study to include such variables as specifications for a latent dimension of performance was Project A (Campbell, 1991), where it was termed personal discipline. It was derived from archival and ratings data and included a wide variety of rule infractions and disciplinary actions.

In the current literature, the specifications generally circumscribe actions that are intentional, that violate or deviate from prescribed norms, and that have a negative effect on the individual's contribution to the goals of the unit or organization. Descriptions of this domain are provided by Gruys and Sackett (2003) and Robinson and Bennett (1995). There seems to be general agreement that there are two major subfactors (e.g., see Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Dalal, 2005), distinguished by the deviant behaviors directed at the organization (theft, sabotage, falsifying information, malingering) and behavior directed at individuals, including the self (e.g., physical attacks, verbal abuse, sexual harassment, drug and alcohol abuse). Although not yet fully substantiated by research, it seems reasonable to also expect an approach/avoidance, or moving toward versus moving away, distinction for both organizational deviance and individual deviance. That is, the CWBs dealing with organizational deviance seems to divide between aggressively destroying or misusing resources versus avoiding or withdrawing from the responsibilities of the work role. Similarly CWBs directed at individuals seem to divide between aggressive actions that are directed at other people and destructive actions directed at the self, such as alcohol and drug abuse, and neglect of safety precautions. The approach-avoidance distinction is a recurring one in the study of motivation (Elliot & Thrash, 2002; Gable, Reis, & Elliot, 2003) and of personality (Watson & Clark, 1993), including a major two-factor model of psychopathology (Markon, Krueger, & Watson, 2005). It is also suggested in a study of counterproductive work behavior by Marcus, Schuler, Quell, and Humpfner, (2002). Consequently CWBs that reflect aggressive actions should be predicted by different factors than CWBs that represent withdrawal.

A major issue in the CWB literature is whether its principal subfactors are simply the extreme negative end of other performance factors or are independent constructs. For example, do withdrawal actions constitute the negative end of the initiative, persistence, effort factor, and do the deviant behaviors directed at individuals constitute the negative end of the peer leadership factors, or do they constitute a different construct? The general question is whether two variables constitute one bipolar variable or two independent variables (i.e., an individual could be high or low on both and individual differences on each item variable are predicted by different things). This is a classic issue in psychological measurement and “more research is needed”; however, the evidence currently available (Berry et al., 2007; Dalal, 2005; Kelloway, Loughlin, Barling, & Nault, 2002; Miles, Borman, Spector, & Fox, 2002; Ones & Viswesvaran, 2003; Spector, Bauer, & Fox, 2010) suggest that CWBs are not simply the negative side of other performance components. Low scores on other performance dimensions could result from a lack of knowledge or skill, but low scores on CWB reflect intentional deviance and are dispositional in origin.

One implication for leadership performance is that so-called dysfunctional leadership could be a function of either CWB or extremely low scores on the dimensions shown in Table 23.1, or perhaps both. However, they are not the same thing and would have different antecedents.

Factor 5—Supervisory, manager, executive (i.e., hierarchical) leadership. This factor refers to leadership in a hierarchical relationship and the substantive content is most parsimoniously described by the six leadership factors in Table 23.1. Again, the parsimony results from the remarkable convergence of the literature from the Ohio State and Michigan studies (p. 410) forward. When describing or assessing leadership performance, the specifications are always in terms of one or more of these six factors. The relative emphasis may be different, and different models may hypothesize different paths from leader performance to leader effectiveness, which for some people may be the interesting part, but the literature’s characterization of leader performance itself seems always within the boundaries of these six subfactors.

Similarly, the six subfactors are meant to circumscribe hierarchical leadership performance at all organizational levels. However, the relative emphasis may change at higher organizational levels and the specific actions within each subfactor may also receive differential emphasis.

Factor 6—Management performance (hierarchical). Within a hierarchical organization, this factor includes those actions that deal with obtaining, preserving, and allocating the organization’s resources to best achieve its goals. The major subfactors of management performance are given in Table 23.2. As it was for the components of leadership, there may be considerably different emphases on the management performance subfactors across work roles, depending on the context or situational changes. The model does not imply that the management performance requirements of a particular position or work role are static and cannot change.

Factor 7—Peer/team member leadership performance. The content of this factor is parallel to the actions that comprise hierarchical leadership (see preceding Factor 5). That is, the subfactors are: providing consideration and support; providing structure, guidance, and direction (to one’s peers); emphasizing goals; facilitating the participation of others in decision making and problem solving; training and coaching others; and serving as a model. The defining characteristic is that these actions are in the context of peer or team-member interrelationships; and the peer/team relationships in question can be at any organizational level (e.g., production teams versus management teams).

Factor 8—Team member/peer management performance. A defining characteristic of the high performance work team (Goodman et al., 1988) is that team members perform many of the management functions shown in Table 23.2. For example, a study by Olson (2000) that developed a taxonomy of team member performance factors, the dimensions that are not accounted for by the technical performance factor or the peer leadership factors concern such management functions as planning and problem solving, determining within-team coordination requirements and workload balance, and monitoring team performance. In addition, the contextual performance and OCB literatures both strongly indicate that representing the unit or organization to external stakeholders and exhibiting commitment and compliance to the policies and procedures of the organization are critical performance factors at any organizational level. Consequently, to a greater extent than most researchers realize or acknowledge, there are important elements of management performance in the peer or team context as well as in the hierarchical setting.

Summary

As stated at the outset, these eight factors are intended to be an integrative synthesis of what the literature has suggested are the principal dimensions of performance in a work role. Even though the different streams of literature may use somewhat different words for essentially the same performance actions, there is great consistency across the different sources.

It must be kept in mind that these eight factors address the substantive content of individual work performance when performance is defined as it is in this chapter. The model does not speak to the determinants of individual differences in performance on the factors or to the specific relationships between individual differences in performance and various outcome (i.e., effectiveness) measures. It also does not speak to the dynamics of within person performance changes on the factor, which can surely occur. What it does imply is that research and discussion regarding performance dynamics, including “adaptability,” cannot be in the context of “overall” performance. It must be in the context of specific substantive performance dimensions. That is, for example, the dynamic properties of technical performance may be very different than the dynamic properties of peer/team leadership performance.

Performance versus Effectiveness

Again, in the context of leadership, performance refers to how well the individual executes the actions that comprise the six dimensions in Table 23.1. High scores are always better than low scores. How much better is a function of the relationship between leadership *performance* and relevant indicators of group, unit, or organizational *effectiveness*. Effectiveness represents the group, unit, or organization’s bottom line. That is, the results that determine the unit’s viability and “success.” Virtually by definition, the group, unit, or (p. 411) organization’s scores on one or more effectiveness indicators is a function of one or more causal agents *in addition to* the quality of its leadership functions. There may be good and sufficient reasons for expecting very little influence of leadership performance on a particular effectiveness indicator or for expecting a very substantial influence. It depends on the indicator.

Probably the most central effectiveness indicator is specific goal accomplishment. That is, the group, unit, or organization achieves some critical level of accomplishment on the important substantive goals adopted by the enterprise. Specific goal accomplishment may be related to more general outcomes such as increased efficiency, productivity, profitability, growth, or return on investment.

The aforementioned outcomes are somewhat distal. There is a more proximal set that frequently appears in the leadership-research literature and that is a function of the reactions of subordinates, peers, or superiors to the leader. That is, measures of leadership effectiveness could include such things as subordinate/peer job satisfaction; job engagement; commitment to the group, unit, or organization; self-efficacy; more positive mood or emotional states; acceptance of change; or increased knowledge and skill levels. Please note, from the individual’s perspective, such outcomes could be judged as valuable for their own sake. From the organization’s perspective, these individual outcomes would only have value if they increased the individual’s performance (including elimination of CWBs), which in turn had a positive effect on group, unit, or organizational goal accomplishment.

Just as for the more distal effectiveness outcomes, the follower/peer outcomes noted earlier would also be a function of multiple determinants, of which leader performance is just one, but probably a major one. For any given proximal or distal indicator, the individual dimensions of leadership may be differentially important. However, in no case should exemplary performance on any one of the six leadership performance dimensions have a negative effect.

Leadership Performance versus Its Determinants

Leadership performance, as it is defined in this chapter, should also not be confused with its determinants. That is, performance itself, and the antecedent factors that cause individual differences in performance are not the same thing, nor do they have the same causal relation to follower/peer outcomes or to group, unit, or organizational effectiveness. The model must be causal in nature. That is, performance determinants (e.g., cognitive ability, education) can only influence leader effectiveness by influencing leader performance. However, given the eight-

factor model of individual performance described earlier, a particular determinant (e.g., cognitive ability) may affect the nonleadership factors (technical performance or CWB) as well as the leadership factors.

The Campbell, et al (1993) model of performance invokes two classes of determinants, direct and indirect. Direct determinants operate in real time and consist “only” of specific job knowledge, specific job skills, and individual decisions about where to direct effort, and at what level of intensity and for how long. All other determinants are “indirect,” and their influences on performance are totally mediated by the direct determinants. Thus, cognitive ability or need for achievement, for example, can only influence performance by influencing knowledge, skill, or the direction, intensity, and duration of effort.

The potential indirect determinants of performance are legion, but might euphemistically be classified into *traits*, *states*, and *treatments*. Traits are usually specified as relatively stable and enduring characteristics, at least over the individual’s working life, and include the usual suspects of cognitive abilities, motives, and personality characteristics. However, there is more to abilities than cognitive abilities (Fleishman & Reilly, 1992). For example, certain physical or psychomotor abilities may be important for the “leader as model” function. Similarly, in addition to normal personality, certain aberrant or dysfunctional (Hogan & Kaiser, 2010; Markon, Krueger, & Watson, 2005) aspects of personality may be important for determining when an individual will exhibit low (or very low) scores on one or more of the six leadership factors. The prevailing notion seems to be that “normal” and “aberrant” personalities are not different construct domains, but that more extreme scores on certain personality dimensions become dysfunctional (e.g., Benson & Campbell, 2007). For example, a higher and higher achievement orientation eventually becomes a dysfunctional narcissism.

State determinants refer to individual characteristics that are more changeable and less stable over time, but which may be no less important as determinants of performance at some particular period of time. Certainly, the knowledge and skills acquired before entering a particular work role fall in this category. (p. 412) These would include such things as technical skills, specific interpersonal skills, and self-management skills. Self-management would include such things as: how well you can set short- and long-term goals for yourself, monitor your progress, provide self-feedback, and plan corrective actions.

Sometimes, set apart from domain-specific knowledge and skill (e.g., small engine repair, behavioral-science research methods) are more general cognitive skills such as problem solving, critical thinking, and perhaps creativity. They frequently appear in leadership “competency models” (Campion, et al 2011; Tett, et al, 2000), but they are seldom, if ever, given a substantive specification. Controversy currently rages over whether there are such general skills, and whether they improve as a function of a college education (Klein, et al, 2008; Steedle, Kugelman, & Nemeth, 2010). The weight of the evidence suggests that critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity skills are largely domain specific; and although there may be a general capability left over, it may be synonymous with general cognitive ability. The moral is that we should be wary of invoking critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity as general (i.e. domain free) state capabilities that determine leadership performance.

There is also a large class of potential state determinants of leadership performance that are dispositional in nature. Some of these would be attitudinal states such as the leader’s own job satisfaction, commitment, job involvement, and job engagement. Others might be characterized as more dynamic motivational states such as the leader’s self-efficacy regarding each major job responsibility, the expected value of specific goal achievement, the specific goals that are actually accepted, and the leader’s emotional state.

State determinants can be viewed either as between-individuals, or within-individual effects. That is, the aim could be to account for interindividual differences in leader performance or for the intra-individual variability in leadership performance for one individual across time. Again, whether the focus is on between or within individual effects, it should be with regard to one or more of the specific substantive dimensions of leadership performance (i.e., Table 23.1).

Treatment determinants refer to planned interventions intended to increase leadership performance. The major kinds of interventions are, of course, training and development; setting goals and objectives; and providing rewards and incentives by various means, such as pay and incentive plans, or redesigning the work role itself.

Again, whether the focus is on trait, state, or treatment determinants, their effects on performance are mediated by

changes in the direct determinants of real-time knowledge, skill, and choice behavior.

The Framework Summarized

In summary, the proposed framework for organizing and interpreting information dealing with leadership theory and research has the following parts.

1. • The central issues concern the nature of leadership performance, the determinants of individual differences in leadership performance (between or within), and the effects of leadership performance on valued outcomes that accrue to other individuals and organizational units.
2. • Leadership is to be distinguished from management, and the substantive differences are portrayed in Tables 23.1 and 23.2. Leadership deals with interpersonal influence, and management deals with acquiring and allocating resources to achieve work, unit, or organizational goals. Neither leadership nor management is limited to one-on-one or top-down relationships.
3. • The valued outcomes of leadership performance are of two principal types: (a) changes in the individual performance, attitudes, or motivational states of someone else; or (b) changes in indicators of group, unit, or organizational effectiveness.
4. • The direct determinants of individual differences in leadership performance are the individual's real-time levels of relevant knowledge and skill, and decisions about effort allocation.
5. • The indirect determinants of leadership performance are many and varied, but they can be parsed (with slippage) into (a) stable trait characteristics; (b) more dynamic state characteristics; and (c) planned (or unplanned) interventions, including specific work experiences. Further, each of the three categories can include ability or dispositional variables. Whatever their nature, indirect determinants can only affect leadership performance via influence on the direct determinants.

What parts of this picture do the chapters in this section address? Each is discussed in turn.

The Authenticity of Being Transformational

Walumbwa and Wernsing (this volume) trace the development of the transformational leadership paradigm from Burns (1978) to Bass (1990), (p. 413) and, also, the general concept of authenticity in behavior as it can apply to leadership (Kernis, 2003). Their basic position seems to be that the positive outcomes of transformational leadership performance will be significantly enhanced if the leader's performance behaviors are genuinely authentic.

In terms of the framework just described, where does being transformational and being authentic fit? Although the Walumbwa and Wernsing discussion is often at a very high level of abstraction, perhaps the most concrete way of characterizing the status of transformational and authentic leadership as components in an overall leadership model is to focus on the dimensions that comprise them.

Currently, according to Walumbwa and Wernsing, transformational leadership is composed of five factors.

- *Attributed Idealized Influence*. Sometimes called "attributed charisma," it reflects the follower's perception of the leader's power, confidence, influence, vision, willingness to take risks, and desire to include them in the pursuit of visionary goals.
- *Idealized Influence*. Refers to the leader's actual behavior in the name of charisma: reflecting confidence, risk-taking propensity, articulating their vision, and communicating their values and moral principles.
- *Inspirational Motivation (of the followers)*. Leader behaviors that raise expectations, show confidence in followers, and motivate them beyond expectations.
- *Intellectual Stimulation*. The leader questions the status quo and urges followers to question their own assumptions, set new goals, and tackle new problems.
- *Individualized Consideration*. The leader provides individualized coaching, developmental feedback, and emotional-interpersonal support.

In terms of the framework presented in this chapter, the first factor is an outcome of the leader's performance, not performance itself. Factors 2–5 qualify as performance "behaviors," and they reflect the more general dimensions

shown in Table 23.1. That is, they are not qualitatively different. Transformational leaders are simply very good at them.

According to Walumbwa and Wernsing, authentic leadership refers to, “a pattern of leader behavior that draws on and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and rational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development (Walumbwa, et al, 2008 p. 94).” The referent in this definition is the leader’s behavior, not the follower’s. This definition leads to a specification of four factors that comprise authentic leadership.

- *Self-awareness* refers to understanding your own strengths and weaknesses; being able to see yourself as others see you, and understanding how such information (about yourself) can be derived or obtained by others. Such information is necessary for the leader’s own effective self-regulation.
- *Relational transparency* refers to presenting one’s true self to others by openly sharing information about one’s true thoughts and feelings. This assumes coherent and thorough self-knowledge/awareness on the part of the leader regarding his or her own values, emotions, motives, and goals. Leaders who are high on relational transparency should be better able to create effective relationships with followers.
- *Balanced processing* refers to solving problems by soliciting information from all relevant sources, including followers, thoroughly analyzing the information with input from all relevant parties, and choosing solutions that are both effective and supported by followers.
- *Internalized moral perspective* refers to self-regulation that is guided by strong individual moral and ethical standards that are consistently applied even in the presence of strong group, organizational, or societal pressure, or when faced with difficult ethical challenges.

When cast against the general framework of leadership performance, its outcomes, and its determinants described earlier, the first three factors of authentic leadership are most appropriately characterized as knowledge (self-awareness) and skill (relational transparency and balanced processing). That is, they are not performance itself but they are important knowledge and skill determinants of performance that lead to exemplary leadership performance and effectiveness. They are knowledge and skills to be developed, but their successful development will be made easy or more difficult as a function of the abilities, motives, and personality of the learner.

Internal moral perspective seems to be a more general self-management skill that requires a strong value system and a strong motivation to use it. Such a (p. 414) skill and the motivation to use it would be determinants of behavior in many situations, not just those calling for leadership.

In sum, authentic leadership seems not in competition with, or an alternative for transformational leadership. It is comprised of knowledge and skills that are important determinants of effective leadership.

Charismatic Leadership

As Conger (chapter 21, this volume) points out, the concept of charisma has a long history, and it was most often invoked in political or military contexts. It has had a rebirth in the organizational leadership/management context via Burns (1978), Bass (1985), and House & Shamir (1993), and as Conger also notes, it is appropriate to ask how well the concept translates from political leadership to organizational management. Essentially, this is because the emergence or relevance of charismatic leadership is thought to be context dependent. That is, the context in which the leadership/management of an organization finds itself determines the reliance of performing or acting (sic) in a charismatic way. If an organization is doing just fine and significant change is not required, then there is no need for charismatic leadership. It’s when things need changing that charismatic leadership can have value.

What, then, is charismatic leadership? The literature is a bit ambivalent about how this question is to be answered, and there are two general approaches. One is to specify what charismatic leaders do when they are being charismatic. That is, what is the substantive content of charismatic leadership performance, as performance was defined previously in this chapter? The second approach views charisma as being in the eye of the beholder. That is, it matters not what these leaders actually did, so long as they are perceived as having produced certain follower judgments and affective reactions.

The Conger chapter seems to take the first approach, the content of which is something like the following.

- The charismatic leader forcefully points out deficiencies in the current context, or status quo. That is, the organization is pursuing the wrong goals, or important goals are not being met, or there is goal conflict that must be resolved. Whether the leader's assessment of the status quo is legitimate or not is another matter.
- The leader communicates a well articulated "vision" of what the organization *should* do. That is, what goals should the organization be trying to achieve?
- The leader communicates clearly and forcefully how achieving the vision will change the status quo, accomplish important organizational goals, and satisfy important follower needs in the process.
- The leader articulates a plan for how to achieve the new goals. The plan must specify important roles for the followers, and the leader must express confidence and optimism that the followers will be able to meet their role obligations.
- To make it all work, by building trust in the leader and a collective identity for those involved, the leader must exhibit high energy and effort, risk taking propensity, personal sacrifice, and a certain amount of heroism in the pursuit of the vision.

The preceding specification for charismatic leadership focuses on performance and the crucial questions would revolve around how expertly the leader can do these things. However, notice that the required performance capabilities are a mixture of leadership and management as portrayed in Tables 23.1 and 23.2. The assessment of current goals (i.e., the status quo), the specification of better goals, and the development of plans for achieving them are all management functions. The fact-to-face articulation of the follower roles (initiating structure), the expression of confidence in the followers (consideration), and the demonstration of high energy, risk taking, and personal sacrifice (modeling), are leadership capabilities.

The second approach would focus on leader performance outcomes and would ask whether followers perceived themselves to be experiencing commitment to the new goals, fulfillment of their important needs, greater collective identity, and increases in their self-efficacy. The followers must attribute these experiences to the leader's influence for the leader to be labeled as charismatic.

Based on Conger's chapter, the determinants of charismatic leader performance are centered around direct determinants such as technical and managerial skills, interpersonal skills, and, above all—communication and rhetorical skills. More indirect trait determinants (cognitive ability, personality) are seldom part of the discussion, except for values that are strongly held (ideology?).

Contrary to the authentic leadership prescription, charismatic leaders need not have an accurate (p. 415) self-concept, present their true self to others, or be guided by strong ethical standards. However, they must be able to involve followers in achieving the new goals, communicate confidence in them, and show them how new-goal accomplishment will satisfy their important needs.

Finally, as discussed by Conger, the efficacy of being charismatic is context dependent (i.e., change is needed) and difficult to institutionalize. Consequently, hiring or promoting someone based on previous exhibitions of charisma may not work (Khurana, 2002).

From LMX to LMX

LMX has been an established sector of leadership theory and research since the 1970s (e.g., Graen, 1976). In its original form it referred to an interactive process between two people called "leader-member exchange." The two people in question are leader-subordinate pairs, and the nature of, and results of, the exchange process could be different for each pairing. Both leader and subordinate are most likely trying to satisfy multiple goals. Leaders must consider the organization's goals they were hired to achieve as well as their own personal goals. Similarly, the subordinates are responding both to the organization's goals and to their own personal goals. It is possible that the leader might also try to facilitate the subordinate's personal goal accomplishment (e.g., reduce work/family conflict) and vice versa (e.g., the follower helps the leader deal with a "problem" subordinate). Consequently, some goals are held in common, some are independent, and some could be in conflict. The exchange process proceeds until both parties decide they have reached some kind of equilibrium, or optimization, regarding the multiple goals. The quality of the exchange, or the degree to which it gets beyond the minimum goal accomplishments required by the

formal employment contract, is a function of the performance capabilities of leader and subordinate and the nature of their goals. In effect, LMX leads to an informal contract that goes beyond, adds to, or just accepts the minimums specified by the formal employment contract. In general, the performance capabilities that both leaders and followers use to optimize the multiple goals of the exchange process are those specified in the model of performance described earlier, including the subfactors shown in Tables 23.1 and 23.2.

The contribution of LMX is that it forces a consideration of leadership as a two-way influence process. The criticism that previous models, including transformational and charismatic leadership, focused too exclusively on the main effects (of either leader or subordinate behavior) and neglected the interactions is well taken. The exchanges for different leader-subordinate pairs could require differential emphases across the performance factors in Tables 23.1 and 23.2. It is not that previous theory is wrong; it is that LMX represents a useful addition.

According to Graen (chapter 20, this volume), the 21st century instantiation of LMX requires a new name, Leader Motivated Xcellence. The new LMX focuses on a particular informal contract referred to as the strategic alliance (SA). The SA is an agreement to go beyond the requirements of the formal contract (i.e., “a tactical alliance”) both in terms of the level of goal accomplishment and, most likely, the very nature of the goals to be pursued. Strategic alliances are not to be confined to leader-subordinate pairs. They can also be formed with managers, peers, or even people outside the organization. The new LMX is a much broader set of informal contracts than the old LMX, and it recognizes that “leadership” can reside almost anywhere in the dynamic modern organization, including within teams. The most central goals for SAs are the organizational goals that, if achieved, will significantly (dramatically?) increase the organization’s value and the rewards it provides for its members. It follows that the organization will maximize its benefit when SAs are widespread and when they take on more difficult and potentially valuable goals, to which everyone becomes committed by virtue of the SA contract. However, it also must follow that commitment to the organization’s goals is not altruistic. Each of the parties has personal goals as well, which may correspond with, be independent of, or conflict with the organizational goals. Individuals would enter SAs because they believe that achieving the new organizational goals will satisfy their personal needs, be they financial or higher order. Graen (chapter 20, this volume) emphasizes higher order needs such as gaining increased responsibility and influence, and achieving difficult and rewarding goals.

Graen (chapter 20, this volume) sees three necessary conditions of the formation of an SA contract: the parties must (a) respect each other’s competence, (b) trust each other to act ethically, and (c) agree that the new (or more valuable) organizational goals to be pursued are the right ones.

In effect, the strategic alliance is an outcome, which can lead to other outcomes such as individual satisfaction, and engagement, which, in turn, can lead to more distal outcomes such as productivity (p. 416) and profitability. That is, in terms of the general framework described earlier, the strategic alliance is not performance itself; it is an outcome of performance. Consequently, one could then ask, what performance capabilities produce viable and useful SAs? Graen (chapter 20, this volume) offers several answers. Certainly, if mutual respect for each other’s competence is a necessary condition, then high technical performance would facilitate SA formulation. Also, demonstrating high initiative and effort would facilitate building SAs. More comprehensively, a study by Graen (cited in Graen, chapter 00, this volume) asked over one thousand managers in five companies how they attempted to demonstrate their potential to be selected as SA members. Their responses were sorted into 13 principal actions. All 13 actions appear as dimensions of performance in the performance model described earlier in this chapter. The 13 include technical performance, initiative, and a number of the subfactors in Tables 23.1 and 23.2.

Also, it would not be unreasonable to view transformational and charismatic leadership as specifications for performance factors that would facilitate the formation of strategic alliances with, or among, subordinates, peers, or team members. Further, the authenticity skills discussed by Walumbwa & Wernsing (chapter 22, this volume) would seem to be valuable prerequisites for effective leadership performance that results in strategic alliances. It is tempting to assert that the existence of informal contracts, with the strategic alliance being dominant, is what mediates the effect of leadership performance on effectiveness outcomes.

Perhaps the Achilles heel of the SA (not of LMX itself) is that the personal goals of one or more of the parties begin to take precedence over the organizational goals, and the power of the SA contract to provide mutual benefit diminishes. There is also the question of competing alliances that result from a lack of agreement about what the

most valuable organizational goals (aka “visions”) should be. These two issues are broader than any particular model of leadership, but if they arise, it is the responsibility of leadership to deal with them.

Authentic transformational leadership, positive charismatic organizational leadership, and leadership that motivates excellence all assert that they address these issues, and dealing with them effectively is the result of expert leadership (*and* management?) performance. It is the assertion of this chapter that such expertise is represented by high scorers on the critical dimensions in Tables 23.1 and 23.2.

If major conflicts over goals cannot be resolved by expert leadership, then leadership reverts to a political process, and issues of power, coalition formation, negotiation, and compromise come into play. It is tempting to assert that leadership as a political process is always suboptimal unless expertise prevails and superordinate goals can be specified that significantly benefit all parties.

A Summary Comment

It was the intent of this chapter to present an overall framework for performance in general, and leadership performance and effectiveness in particular, into which current theory and research on leadership could be inserted. At the risk of being self-serving, it seemed to work. The chapters in this section complement one another and address many of the critical issues that organizational leadership must face. The chapters are not in conflict. It is also the assertion here that the empirical research literature regarding leadership assessment, leadership training and development, leadership selection, and the determinants of leadership effectiveness has also produced much more usable knowledge than we give it credit for. If only the full spectrum of *research* findings could be inserted into a general framework that would make it easier to interpret, archive, and use. But that is another story.

References

- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 421–429.
- Bales, R. F. (1958). Task roles and social roles in problem solving groups. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology* (pp. 437–447). New York: Holt.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*, 19–31.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- 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.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 349–360.
- Benson, M. J., & Campbell, J. P. (2007). To be, or not to be linear: An expanded representation of personality and its relationship to leadership performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 15*, 232–249.
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 410–424. (p. 417)
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1983). Management by grid principles or situationalism: Which? *Group and Organization Studies, 7*, 207–210.

Leadership, the Old, the New, and the Timeless: A Commentary

- Borman, W. C., & Brush, D. H. (1993). More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements. *Human Performance, 6*, 1–21.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance. The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10*, 99–109.
- Bowers, D. G., & Seashore, S. E. (1966). Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 11*, 238–263.
- Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Halpin, S. M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 288–307.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Campbell, J. P. (1991). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Rev. ed., pp. 687–732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Campbell, J. P. (2012). Behavior, performance, and effectiveness in the 21st century. In S. W. J. Kozlowski (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of organizational psychology* (Vol. I, pp. 159–194). New York: Oxford Press.
- Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, K. E., & Weick, K. E. (1970). *Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Frontiers in industrial/organizational psychology: Personnel selection and classification* (pp. 35–71). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Campion, M. S., Fink, A. A., Ruggeberg, B. J., Carr, L., Phillips, G. M., & Odman, R. B. (2011). Doing competencies well: Best practices in competency modeling. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 225–262.
- Carroll, S. J., Jr., & Gillen, D. J. (1987). Are the classical management functions useful in describing managerial work? *Academy of Management Review, 12*, 38–51.
- Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (1960). *Group dynamics research and theory*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Conway, J. M. (1999). Distinguishing contextual performance from task performance for managerial jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 3–13.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior [Special issue: Special section: Theoretical models and conceptual analyses—second installment]. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 1241–1255.
- Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2006). Leadership in team-based organizations: On the threshold of a new era. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 211–216.
- Drath, W. H., McCauley, C. D., Paulus, C. J., Van Velsor, E., O'Connor, P. M. G., & McGuire, J. B. (2008). Direction, alignment, commitment: Toward a more integrative ontology of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*, 635–653.
- Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: Approach and avoidance temperaments and goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 804–818.
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*. London: Pitman.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: Academic Press.

Leadership, the Old, the New, and the Timeless: A Commentary

- Fleishman, E. A. (1983). The description of supervisory behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *26*, 1–6.
- Fleishman, E. A., & Reilly, M. E. (1992). *Handbook of human abilities: Definitions, measurements, and job task requirements*. Bethesda, MD: Management Research Institute.
- Frese, M. (2008). The word is out: We need an active performance concept for modern workplaces. Commentary on focal article by Macey & Schneider: The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, *1*, 67–69.
- Gable, S. L., Reis, H. T., & Elliot, A. J. (2003). Evidence for bivariate systems: An empirical test of attraction and aversion across domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *37*, 349–372.
- Goodman, P. S., Devadas, R., & Griffith-Hughson, T. L. (1988). Groups and productivity: Analyzing the effectiveness of self-management teams. In J. P. Campbell, R. J. Campbell, & Associates (Eds.), *Productivity in organizations: New perspectives from industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 295–327). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Graen, G. B. (1976). Role making processes within complex organizations. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1201–1245). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, *6*, 219–247.
- Griffen, M. S., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, *30*, 327–347.
- Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *11*, 30–42.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1959). Job descriptions for executives. *Harvard Business Review*, *37*(September-October), 55–67.
- Hiller, N. J., Day, D. V., & Vance, R. J. (2006). Collective enactment of leadership roles and team effectiveness: A field study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 387–397.
- Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2008). A theoretical and empirical examination of the transactional and non-leadership dimensions of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 501–513.
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2010). Personality. In J. C. Scott & D. H. Reynolds (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace assessment: Evidence based practices for selecting and developing organizational talent* (pp. 81–108). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *16*, 321–338. (p. 418)
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189–207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Contemporary Business*, *3*, 81–98.
- House, R. J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. In M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research perspectives and directions* (pp. 577–594). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Hunt, J. G. (1999). Transformational/charismatic leadership's transformation of the field: An historical essay. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 129–144.
- Kelloway, E. K., Loughlin, C., Barling, J., & Nault, A. (2002). Self-reported counterproductive behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors: Separate but related constructs. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *10*, 143–151.

Leadership, the Old, the New, and the Timeless: A Commentary

- Kernis, M. H. (2003). Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 145–149.
- Khurana, R. (2002). *Searching for a corporate savior: The irrational quest for charismatic CEOs*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Klein, S., Freedman, D., Shavelson, R., & Bolus, R. (2008). Assessing school effectiveness. *Evaluation Review*, 32, 511–525.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Ilgen, D. R. (2006). Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 7, 77–124.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lord, R. G., & Hall, R. J. (2005). Identity, deep structure and the development of leadership skill. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 591–615.
- Mahoney, T. A., Jerdee, T. H., & Carroll, S. J., Jr. (1963). *Development of managerial performance: A research approach*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.
- Marcus, B., Schuler, H., Quell, P., & Humpfner, G. (2002). Measuring counterproductivity: Development and initial validation of a German self-report questionnaire. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 18–35.
- Markon, K. E., Krueger, R. F., & Watson, D. (2005). Delineating the structure of normal and abnormal personality: An integrative hierarchical approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 139–157.
- Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997–2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34, 410–476.
- Miles, D. E., Borman, W. C., Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive work behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 51–57.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mumford, M. D., Antes, A. L., Caughron, J. J., & Friedrich, T. L. (2008). Charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leadership: Multi-level influences on emergence and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 144–160.
- Murphy, K. R. (1989). Dimensions of job performance. In R. Dillon & J. Pellingrino (Eds.), *Testing: Applied and theoretical perspectives* (pp. 218–247). New York: Praeger.
- Olson, A. M. (2000). *A theory and taxonomy of individual team member performance*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (2003). Personality and counterproductive work behaviors. In M. Koslowsky, S. Stashevsky, & A. Sagie (Eds.), *Misbehavior and dysfunctional attitudes in organizations* (pp. 211–249). Hampshire, England: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, KY: Lexington Books.
- Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 797–837.
- Page, R., & Tornow, W. W. (1987, April). *Managerial job analysis: Are we farther along?* Paper presented at the Second Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.
- Peterson, N. G., Mumford, M. D., Borman, W. C., Jeanneret, P. R., & Fleishman, E. A. (1999). *An occupational information system for the 21st century: The development of O*NET*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Leadership, the Old, the New, and the Timeless: A Commentary

- Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. S., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 8*, 612–624.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 555–572.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Wu, J. B., & Scandura, T. A. (2009). A meso measure? Examination of the levels of analysis of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*, 604–616.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept theory. *Organization Science, 4*, 1–7.
- Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 781–790.
- Steedle, J., Kugelmass, H., & Nemeth, A. (2010). What do they measure? Comparing three learning outcomes assessment. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 42*, 33–37.
- Stogdill, R. M., Goode, O. S., & Day, D. R. (1962). New leader behavior description subscales. *Journal of Psychology, 54*, 259–269.
- Tett, R. P., Guterman, H. A., Bleier, A., & Murphy, P. A. (2000). Development and content validation of a “hyperdimensional” taxonomy of managerial competence. *Human Performance, 13*(3), 205–251.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*, 298–318.
- Urwich, L. F. (1952). *Notes on the theory of organization*. New York: American Management Association.
- Walumbwa, F., Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Wernsing, T., & Peterson, S. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management, 34*, 89–126. (p. 419)
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1993). Behavioral disinhibition versus constraint: A dispositional perspective. In D. M. Wegner & J. W. Pennebaker (Eds.), *Handbook of mental control* (pp. 506–527). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. New York: Free Press.
- Wilson, C. L., O’Hare, D., & Shipper, F. (1990). Task cycle theory: The processes of influence. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 185–204). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Vey, M. A., & Campbell, J. P. (2004). In-role versus extra-role organizational citizenship behaviors. *Human Performance, 17*, 119–135.
- Yukl, G. A. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*, 285–305.
- Yukl, G. A. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. A., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 9*, 15–32.
- Yukl, G. A., & Lepsinger, R. (2005). Why integrating the leading and managing roles is essential for organizational effectiveness. *Organizational Dynamics, 34*, 361–375.
- Yukl, G. A., & Nemeroff, W. (1979). Identification and measurement of specific categories of leadership behavior: A progress report. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Crosscurrents in leadership* (pp. 164–200). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Yukl, G. A., Wall, S., & Lepsinger, R. (1990). Preliminary report on validation of the managerial practices survey. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 223–238). West Orange, NJ; Leadership Library of

America. (p. 420)

John Campbell

John Campbell is Willis S. and Marion Slusser Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy, University of California at Berkeley.

