

**INTEGRATIVE LEADERSHIP MODELS**

**IN THE MILITARY CONTEXT**

**Prepared for the Director Canadian Forces Leadership Institute (CFLI)**

**AUTHORS:  
CAROLIN EBERMAN  
ARNI AHRONSON  
& VIC CATANO**

**May, 2002**

Correspondence to the authors can be to:  
AHRONSON & ASSOCIATES  
36 Arbordale Crescent, Ottawa, ON  
Ph: 613-224-1657, Fax: 613-224-0535  
Email: [ahronson@magma.ca](mailto:ahronson@magma.ca) or [c\\_eberman@hotmail.com](mailto:c_eberman@hotmail.com)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Abstract</b> .....		3
<b>Part I</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	4
<b>Part II</b>	<b>Overview of Types of Theories</b>	
	<b>Subsection 1A: Strategic/Executive Leadership Theories</b> .....	6
	<b>Subsection 1B: Supervisory Leadership Theories</b> .....	10
<b>Part III</b>	<b>Review of Relevant Models and Theories</b>	
	<b>Subsection 2A: Strategic/Executive Leadership Theories</b> .....	14
	<b>Subsection 2B: Supervisory Leadership Theories</b> .....	22
<b>Part IV</b>	<b>Integration of theories - A Proposed Model for the Military and its Applications</b> .....	40
	<b>Summary of key concepts: Various theories and their applicability to the military context.</b> .....	56
<b>Part V</b>	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	59
	<b>References</b> .....	61

## ABSTRACT

The academic literature provides a wide range of conceptual models and definitions of leadership. Because leadership has long been considered as critical to the operational effectiveness of military organizations, this paper chronicles our attempt to determine which models are deemed applicable to leadership in the military. This paper is divided into four sections. In the first section, we begin with a necessary backdrop for determining which models of leadership are applicable to the military context by providing an overview of the dominant types of Strategic/Executive Leadership theories and Supervisory Leadership Theories. In the second section, we narrow the focus of the paper by examining several models and theories with a concentration on Supervisory Leadership Theories. In the third section, we integrate the research from the previous sections by exploring how relevant theories complement each other. To the extent that no model fully encompasses military leadership, the last section focuses on suggestions for developing a relevant integrative model that could be successfully applied to various Human Resources practices in the military, such as selection, assessment and training.

## PART I

### INTRODUCTION

As Norman Dixon (1976) argued, military leaders are required to fulfil incompatible roles.

They are expected to show initiative, yet remain hemmed in by regulations.

They must be aggressive, yet never insubordinate. They must be assiduous in caring for their men, yet maintain an enormous social distance. They must know everything about everything, yet never appear intellectual.

In this passage, Dixon illustrates both the importance given to leadership in the military, as well as some of the complexities that are relevant to understanding leadership today.

Undoubtedly, it is because of the life-and-death nature of military operations and the importance of the military to a nation's survival that leadership has typically been studied more seriously in military organizations than in civilian institutions (Waddell III, 1994). Yet as James L. Stokesbury noted, “we do not know exactly what makes men get up out of a hole in the ground and go forward in the face of death at a word from another man” (Waddell III, 1994, pp. 29). And so, leadership remains one of the highest and most elusive of qualities.

Nonetheless, the academic literature provides a wide range of conceptual models and definitions of leadership. Because leadership has long been considered as critical to the operational effectiveness of military organizations, this paper chronicles our attempt to determine which models are deemed applicable to leadership in the military.

Furthermore, to the extent that no model fully encompasses military leadership, we

provide suggestions for the development of an integrative model of particular relevance to the Canadian Forces.

To this end, this paper is divided into four sections. In the first section, we begin with a necessary backdrop for determining which models of leadership are applicable to the military context by providing an overview of the dominant types of Strategic/Executive Leadership theories and Supervisory Leadership Theories. In the second section, we narrow the focus of the paper by examining several models and theories with a concentration on Supervisory Leadership Theories. In the third section, we integrate the research from the previous sections by exploring how relevant theories complement each other. The last section focuses on suggestions for developing a relevant integrative model that could be successfully applied to various Human Resources practices in the military, such as selection, assessment and training.

Because a plethora of leadership research exists, this document is not intended to be an exhaustive review of all leadership theory and research. Rather, the intent of this paper to provide a review of those leadership theories deemed to be applicable to the military context. For a complete review of leadership theory and research refer to the Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, volume III (Yukl and Van Fleet, 1992).

## PART II

### SECTION 1: OVERVIEW OF TYPES OF THEORIES

#### *Subsection 1A: Strategic/Executive Leadership Theories*

##### Conceptual Complexity Theories

The Conceptual Complexity theories of leadership involve the information-processing and cognitive demands of leaders (Reisweber, 1997). Cognitive processes consist of many types of mental processes such as learning, memory, concept formation, problem solving, and decision-making (Reisweber, 1997; Zaccaro, 1996). These theories argue that as a leader's position within the organization increases, so do the cognitive and information processing demands placed on the individual. To this end, top executives need to respond to greater cognitive demands than do middle level managers, who in turn have to respond to greater cognitive demands than do lower level supervisors. The increased cognitive demands associated with higher-level leaders result from a rise in the responsibilities related to the position, particularly in regard to long-term planning, engagement in the organization's external environment, consensus building, creation of organizational policies, and network development.

In order to exercise leadership in response to increasing cognitive demands, a leader must involve a broad range of skills that include integration of information, abstraction, independent thought, and use of broad and complex frames of reference. A frame of reference consists of the surrounding factors, elements, and events, together with their interrelationships, which enable an individual to understand the series of events that constitute experience. It is through understanding the complex interrelationships that

exist among these factors, that the leader can begin to understand how a situation came to be and how he or she can influence it further (Jacobs & Jaques, 1987).

As one's position in the organization increases so does the complexity of one's frame of reference. Those with high levels of cognitive complexity are able to think in metaphors and seek related patterns in unrelated objects, situations and events (Reisweber, 1997). Therefore, as one moves up the organizational levels, the complexities of the frame of references increase. Consequently, though all leaders must be able to effectively construct and interpret a frame of reference, the frame of reference of a senior executive will be more complex than that of a lower-level supervisor (Zaccarro, 1996). Clearly, cognitive complexity is fundamentally a measure of how an individual constructs meaning to incoming information by organization. It does not encompass what a leader thinks, but how he or she thinks (Phillips & Hunt, 1993).

#### Behavioural Complexity Theories

The Behavioural complexity theories of leadership focus on the ability of the leader to execute a complex strategy by playing multiple, even competing roles in a highly integrated and complementary way (Reisweber, 1997). In effect, these theories of leadership focus on the social demands to be considered by leaders when formulating action. For example, these demands require that the leader adapt his or her behaviour patterns in response to the surrounding environment. A behavioural pattern that is successful in one situation or with a particular group of individuals may not be successful if applied in another context or with another group of individuals (Yukl, 1989). In essence, the effectiveness of the leader's behaviour is dependent upon the situational context as well as the characteristics of the individuals with whom the leader is

interacting. A successful leader, therefore, must adapt his or her behaviour in order to accomplish the multiple organizational roles that call for different behaviour styles; the leader must assess each role to achieve the performance needed from all critical players (Zaccaro, 1996).

Current research on the Behavioural Complexity Theories suggests that senior level leaders must demonstrate a greater diversity of roles than lower level leaders within an organization (Zaccaro, 1996). The increased diversity of roles is a reflection of the opposing behavioural requirements that are often placed upon senior level leaders. To illustrate this fact, consider the competing values that underlie the traits of stability and innovation. An effective leader is expected not only to demonstrate stability and predictability in his or her behaviour, but also to demonstrate innovation and creativity in order to further the development of the organization (Quinn, 1988). The opposing behavioural requirements for stability and innovation are indicative of the behavioural flexibility required by leaders (Quinn, 1988). Moreover, the ability of senior level leaders to adapt diverse roles in accordance with the demands of the environment is associated with measures of individual and organizational accomplishment (Zaccaro, 1996).

#### Strategic Decision Making Theories

The Strategic Decision Making theories focus on how executive leaders approach existing or anticipated changes in the organizational environment. In particular, these theories explain the processes, such as environmental scanning, interpretation, and strategic decision making, by which leaders attempt to align the organizations' activities with opportunities or threats from the external environment. It is through their actions



and personal qualities that leaders are able to have an impact on organizational performance beyond the influences of environmental and organizational characteristics (Zaccaro, 1996).

In the context of strategic decision-making, environmental scanning encompasses “the managerial activity of learning about events and trends in the organization’s environment”. Here, the leader focuses on specified environmental sectors as directed by the particular organizational requirements present at any given time. This process leads to information interpretation, which entails making sense of the information from environmental scans. This process typically involves classifying the collected information into the following categories: strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. By drawing on the essential categorized information, the leader then makes strategic decisions (Bluedorn, Johnson, Cartwright, & Barringer, 1994).

#### Visionary/Inspirational Leadership Theories

The Visionary and Inspirational Leadership Theories focus on the role of senior leaders in formulating and implementing a direction for their organization through a value-based visionary statement. The fact that the vision is value-based does not imply that it is out of touch with the organizational and environmental conditions, but rather that it also reflects the senior leader’s preferences about what the organization should be (Zaccaro, 1996). Visions become symbols of change that are used by executives to adjust the collective behaviours of employees. Thus, they become the means by which leaders inspire and give meaning to employee actions (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). As such, visions are most useful in bringing change to the climate and culture of an

organization, and therefore are important to the successful implementation of structural changes throughout the organization (Zaccaro, 1996).

### ***Subsection 1B: Supervisory Leadership Theories***

#### 1. Contingency Theories

Contingency theories of leaderships assert that leaders should make their behaviours contingent on various aspects of the followers or the situation in order to improve leadership effectiveness (Hughes, Ginnett, Curphy, 1998; Robinson, 1998). The four most well-known contingency theories of leadership are the Normative Decision-Making Model (Vroom & Yetton, 1973), the Situational Leadership Model (Hershey & Blanchard, 1982), the Contingency Model (Fiedler, 1967), and the Path-Goal theory (House & Dressler, 1974).

Although each of the contingency theories has significantly added to the leadership body of knowledge, they are not without shortcomings. One of the weaknesses of the contingency theories is their assumption that leaders can accurately assess key situational factors and follower characteristics. In reality, it is very possible that two leaders in the same situation or dealing with the same individual could assess the situation differently, thereby reaching quite distinct conclusions (Robinson, 1998). A further limitation of the contingency theories is their limited scope. The theories fail to consider many of the factors that are known to affect leader and follower behaviours such as level of stress, organizational culture, working conditions, or economic conditions (Robinson, 1998). Thus, if the contingency theories are applied to the military context, they should be done so in addition to other relevant theories.

#### 2. Trait/Behavioural Theories

The Trait theories of Leadership argue that if leaders are endowed with superior qualities that differentiate them from their followers, it should be possible to identify these qualities (Bass, 1990, p. 38). The majority of early leadership research (from 1900 through much of the 1940's) used the trait-theory approach. Although this research identified some characteristics of leaders, reviewers (e.g. Bass, 1960, Stogdill, 1974) generally have agreed that only a few traits were slightly more descriptive of leaders than of followers (Edwards, Rode, Ayman, 1989).

In fact, the somewhat disappointing findings resulting from studies using the trait approach of leadership led researchers to focus on leader behaviour. Behavioural theories viewed the most important aspect of leadership to be what leaders do, rather than their particular personality traits (Edwards et al., 1989). The behavioural theories emphasized that subordinate behaviour is contingent upon reinforcement or the avoidance of punishment (Bass, 1990).

According to Davis and Luthans (1979), leader behaviour is a cue to evoke subordinate task behaviour, which in turn, can act as a consequence for the leader. This consequence for the leader can reinforce, punish, or extinguish the leader's subsequent behaviour. Similarly, subordinate behaviour has its own consequences, which also serve to reinforce, punish, or extinguish behaviour. In effect, Davis and Luthans contended that the consequences for subordinate behaviour may be related to the leader's subsequent behaviour, the work itself, its outcomes, or to other organization members. In sum, behavioural theories assert that supervisors do not directly cause subordinate behaviour. Rather they set the occasion by providing a discriminative stimulus for the

evocation of behaviour. The behaviour of subordinates therefore depends upon its consequences, environmental cues, and discriminative stimuli (Bass, 1990).

The empirical research on behavioural theories is generally supportive of the notion that leaders who apply rewards contingent to subordinate performance are likely to increase subordinate performance and satisfaction, whereas contingent punishment has little effect on performance and may have somewhat negative effects on satisfaction (Hunt & Schuler, 1976; Podsakoff, Todor, & Skow, 1982; Sims, 1977). However, this finding also highlights one of the basic problems of behavioural approaches to leadership. Many behaviours that are critical to effective organizational behaviour are difficult to pinpoint and even harder to consistently monitor (Chemers, 1997).

### 3. Cognitive Models

Expectancies held by the leader, about the follower or the situation, determine the leadership behaviours or strategies chosen, thereby influencing leader behaviour (Matsui & Ohtsuka, 1978; Nebeker & Mitchell, 1974). These leader expectancies are based upon various kinds of judgements about subordinates (e.g., needs, motivation, ability, commitment) and the situation (e.g. task difficulty, resources available). Cognitive Models of leadership, therefore, focus on the leaders' and followers' perception and judgments of each other (Chemers, 1997) in addition to the schema used by each to actively organize information in order to give specific meaning to situations. Information about specific situations and individuals is encoded, stored, and retrieved in terms of category structures and inferential strategies (Pervin, 1985).

One of the strengths of the Cognitive Models of leadership is that they successfully account for the inaccurate perceptions made by leaders, as in actual fact, the

perceptions of leaders are likely to reflect a combination of accurate observations and systematic biases. The cognitive models of leadership consider the problems created for leadership theorizing and research design by perceptual biases. To this end, the cognitive models of leadership emphasize that those theories that do not reflect the importance of individual perceptions and judgments are inadequate in explaining the full range of leadership behaviours (Chemers, 1997).

### PART III

#### SECTION 2: REVIEW OF RELEVANT MODELS AND THEORIES

##### *Subsection 2A: Strategic/Executive Leadership Theories*

###### Warrior Model

Although different sources vary somewhat in their depictions of the warrior leader, Nice (1998) contended that a number of themes emerge fairly consistently. Specifically, there are the beliefs that leadership is inseparably related to conflict and opposition, control over flows of information, the assertion that results are more important than the methods used to achieve them, and an emphasis on knowing the people that the leader is seeking to defeat or lead. In addition, the warrior model contends that a shrewd leader selects battles carefully and does not fight unnecessarily, uses other people as buffers and plans and prepares for future contingencies.

As noted above, a central component of the warrior model is its emphasis on conflict and triumphing over one's opponents. It is this component that is directly adapted from military leaders. A second major theme of this model is its emphasis on controlling flows of information. That is, the astute leader must control flows of information to followers as well as to opponents because the close ally of today may be a rival tomorrow (Nice, 1998).

In addition, Nice (1998) noted that a fundamental premise of the warrior model is that victory must be achieved, even if it requires the use of tactics that most people regard as objectionable. Citing such works as Machiavelli's "The Prince" Nice further noted that the warrior model argues for deception, betrayal, violence, and virtually any other tactic that could offer advantage may need to be used at times to accomplish vital goals.

Another recurrent theme in the classic works on the warrior model is the need for thorough knowledge of other people, both adversaries and others. A leader who knows the needs and weaknesses of others can make use of that information in a variety of ways. For example, such a leader can strike adversaries at their vulnerable points and when they are least prepared.

Another important component of the warrior model is the principle that although conflict is a central feature of leadership, the prudent leader does not engage in conflict on a casual basis. Instead, the leader must carefully weigh the probable costs and benefits of engaging in battle. In other words, not all battles are worth fighting, and not all adversaries should be challenged.

Although the Warrior Model has been one of the most influential models of leadership through the ages, it has several limitations. First, not all models of leadership accept the warrior model's emphasis on conflict and defeating opponents. In addition, the warrior model's emphasis on secrecy and information control stands in stark contrast with more democratic leadership styles, which call on leaders to share information with followers and to help them learn more about relevant issues and possible remedies (Fenno, 1978). In other words, the Warrior Model does not consider that sharing information with subordinates better equips them to make positive contributions.

Moreover, the Warrior Model's endorsement of doing whatever is necessary to achieve success when success is vital, is troubling to many observers. To the degree that successful leaders are likely to be copied, a leader who succeeds by using violence, betrayal, terror, and other similar tactics may encourage the use of those tactics by others. Also troubling to many individuals is the Warrior Model's emphasis on exploiting the

vulnerabilities of others, particularly in comparison to the transformational theories of leadership, which also emphasize knowing the vulnerabilities of followers in order to uplift them rather than to take advantage of their weaknesses (Burns, 1978).

Finally, although the warrior model stresses the importance of choosing one's battles carefully, one must also consider that a leader who fails to act in a timely fashion may be criticized for being weak, lazy, or uncaring and may allow opponents the opportunity to gain the advantage. Therefore choosing one's battles emerges as not only an important but also a risk-prone aspect of leadership strategy.

### Stratified Systems Theory

According to Ross (1992) natural hierarchies assert themselves wherever human beings organize themselves to fight or work, and this structuring is true regardless of "whether it's a factory in a small town in Canada or a high-tech firm in the United States". As such, Jacques Elliot's Stratified Systems Theory is based on this phenomenon, such that as you move up the hierarchy of an organization so does the corresponding level of cognitive complexity. Thus, the leader's cognitive complexity must match what is required by his or her organizational level (Ross, 1992).

What distinguishes one level in the hierarchy from the next in the Stratified Systems theory is related to time. For example, at the bottom level of the hierarchy, time to complete tasks may range from 20 minutes to a day (e.g. a production line, assembly work, secretarial work). At higher levels, tasks extend farther in the future: perhaps two years for a sales manager to rebuild a marketing organization or five years for a CEO to turn around a company (Ross, 1992).



Although the hierarchy-time relation is rather easily accepted, the consequences of this notion are more controversial. If there are natural strata in human hierarchies, there are also people who are naturally meant to occupy them. At any given time in our maturation, the level of sophistication with which we approach problems determines where in the hierarchy we really belong (Ross, 1992). The smarter we are at processing information, in other words, the farther we are able to project ourselves into the future. That's the fundamental difference between an assembly line worker and a CEO --not just intelligence or acquired knowledge, but a measurable, qualitative difference in the way each solves problems, and in the time horizons of the roles in which each feels most comfortable.

One implication of Stratified Systems Theory is that problem-solving abilities develop through youth and maturity in predictable patterns. This means that each person has an inherent potential for cognitive development and is thus equipped to rise only so high, and no higher, in an organization. Learning and experience will enhance our skills and knowledge, but no amount of positive thinking can change our potential to approach problems in increasingly sophisticated ways. The theory basically says that some people are born with the ability to make CEO--and some aren't. In a culture that is obsessed with self-improvement, it is unlikely that this assumption will be widely accepted (Ross, 1992).

### Mintzberg's Managerial Roles

One of the long-standing controversies in the study of leadership and management is the similarities and differences between these two constructs. Although no one has suggested that leaders and managers are equivalent, there has been much disagreement

about the distinction. Some have argued that the two constructs are almost mutually exclusive. Bennis and Nanus (1985), for example, proposed that "managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing" (p. 21). However, Mintzberg's (1973) classic taxonomy of managerial roles includes a leader role.

Mintzberg's Managerial Roles proposes that managerial activities can, in general, be divided into three categories: interpersonal, informational, and decisional roles. Within each of these three categories, Mintzberg identified specific roles. Of particular relevance to the present discussion is the leader role, identified in the interpersonal role. In the leader role, managers establish the work atmosphere within an organization and motivate subordinates to achieve organizational goals. Thus, according to Mintzberg, being a manager is not a precondition to being a leader. However, being a leader is a necessary component of being a good manager.

#### Competing Values Framework

The Competing Values Framework (Quinn & McGrath, 1982; Quinn & Hall, 1983) is an integrated theory of leadership that distinguishes among 3 important dimensions among organizations. One dimension reflects the extent to which an organization has a control orientation. That dimension runs from an emphasis of control to an emphasis of flexibility. The second dimension reflects the extent to which an organization is focused on its internal or external functioning. The third dimension reflects the extent to which an organization's values are focused on organizational processes versus organizational outcomes. Together these 3 dimensions form four separate quadrants, each with two performance criteria and a set of general values specific to its' quadrant. These four quadrants form the basis of the four models of the

Competing Values Framework; the open systems model, the rational goal model, the internal process model, and the human relations model. Each of these models represents a distinct organizational culture (Quinn & McGrath, 1982).

The Competing Values Framework has been applied to several topic areas, including leadership (Quinn & Hall, 1983). Applied to leadership, the framework conceives that leaders provide intellectual stimulation to their followers in one of four ways: rationally, existentially, empirically, or idealistically. Rationally oriented leaders emphasize ability, independence, and hard work. They try to convince followers to use logic and reason to deal with the groups' or organizations' problems (Bass, 1990). The rational leader leads by initiating action using a task-oriented and work-focused approach in a producer-type role, or by means of providing structure by demonstrating decisiveness and direction in a director-type role (Quinn & McGrath, 1985). Existentially oriented leaders try to move others toward a creative synthesis by first generating various possible solutions in informal interactions with others and their common problems (Bass, 1990). The existential leader leads by showing consideration of others using caring and empathy with followers in a mentor-type role, or by means of facilitating interactions by demonstrating diplomacy and tactfulness in a group facilitating-type role (Quinn & McGrath, 1985). Empirically oriented leaders promote attention to externally generated data and the search for one best answer from a great deal of information (Bass, 1990). They lead by maintaining structure by being dependable and reliable in a coordinator-type role, or by monitoring compliance (Quinn & McGrath, 1985). Idealist leaders encourage speedy intuition and need only to gather a minimum amount of data to reach a conclusion (Bass, 1990). They lead by envisioning change, being creative and clever, in

an innovator-type role, or by acquiring resources, being resource-oriented and politically astute, in a broker-type role (Quinn & McGrath, 1985).

### Theories of Charismatic Leadership

The original charismatic leadership theory by Weber (1946) described charisma as extraordinary qualities attributed to the leader by his or her followers. In more recent years, other authors and theorists, such as House (1977), Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993), and Conger and Kanungo (1988, 1998) have expanded and modified this theory to include a greater emphasis on emotions and values (Shamir, 1999). These recent theories describe charismatic leadership as the amount of influence that leaders have over their followers. Moreover, the role of the leader in making events meaningful for followers is acknowledged. Thus these theories help us understand how a leader can influence followers to make self-sacrifices, commit to difficult objectives, and to achieve much more than was initially expected (Shamir & Howell, 1999).

Although the core behaviours in charismatic leadership vary somewhat from theory to theory, key behaviours have included; articulating an appealing vision, communicating high performance expectations and expressing confidence that subordinates can attain them, showing self-confidence, and modeling exemplary behaviour (Shamir & Howell, 1999). In response to such behaviours, followers have exhibited implicit trust, obedience, and acceptance of the leader (House, 1977), and have demonstrated beliefs consistent with the leader thus becoming involved with carrying out the vision (Yukl, 1989).

The most significant attribute of the leader is his or her ability to create a compelling vision that followers readily accept and share (Bass, 1990). The vision serves

as a source of motivation and inspiration to the followers (Tritten & Keithly, 1996). It acts as a focal point to energize followers to accept organizational changes and commit to new ideas (Bognar, 1998). It is the leader's capacity to inspire confidence in others that is his or her source of legitimacy, not the leaders' office or status (Tritten & Keithly, 1996).

However, although charismatic leaders can inspire great commitment, sacrifice and energy, the possibility of negative implications associated with charismatic leaders should also be considered. For example, there is no guarantee that the leaders' vision is meaningful and worthwhile (Stoner, Freeman & Gilbert, 1994). In fact, some charismatic leaders may use their visionary abilities for self-serving purposes with little regard for their followers' welfare (Bass, 1990).

Critics of the charismatic leadership theories have argued that there is a need for greater clarity and consistency in regard to: 1) how the charismatic term is defined, 2) the importance of the underlying processes such as personal identification, internalization of the vision, and collective identification, and 3) the key behaviours demonstrated by charismatic leaders (Bognar, 1998). In addition, charismatic leadership theories may need to expand on the characteristics of the followers and of the environment and/or situation which are conducive to charismatic leadership (Bognar, 1998). Finally, experimental laboratory research needs to be carried out on the effectiveness of charismatic leadership (Wofford, 1999, Brown & Lord, 1999) due to the correlational survey form of the majority of existing research.

#### Visionary Leadership Theory

According to theories of visionary leadership, the leader is the main person setting direction for the group. He or she champions a particular image of what is possible, desirable, and intended for the future (Nanus, 1998). The leaders' visions are a symbol to their followers of all that is possible. Such an image has great power. It provides a sense of direction, thus inspiring action (deBono, 1984). If we apply Nanus' definition of vision to the description of a Commander's intent, we could describe vision as "the mental image of what you want the organization to do in the future, how you believe it should generally accomplish this transition or journey and what the organization should look like at the end of the transition or journey."

Whether you agree with this definition or prefer another, vision must be communicated, shared and understood by all within the organization if the organization is to succeed. It is essential that the vision be shared and communicated in order to inspire people's emotion and challenge subordinates to attain organization goals for the future. Subordinates must buy into the vision, support it and act on it, or organizational success will be minimized (Leboeuf, 1999).

## **Subsection 2B: Supervisory Leadership Theories**

### Transformational Leadership Theory

According to Bass (1985a, 1985b), effective leaders use two primary sets of behaviours to influence subordinates: (1) transactional behaviours, and (2) transformational behaviours. The first set, transactional behaviours, defines an exchange-based influence between leaders and subordinates whereby followers exchange effort for rewards received from their leaders. In the transactional approach, the leader is said to

answer a follower's immediate needs and the follower gives the leader the right to command him or her. Transactional leaders are perceived as being task oriented and not having an anticipated outlook on the future (UMP, 2001).

Alternatively, transformational leaders are thought to go beyond a simple exchange between work and reward. This exchange implies the desire to integrate the leader's vision in order to have a real but intangible reward such as to conceptualize and model the leader's behaviour, which requires interdependent co-ordination. The transformational leader is thought to influence follower behaviour by a process that gets the follower to internalize key values and beliefs specific to the organization. According to Bass, transformational behaviours promote the following subordinate outcomes: admiration, respect, and trust of the leader; motivation and commitment to shared goals and visions; innovative and creative approaches; and growth reflecting the unique needs and desires of individual followers. In other words, transformational leadership is thought to accentuate the level of consciousness in subordinates towards new and challenging goals and visions, to instil the desire in followers to perform their best at work while generating intellectual stimulation. From the follower's perspective, transformational leaders are characterized as charismatic individuals who care for subordinates' well-being (UMP, 2001).

Accordingly, Bass proposed that follower outcomes promoted by transformational behaviours result in levels of organizational effort and performance over and beyond what is possible by transactional behaviour. These effects of transformational leadership on subordinate outcomes define the augmentation hypothesis (Waldman, Bass, &

Yammarino, 1990), which has guided empirical testing of Bass's ideas about transformational leadership (Kane & Tremble, 2000).

#### Transformational Leadership and the Canadian Forces

The Canadian Forces have a number of publications that specifically state its doctrine on leadership. Among the doctrinal statements, leadership has always been the “primary function of all commissioned and non-commissioned officers”, and according to the current doctrinal authority (Leadership), leadership is defined as “that combination of persuasion, compulsion and example that makes people do what you want them to do”. Specifically, a leader is “anyone who directs and influences people in such a way that they will act with willing obedience, confidence, respect, and loyal cooperation in order to accomplish a mission”.

In the last decade, the Directorate for Human Resource Research and Evaluation (DHRRE; previously the Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit; CFPARU) conducted numerous research projects on topics related to leadership. For example, Stouffer (1994) attempted to identify the leadership attributes and behaviours that could be assessed in the selection of junior naval officers and the selection of junior combat arms officers, and Tzvetanka Dobрева-Martinova (1999) examined leadership behaviour in the context of human dimensions of operational combat readiness, such as morale and cohesion, professional morale, perception of immediate leader's skills, and confidence in leaders at different levels. In addition, the relationship between several occupational personality attributes and performance has been investigated in other studies conducted by DHRRE (e.g., O'Keefe, 1999).



As a part of DHRRE's research paradigm, either the Unit Morale Profile (UMP) or the Ship's Effectiveness Profile (SEP) are typically administered to Canadian Forces' members participating in specific research studies. In terms of item content, these instruments are virtually identical survey documents designed for different sections of the Canadian Forces. Whereas the UMP is administered to the Canadian ARMY, the SEP is administered to the Canadian NAVY. The UMP and SEP include several scales that purport to measure different aspects of the work environment. Among the different facets measured by these instruments, the leadership construct is currently assessed using the Bass Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5x, Military Format, 1996), and leadership in the context of DHRRE research is defined as "an individual's personal influence that causes another individual or a group to accomplish a task or an activity that the leader intends to achieve" (UMP, 2001).

The MLQ was developed and refined by Bass and colleagues (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1996; Bass, 1990), and it measures a broad range of leadership styles using the most commonly employed measure of transactional and transformational leadership. The different dimensions measured with this instrument are transactional leadership (Contingent Rewards, Management-by-exception) transformational leadership (Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration), and laissez-faire leadership (UMP, 2001).

According to Bass (1985a, 1985b), the laissez-faire leadership style is not among the sets of behaviours that are typically displayed by leaders to influence subordinates. That is, laissez-faire leaders leave the decision making up to their subordinates, and these leaders are typically perceived as giving up responsibility for leading, indifferent,

indecisive, and often inaccessible (UMP, 2001). As previously discussed, effective leaders use two primary sets of behaviours to influence subordinates: (1) transactional behaviours, and (2) transformational behaviours (Bass, 1985a; 1985b).

Clearly, Bass's (1985a, 1985b) ideas are especially attractive to military organizations, such as the Canadian Forces. Recall that the Canadian Forces doctrine states that leadership is the primary function of all commissioned and non-commissioned officers, and it implies that leaders effectively contribute to unit performance by using a combination of "persuasion, compulsion and example". In a similar vein, transformational leaders are thought to promote admiration, respect, trust of the leader, motivation, and commitment to shared goals and visions, each of which are elements that could contribute to effective team performance in the military context. Undoubtedly, it is for this reason that leadership in the Canadian Forces is currently operationalized in terms of the MLQ.

#### Leader-Member Exchange Model

Leader-Member Exchange theory postulates that leader effectiveness is driven by the quality of the leader-subordinate relationship. Leader-Member Exchange theory defines a quality relationship between leader and subordinate as one that denotes mutual respect and trust (Gerstner & Day, 1997). However, due to time restrictions and assorted pressures, leaders generally develop close relationships with only a few key subordinates who are termed the "in group". The leader's relationships with members of the "in group" can result in increased job latitude, influence in decision making, open communications, support for the member's actions, and confidence in and consideration for the member

(Case, 1998). The member can reciprocate by providing greater availability and commitment to the success of the entire unit or sub-organization (Case, 1998).

Leader-subordinate relationships with "out group" members, on the other hand, are characterized by low levels of mutual influence. The primary source of leader influence for these members is legitimate authority in combination with coercive power and a limited degree of reward power. Therefore, the only requirement for "out group" members to satisfy the terms of the exchange relationship is their compliance with formally prescribed role expectations (e.g., job duties, rules, standard procedures), and with the legitimate directions of the leader. As long as such compliance is forthcoming, the subordinate receives the standard benefits (e.g., compensation) for his or her position in the organization (Case, 1998).

The Leader-Member Exchange theory suggests that the leader defines what the subordinate's role expectations will be, and this interpersonal exchange relationship is especially pronounced for new organizational members. Graen and Cashman (1975) noted that these role expectations develop fairly quickly and remain stable after they have been formed. They pointed out further that a group member's compatibility, competence, and dependability are significant factors in determining whether an individual becomes a member of the "in" or "out" group.

Early Leader-Member Exchange studies offer convincing support that such exchanges do occur and have a significant impact on employee satisfaction (Graen, Novak and Sommerkamp, 1982), retention and turnover (Ferris, 1985; Graen, Liden and Hoel, 1982), and performance (Vecchio and Gobdel, 1984; Wayne and Ferris, 1990). Furthermore, Leader-Member Exchange is also related to job attitudes, leader attention,

leader support, participation in decision-making, and amount of time and energy invested in the job (Crouch and Yetton, 1988; Graen and Schiemann, 1978; Kozlowski and Doherty, 1989; Scandura, Graen and Novak, 1986). In general, Leader-Member Exchange research supports the major propositions of the theory (Case, 1998).

### Path-Goal Theory

The Path-Goal theory of leadership suggests that a successful leader shows a follower the rewards that are available to him or her as well as the paths (behaviours) through which the rewards may be obtained (House, 1971). Along the way, the effective leader will clarify the paths towards these goals and aid the follower in removing any imposing obstacles. The leader also provides emotional support as needed (Hughes, Ginnette, & Curphy, 1998). These actions essentially strengthen the followers' beliefs that if they exert a certain level of effort they will be more likely to accomplish a task, and if they accomplish the task they will be more likely to achieve some valued outcome (Hughes, Ginnette, & Curphy, 1998). The leader therefore arouses followers to increase their efforts to perform well and thus, the followers achieve satisfaction from the job to be done (Bass, 1990).

There are four types of leader behaviour in the Path-Goal theory; directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented leadership. It is the situation and the follower characteristics that determine which leadership style the leader will adopt in order to accomplish the path-goal purposes. For example, in an ambiguous situation, the leader may adopt a directive leadership style by outlining what it is to be done and establishing ground rules on how it is to be completed. Alternatively, should the leader wish to increase group satisfaction, he or she may adopt a supportive leadership style by

establishing good relations within the group, demonstrating sensitivity to subordinates needs, and remaining open and approachable to followers. Other leadership styles include participative leadership which focuses on sharing information within the group, soliciting subordinate suggestions and concerns, and making decisions based on group consultation, and achievement-oriented leadership which focuses on challenging the group with high goals and demonstrating confidence in the group's ability to achieve these goals (Hughes, Ginnette, & Curphy, 1998).

The theory assumes that leaders use not only varying styles with different subordinates, but also differing styles with the same subordinates in different situations (Hughes, Ginnette, & Curphy, 1998). In general, there are three types of situational variables which influence the type of leadership style the leader will adopt; task variables, environmental variables, and individual differences. Task variables include such things as role clarity, routine, and externally imposed controls, environmental variables, consisting of variables present within the internal and external organizational environment, and individual difference variables which include such things as personality, competence, intelligence, and role expectations (House & Dessler, 1974).

#### Attributional Leadership Model

According to the Attributional Leadership Model, each leader and follower is seen to have his or her own implicit theory of leadership (Calder, 1977). Followers observe the behaviour of leaders and infer the causes of these behaviours to be various personality traits or external constraints. If the causes of these behaviours match the followers' implicit assumptions about what a leader should do, then the term "leadership" is used to describe the persons observed (Eden & Leviatan, 1975). Thus, in this context leadership

changes from a scientific concept to a study of the social realities of leaders and observers (Calder, 1977).

If we want to understand the behaviour of individual leaders, we must begin by attempting to find out what they are thinking about the situation that they are leading (Pfeffer, 1977). The Attributional leadership model of Green and Mitchell (1979) suggests that a leader's behaviour is a consequence of the leader's interpretation of the subordinate's performance. The model presents an explanation of leaders' responses to poor performance of subordinates. The model suggests that the leader first diagnoses the causes of poor performance by processing information using a causal schema consisting of four elements: ability, effort, task difficulty, and luck (Weiner, Frieze, Kukla, Reed, Rest, & Rosenbaum, 1972). In the second stage, on the basis of the attribution made, the leader chooses a response directed either at the subordinate or the situation. According to this theory, causality is attributed more to the subordinate than to the situation if the subordinate has had a history of poor performance and if the effects of the poor performance have severe outcomes (Michell & Wood, 1979).

Critics of the model argue that the Attribution theory of leadership may falsely link organizational outcomes to leadership (Horner & Donald, 1996). Specifically, the model aids individuals in making sense of their environments by using their own social construct of reality to link leaders and outcomes, regardless of any real or actual leadership effects. Thus, instead of the leader being linked to organizational outcomes due to his inherent capacity to produce actual or intended effects, he or she is presumed to affect outcomes so that his or her subordinates will understand organizational activities (Horner & Donald, 1996). This process of linking organizational outcomes to the leader

simplifies an otherwise complex process of assessing outcomes and attributing their cause to less-salient, less-controllable and less apparent explanations.

One must therefore be cautious in applying the Attribution theory to a military context, as it suggests that superiors and subordinates alike may tend to perceive the leader as the cause for whatever happens or fails to happen in his or her unit, regardless of whether the leader is the actual cause. Furthermore, such attributions are magnified when organizational outcomes are extreme in either direction (Horner & Donald, 1996).

#### Situational Leadership Model-Air War College Model

In the early 1990s, United States Air University Leadership and Management Program Advisory Group (LMPAG) met to discuss the Hersey and Blanchard Situational Leadership model (1982) that was being used extensively for Officer Training in different sections of the U.S. military. The general feeling was that the Hersey and Blanchard model is useful but has some significant limitations when applied to the military context (Waddell III, 1994). In particular, the LMPAG concluded that the model suggests that the appropriate leadership style be based on the maturity or development level of the followers, but it does not adequately address other military considerations, including the level at which leadership is exercised, different styles that may be required because of the demands of combat, and staff versus operational leadership. These shortcomings of the Situational model led to the development of the Air War College (AWC) Model, a model of leadership situations unique to the military (Waddell III, 1994).

As a backdrop, we begin with a brief description of Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership model. Based on their review of leadership theory in the twentieth century, Hersey and Blanchard (1982) concluded that no one theory of leadership is

wholly correct, and therefore, developed their model. In general, the Situational model holds that any leadership style can be effective or ineffective depending on the response that style gets in a particular situation. In fact, effective leaders are thought to adapt their leader behaviour to meet the needs of their followers and the particular environment.

As an extension of this model, the AWC model was developed to describe situational leadership in a military context. In effect, the AWC model stresses the components of leadership as identified by the U.S. Air Force (leader, follower, mission) as they are influenced by the situation or context in which leadership is exercised (Waddell III 1994). For example, the model suggests that it is not the leader, but the followers who actually do the work and accomplish the mission. It is also the followers who provide feedback to the leader on their progress in accomplishing the mission. For that reason, the model proposes that communication between leader and follower needs to be free flowing. In other words, communication between the leader and the follower must be in the form of a dialogue, not a monologue.

Clearly, a major consideration in understanding leadership is the relationship between the leader and follower. The other major component is the situation, the environment, or the context in which leader behaviour takes place. To this end, the AWC model is useful in modeling how the dynamics of the leader-follower relationship change as the situation changes. In particular, the AWC model specifies several situations that are particularly relevant to the military context. For example, this model examines situations such as the levels at which leadership is exercised, peacetime leadership as compared to wartime operations, service, and staff leadership as opposed to leadership of operational units.



In terms of the levels at which leadership is exercised, the AWC model specifies that the mission is very specific at the tactical level but becomes broader at higher levels of leadership. That is, the model illustrates that when the leadership situation changes from tactical to operational and higher, mission tasking should become less specific. The model also allows us to visualize changes in the interaction between the leader and the followers as levels of leadership change. As the leader rises above the tactical level, the number of people for whom the leader is responsible increases. Consequently, the interaction with these soldiers becomes less and less direct.

The changes in mission and followers associated with the rise above the tactical level force certain changes upon the leader as well. The leader at the tactical level is primarily a technician, a practitioner, who actually participates in an operation. As leadership is exercised at the higher levels, the technician becomes a generalist, less concerned about operations at the tactical level and more concerned about the broader application of military power at strategic levels.

In terms of peacetime leadership as compared to wartime operations, wartime missions are more critical and the result takes on potentially tragic consequences. In wartime, the mental state of followers takes on greater significance because fear complicates their ability to perform. The model specifies that leaders must take this factor into consideration when transforming from peace to war. To compensate for fear and the greater importance of mission accomplishment, leaders may become more authoritarian. However, an authoritarian response is not an automatic response to a combat situation. The model still maintains that the leader's style depends on the situation and the leader. Furthermore, the model specifies that the interaction between

the leader and the follower in a combat environment during peacetime operations is complex and difficult. During war, this interaction becomes even more difficult since it is exacerbated by the fog and friction of war.

In terms of staff versus operational leadership, the model specifies that leaders in operational units are probably more effective if they conform to the heroic leader style, while a staff leader's style is more appropriately bureaucratic and participative. The interaction between leader and followers is primarily verbal and informal in an operational environment, whereas in a staff environment it is written and formal. Likewise, the followers are more sophisticated in the staff environment and the mission is more in the arena of policy and plans.

Clearly, the AWC model is a particularly useful framework for assessing leaders and their leadership in the military context. As discussed, this model is useful in helping leaders adapt their leadership style to the situations in which they find themselves. And as Waddell III (1994) put forth, "in light of unprecedented technological developments, rapidly changing world events, and compressed cycles of social change, the need for adaptive, flexible, empowering leadership has never been greater" (pp. 43, Waddell III, 1994).

#### Fiedler's Contingency Model

Fiedler's Contingency model proposes that group effectiveness is contingent upon how the leader judges his or her least preferred co-worker, as measured by the Least Preferred Co-worker Scale (LPC scale). The LPC scale consists of 15-25 eight-point, bipolar, semantic differential scales (e.g., cold-warm, gloomy-cheerful). Leaders are instructed to use these scales to rate their least preferred co-worker, defined as the one

person with whom they have the most trouble getting the job done. A leader's LPC score is simply calculated by taking the sum of all the bipolar scales (Bass, 1990; Rice, Seaman & Garven, 1999).

The model proposes that although leaders of both high and low LPC appreciate and desire success, the two groups differ significantly in terms of what kind of outcomes they deem to be highly valuable. For the low-LPC leaders, task success is most salient, while for the high-LPC leaders, successful interpersonal relationships are most highly valued (Rice et al.). This value difference underlies what is identified as task versus interpersonal orientations (Bass, 1990; Rice et al., 1999). Those leaders scoring low on the LPC scale are considered to be task oriented and thus have quite negative views of their least preferred co-worker. Presumably such attitudes are negative because the co-worker poses a serious threat to their most valued outcome: successful task accomplishment. In contrast, those leaders scoring high on the LPC scale are considered to be relationship oriented. This is presumably so because the co-worker does not pose a threat upon the most valued outcome: interpersonal relationships (Rice et al., 1999).

Fiedler's contingency model attempts to identify those situations in which groups with low-LPC leaders perform most effectively and those situations in which groups with high-LPC leaders perform most effectively. The task-oriented leader is deemed to be most effective in situations that are most or least favourable to him or her. In contrast, the relations-oriented leader is deemed most likely to be effective in situation in between the two extremes (Bass, 1990). To this end, Fiedler's model emphasizes the need to place the person in the situation for which he or she is best suited rather than focusing on how the person needs to be developed to adapt best to the situation (Theodory, 1982).

One must be careful when applying Fiedler's contingency model to the military context. The emphasis of this model is on placing the right person in the right situation, however, as previously discussed, it is important for military leaders to be able to adapt their leadership styles to the situations in which they find themselves. This is especially true given the unpredictable nature of the environment and the significance of potential consequences of action.

#### Normative Decision-Making Model

The Normative Decision-Making Model (Vroom-Yetton, 1973) suggests that a leader adopts a specific leadership style based on key situational variables. Accordingly, the situation is analyzed according to the presence or absence of the following attributes: 1) the need for a quality decision; 2) whether the leader has sufficient information to make a quality decision alone; 3) the degree to which the problem is structured; 4) whether subordinates' acceptance is needed for implementation; 5) whether subordinates will accept the leader's decision; 6) the degree to which subordinates share the organization's goals (Bass, 1990).

The leader thus adopts the appropriate decision-making style in accordance with the information yielded by the situational analysis. There are five decision-making styles, the first two being the autocratic styles. With the first autocratic style, Autocratic I, the leader solves a problem with the information that is already available to him or her. Using the second autocratic style of decision-making, Autocratic II, the leader obtains additional information from the group and uses it, in addition to the information already available, to make a decision. The third and fourth decision making styles are the consultative styles. Using the Consultative I decision-making style the leader discusses

the problem with his or her subordinates individually before making a decision. Using the second consultative style of decision-making, Consultative II, the leader shares the problem with subordinates as a group before making a decision. The fifth and final decision-making style of the Normative Decision-Making Model is the Group II style. With this decision-making style, the leader acts a chair while the problem is discussed and the group forms a consensus in order to make a decision (Parker, 1999).

### Cognitive Categorization

The Cognitive Categorization theory of leadership (Cronshaw & Lord, 1987) is founded upon the notion that human observers are unable to process and remember all information to which they are exposed, including those stimuli which arise from leader-follower interactions. Thus, human observers employ cognitive heuristics to aid in management of these complex social cues (Palich & Hom, 1992). One common heuristic involves matching an observed stimulus with a prototype, the prototype being the most representative member of a cognitive category (Phillips, 1984; Shaw, 1990; Walsh, 1988). Applied to leadership, Cronshaw and Lord (1987) proposed that if observers perceive similarities between salient behaviours or qualities of an individual and those of a leader prototype, then the person is encoded into long-term memory as a leader. Simply stated, people identify others as leaders or non-leaders based on the frequency and nature of displayed leader behaviours. Over time, further category attributes, which were not present during encoding, may also be attributed to the person as a result of closely identifying the person with his or her category (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). When making later judgments about the person, individuals rely on the corresponding category attributes to which the individual is encoded (Cronshaw & Lord, 1987).

### The Pygmalion effect

The Pygmalion effect outlines the importance of the leader's expectations as a determinant of subordinate performance. Specifically, the Pygmalion effect is a self-fulfilling prophecy in which raising leader expectations enhances subordinate performance (Davidson & Eden, 2000; Eden, 1984). Research on the phenomenon of self-fulfilling prophecy provides ample evidence that other people act in ways that are expected of them (Bowers & Seashore, 1966; Eden & Shani, 1982; Jensen, 1969; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Schrank, 1968) in a variety of situations including in the classroom, in a military context, and within hierarchical organizations. A leader with high expectations treats subordinates in ways that bolster their self-confidence, thereby making it possible for those people to achieve more than they may have initially believed possible.

Leaders' belief in subordinates creates a self-fulfilling prophecy; they do as they are expected to do. However, the downside to the Pygmalion effect is clear. In line with the theory, if we expect people to fail, they probably will (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Moreover, research has consistently found that this theory tends to hold true in a military context (Crawford, Thomas, & Fink, 1980; Eden & Ravid, 1981, 1982; Eden & Shani, 1979, 1982; Schrank, 1968) thus it becomes all the more important that military leaders demonstrate confidence in their subordinates, increasing their self-confidence and instilling in them a sense of self-worth, and thereby enhancing their performance. This effect may be particularly important in training in situations where accurate performance is critical.

### Impression Management

Impression management involves what individuals do to create and maintain desired perceptions in others about themselves (Schlenker, 1980- referenced in Bass). In terms of leadership, such perceptions are important as they affect the degree to which a leader is esteemed by his or her subordinates, and therefore, to what extent the leader can be successful in influencing them.

Jones and Pittman (1982) assert that there are five impression management strategies that leaders use in order influence the perceptions of others. The first strategy, used to enhance the leaders likeability or attractiveness to followers, is that of ingratiation. Using the ingratiation strategy would include behaviours such as repeatedly complimenting an influential colleague in order to enhance the perception of the leader as a likeable person. The second strategy, self-promotion, is used to present the leader as highly competent with regard to certain skills or abilities. An example of a self-promotion behaviour is a leader attempting to take credit for recent achievements in order to improve his or her followers' impressions of competence. The third strategy, used to enhance the leader's appearance of being morally worthy, is that of exemplification. This strategy may also be used to elicit follower emulation, and involves the leader modeling basic ethical values on a day-to-day basis. The fourth strategy, intimidation, is used to present the leader as a dangerous person. Using the intimidation strategy would include behaviours such as threatening to fire or publicly humiliating a subordinate for poor performance. The final strategy, used to present the leader as pitiful or helpless, is that of supplication. Using the supplication strategy would include behaviours such as acting dumb or incompetent in order to elicit help on a difficult task or assignment from another individual (Jones & Pittman, 1982).

**PART IV**

**INTEGRATION OF THEORIES - A PROPOSED MODEL FOR THE MILITARY**

**AND ITS APPLICATIONS**

In this section we provide suggestions for developing a relevant integrative model that can successfully be applied to various Human Resources practices in the military, such as selection, assessment and training. Those theories with direct or obvious military implications have been addressed previously, and will be reviewed here. Other theories, with less obvious or direct military implications, have not yet been addressed, and thus are dealt with here.

From the Conceptual Complexity theories we know that leadership requires information-processing and cognitive skills such as learning, memory, concept formation, problem solving, decision-making, integration of information, abstraction, independent thought, and use of broad and complex frames of reference. Moreover, the more senior the leader, the more demanding are the cognitive processes required. This results primarily from increased responsibilities related to the position, particularly in regard to long-term planning, engagement in the organization's external environment, consensus building, creation of organizational policies, and network development.

Future military leaders must possess high levels of cognitive complexity to understand conceptually highly complex, volatile and probabilistic environments, and to construct a plan or vision for the future. Failure to construct such a vision will most likely result in defeat (Phillips and Hunt, 1992). Those most gifted in cognitive complexity are better able to understand and identify what is critical given the same amount of information available to others. Discovery consists of seeing what everyone



else has seen and thinking what no one has thought. The ability to correctly see the battlefield is central to battle command success. The greater the leaders' cognitive capacity, the stronger the foundation upon which the entire battle command process rests (Reisweber, 1997)

The Behavioural Complexity theories focus on the leader's ability to adapt his or her behaviour as required by the situation. When we look at Conceptual Complexity theories in light of the Behavioural Complexity theories we see that a well thought out plan of action, developed through use of the leaders' cognitive abilities, is more effectively implemented by a leader whose behaviour complies to the requirements of the situation. Thus, the two sets of theories complement each other.

Unlike the Conceptual and Behavioural Complexity theories, which focus on what leadership is, the Strategic Decision-Making theories focus on how leaders accomplish their work. Specifically, the Strategic Decision-Making theories explain the processes, such as environmental scanning, interpretation, and strategic decision making, by which leaders attempt to align the organizations' activities with opportunities or threats from the external environment. The Strategic Decision-Making theories are consistent with the Conceptual Complexity theories and their conception of information-processing, however the Strategic Decision-Making theories offer increased specificity in terms of the underlying processes involved in the development of the frame of references.

The Strategic Decision-Making theories, with their emphasize on scanning internal and external conditions in order to create a direction for the organization, neglect to consider the processes used by leaders to motivate subordinates into action. It is the Theories of Visionary and Inspirational Leadership which take such considerations into

account. Thus, the Visionary and Inspirational Leadership Theories focus on the role of senior leaders in formulating and implementing a direction for their organization through a value-based visionary statement. It is the leaders' vision that represents what is possible, desirable, and intended for the future, thus providing a sense of direction, and inspiring the action of followers.

A particular strength of the cognitive models of leadership is their consideration of perceptual biases. Behavioural ratings or evaluations of any individual leader are likely to be biased leading to inaccurate and unfair evaluations. For example, leaders whose personal characteristics match those of the dominant leader prototype might be overrated whereas non-traditional leaders tend to be underrated. Thus, leadership theories that regard reports by leaders and followers as accurate measures of behaviour and outcome, ignoring the biasing effects of cognitive constructions, increase the likelihood of inappropriate conclusions (Chemers, 1997). This being said, even in models where reports are susceptible to distortions, evidence of the relative advantage of some leaders over others is apparent, providing support of effects over and beyond those associated with cognitive biases (Chemers, 1997).

Hence, the contingency models of leadership do provide insight into leader-subordinate relations, with their emphasis placed on the necessity of leaders to use varying leadership styles according to the characteristics of the subordinates and the environment, even though the degree of the effect may be misrepresented by research designs that are susceptible to perceptual biases. Furthermore, the empirical research on behavioural theories is generally supportive of the notion that leaders who apply rewards contingent to subordinate performance are likely to increase subordinate performance and

satisfaction. The problem still exists however that many behaviours that are critical to effective organizational behaviour are difficult to pinpoint and even harder to consistently monitor. Thus again we see that each of the types of models discussed has something to add to the leadership body of knowledge and yet none are able to account for the leadership construct alone.

Let us now examine the particular relevance to the military of each of the theories discussed. From the Stratified Systems theory we know that natural hierarchies assert themselves wherever human beings organize themselves to fight or work, and this structuring is true regardless of “whether it's a factory in a small town in Canada or a high-tech firm in the United States”. Accordingly, as you move up the hierarchy of an organization so does the corresponding level of cognitive complexity required. Thus, applied to a military context, the leader’s cognitive complexity must match what is required by his or her military rank. Thus military leaders at the highest level must possess the level of cognitive complexity required to understand conceptually highly complex, volatile and probabilistic environments, and to construct a plan or vision for the future.

Because of the wide range of managerial skills associated with conceptual complexity, a number of strategies for expanding managers’ capacities for complex thinking have been developed. Training in educational settings generally fosters complex thinking through the use of problem-centred designs, a level of complexity that both supports and challenges the development of participants, and the presentation of multiple perspectives with provisions to integrate them. Beyond an educational setting, a complex work environment that exposes individuals to unfamiliar, challenging, and mind-

stretching situations may also foster cognitive development (Bartunek, & Louis, 1988). Nonetheless, although cognitive training may enhance our skills, the process is not an easy one. The development of cognitive complexity requires an effort spanning several years and encompassing several aspects of life and may not have long-term effects (Bartunek, & Louis, 1988). Moreover, such efforts are generally able to enhance our abilities only to the level of our predetermined upper limit of cognitive ability (Elliott, 1996).

A number of themes from the Warrior Model emerge fairly consistently. Specifically, there are the beliefs that leadership is inseparably related to conflict and opposition, control over flows of information, the assertion that results are more important than the methods used to achieve them, and an emphasis on knowing the people that the leader is seeking to defeat or lead. In addition, the warrior model contends that a shrewd leader selects battles carefully and does not fight unnecessarily, uses other people as buffers and plans and prepares for future contingencies.

Although the Warrior Model has been one of the most influential models of leadership through the ages, it has several limitations. First, the emphasis on conflict, defeating opponents and doing whatever is necessary to achieve success (e.g., betrayal, terror) directly opposes the peacekeeping nature of the Canadian Forces. However, the warrior models emphasize on choosing one's battles carefully is consistent with Canadian military practices.

Although, some have argued that the two constructs, leader and manager, are almost mutually exclusive, Mintzberg's taxonomy of managerial roles does include a leader role. When applying Mintzberg's managerial roles to the military context, we see

that, because of the value placed on leadership within the military, the difference between these two constructs should be minimal. That is, an officer who oversees a group of individuals, has as his or her duty to lead those individuals, not simply to manage them. Thus, Mintzberg's Managerial role of leader, to establish a work atmosphere that motivates subordinates to achieve organizational goals, becomes even more important when applied to the military context.

Mintzberg has developed a two-day executive development session based on his Managerial roles, a component of this session devoted to leader development. In addition, Mintzberg has initiated an International Masters Program in Practising Management where students take classes at locations in Canada, the UK, France, India and Japan. The Masters Program focuses on developing the leadership skills of individuals, who having been with their companies for many years, have risen to leadership positions despite a lack, in most cases, of formal management education. Mintzberg developed the MBA program partially in response to typical MBA programs which he believes train the wrong people in the wrong ways. Specifically, he believes that most individuals in MBA programs are too young and too inexperienced, and because of their lack of devotion to and experience in a company, do not deserve the leadership positions for which they are being trained (Schachter, 1996). Although, Mintzberg's Managerial training is proving effective in organizational management settings, the training is targeted at for-profit organizations, and thus many aspects of the training are not relevant to the military context. Consequently, although Mintzberg's idea of managers as leaders is fundamental to the military, his training sessions are not deemed applicable to Canadian Forces officers.

The Competing Values Framework, when applied to leadership, contends that leaders provide intellectual stimulation to their followers in one of four ways: rationally, existentially, empirically, or idealistically. As discussed, each of the four types of leaders emphasizes different processes and leads with distinct styles. In the military, the environment can be unpredictable and the behavioural outcomes may be critical. Thus it is important that the military leader be flexible enough to adapt his or her behaviour to the situation rather than identifying his or her preferred leadership style (rational, existential, empirical, idealistic) and applying it to a variety of situations and individuals.

Competing Values training usually involves three general steps: 1) doing a self-assessment, 2) developing a change strategy, and 3) implementing the change strategy. In the self-assessment phase the leader analyzes his or her skills in each of the leadership styles using the competing values instrument. In the second phase the leader gathers qualitative and quantitative data in order to make a final assessment of his or her strengths and weaknesses in each role of the competing values framework. The leader then focuses on improving his weak areas. This is done by identifying someone who performs very well in the leader's weak area, and having him or her work with that individual. There are also several resources available to the leader (self-improvement books and professional management books) which focus on each of the competing values roles. The final phase, implementing strategy, involves experimenting with new strategies and behaviours in accordance with what was learned in phases one and two. For a thorough review of training and the Competing Values Framework refer to Beyond Rational Management (Quinn, 1988).

Motivation and inspiration are well-understood military leadership facets, as are vision and insight (Tritten & Keithly, 1996). Recent charismatic and visionary leadership theories help us understand the importance of these constructs by exemplifying how a leader can influence followers to make self-sacrifices, commit to difficult objectives, and to achieve. This is done through a variety of methods, the most dominant being the leader's ability to create a compelling vision that followers readily accept and share. The visionary leadership theories emphasize the importance of communicating and sharing the vision so that all within the organization understands it. Thus, the charismatic and visionary leadership theories have much to add to the military context, given that motivation and inspiration are important aspects of military life.

Several researchers (for example, Bass) have initiated leadership training designs that incorporate the behavioural components of charisma. It should, however, be recognized that certain contextual factors within the environment and/or certain developmental antecedents in the life history of a military officer may act as barriers to the effectiveness of these programs (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Thus, while it is naïve to assume that all military leaders can be transformed into great visionary leaders, it is reasonable to assume that through training the behavioural components of charismatic leadership, we can enhance the effectiveness of military leaders (Conger & Kanungo, 1988).

The transformational leader is thought to influence follower behaviour by a process that gets the follower to internalize key values and beliefs specific to the organization. Moreover, transformational behaviours promote the following subordinate outcomes: admiration, respect, and trust of the leader, motivation and commitment to

shared goals and visions, and innovative and creative approaches. In other words, transformational leadership is thought to instil the desire in followers to perform their best. Thus, transformational leadership is thought to promote levels of organizational effort and performance over and beyond what is possible by transactional behaviour. Clearly then transformational leadership should be of primary interest to the military.

Transformational leadership can be taught to individuals at all levels within an organization (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Programs designed to develop transformational leadership usually require that individuals take the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire or a similar questionnaire to determine the leader's particular strengths and weaknesses in transformational leadership. Training then focuses on those areas of transformational leadership which need improvement (Northouse, 1997). Research on transformational training indicates that training results in significant effects on subordinates' perceptions of leaders' transformational leadership, in addition to affecting subordinates' own organizational commitment (Barlow, Weber, Kelloway, 1996).

From the Leader-Member Exchange theory we learn that a quality leader-subordinate relationship significantly impact employee satisfaction (Graen, Novak and Sommerkamp, 1982), retention and turnover (Ferris, 1985; Graen, Liden and Hoel, 1982), and performance (Vecchio and Gobdel, 1984; Wayne and Ferris, 1990), and is related to job attitudes, leader attention, leader support, participation in decision-making, and amount of time and energy invested in the job (Graen and Schiemann, 1978; Kozlowski and Doherty, 1989; Scandura, Graen and Novak, 1986). Moreover, the theory contends that the leader defines the subordinate's role expectations, through an evaluation of his or her competence and dependability, and that these role expectations remain stable



after they have been formed. However, the theory also emphasizes that quality leader-subordinate relationships, and high subordinate expectations generally only develop with a few key subordinates.

Thus if this theory is to be applied to the military context, it should be used to draw attention to the fact that quality leader-subordinate relationships should be maintained with all individuals, not simply a selected few; particularly given the apparent impact that quality relationships have on subordinates. From the Pygmalion effect we know that a leader with high expectations treats subordinates in ways that bolster their self-confidence, thereby making it possible for those people to achieve more than they may have initially believed possible. Thus, it becomes all the more important that military leaders attempt to develop and to maintain high expectations and quality relationships with all subordinates rather than a selected few, thereby increasing their self-confidence, instilling in them a sense of self-worth, and enhancing their performance.

Leader-Member Exchange training programs focus on enabling and encouraging supervisors to correct the “in group/out group” situation by teaching them to analyze and act upon major positive and negative elements of their relationship with each subordinate (Latham, 1988). Leader-Member Exchange training results in significant increases in the degree of supervisor support and member availability perceived by the initial “out group”. Furthermore, the training resulted in increased weekly productivity and increased job satisfaction (Scandura & Graen, 1984).

Pygmalion training workshops focus on teaching Pygmalion Leadership style concepts, conducting skill-practice exercises, and assisting managers with planning implementation. Numerous Pygmalion training workshops have been carried out with

military staff, counsellors, blue-collar supervisors, principals, bank personnel, and hospital service managers. A review of the Pygmalion training effect indicates that Pygmalion training produces small-to-medium-to-large changes in leadership effectiveness (Eden, Geller, Gewirtz, Gordon-Terner, Inbar, Liberman, Pass, Salomon-Segev, Shalit, 2000).

When we apply the path-goal theory, the contingency theory, and the normative decision-making theory to the military context we see that although each of the theories provides some insight into leader-subordinate relations, particularly the emphasize placed on the necessity of leaders to use varying leadership styles according to the characteristics of the subordinates and the environment, the theories are nonetheless limited in their scope. They fail to consider many of the factors that are known to affect leader and follower behaviours such as level of stress, organizational culture, working conditions, or economic conditions (Robinson, 1998). Thus, if these theories are to be applied to the military context, they should be done so in addition to other relevant theories.

Several leadership training programs have been initiated based on the principles of the contingency models. Training using Fiedler's Contingency model focuses on teaching people to change the situation so that it is favourable to them. Although it is essential for military leaders to be able to adapt their behaviour to the situation in which they find themselves, contingency training may be of use to military leaders in order to make the best of the situation. The training program appears to have a positive effect on performance (Fiedler, Mitchell, & Triandis, 1971; Lesiter, Borden, Fiedler, 1977), and appears to successfully generalize across situations (Burke & Day, 1986). Recent

research on the Path-Goal theory of leadership supports the emphasize the theory places on the need of leaders to adapt their behaviour to meet subordinate values and needs. Although the application of such results to supervisor selection and training has been discussed, no formal training programs have been developed (Foster, 2000).

Training in Normative Decision-Making focuses on helping individuals select the appropriate decision-making style based on the problem at hand. This is done by sequentially responding to a series of questions which analyze the attributes of the problem (Paul & Ebadi, 1989). Although the decision-making training has proved to be useful, it may be difficult or even impossible to implement in a military environment where decisions must often be made immediately and without hesitation.

According to the Attributional Leadership Model, each leader and follower is seen to have his or her own implicit theory of leadership, thus changing leadership from a scientific concept to a study of the social realities of leaders and observers (Calder, 1977). Critics of the model argue that the Attribution theory of leadership may falsely link organizational outcomes to leadership (Horner & Donald, 1996). Specifically, the model aids individuals in making sense of their environments by using their own social construct of reality to link leaders and outcomes, regardless of any real or actual leadership effects. This theory, applied to a military context, suggests that superiors and subordinates alike may tend to perceive the leader as the cause for whatever happens or fails to happen in his or her unit, regardless of whether the leader is the actual cause. Furthermore, such attributions are magnified when organizational outcomes are extreme in either direction (Horner & Donald, 1996).

Although attribution training is uncommon, limited attribution retraining has been initiated with students. Such training programs generally include discussion and demonstration of attribution principles, and correction and direction-taking training that can last up to several months. The results of this training indicate that attributional retraining can lead to more accurate attributions, in addition to enhancing individual achievement, motivation, and persistency (Rensheng, 1998). Because of the extensive time involved with attribution training, and the scarcity of significant findings regarding attributional outcomes, such training is not believed to be of high value to the Canadian Forces.

The Cognitive Categorization theory of leadership suggests that individuals match observed stimuli with prototypes, the prototype being the most representative member of a cognitive category (Phillips, 1984; Shaw, 1990; Walsh, 1988). Thus, if observers perceive similarities between salient behaviours or qualities of an individual and those of a leader prototype, then the person is encoded into long-term memory as a leader. Over time, further category attributes, which were not present during encoding, may also be attributed to the person as a result of closely identifying the person with his or her category (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Consequently, when making judgments about a person, individuals may be biased as they are relying on the corresponding category attributes to which the individual is encoded (Cronshaw & Lord, 1997). Thus, in accordance with the Attributional Leadership model, individuals may overemphasize the role of the leader in causing whatever happens in his or her unit, this time based on the leader's prototype. Techniques for influencing cognitive categorization include providing information on the principles of cognitive categorization and coaching individuals to consciously challenge

existing categorizations. However, formal training programs in cognitive categorization have not been developed, and existing techniques for influencing cognitive categorization are not deemed to be of great value to the Canadian Forces.

The Air-War College model, an adaptation of the Situational Leadership Model, was developed to address military considerations that were not appropriately addressed in the original model. In particular, the Air-War College model specifies several situations that are particularly relevant to the military context such as the level at which leadership is exercised, peacetime leadership as compared to wartime operations, service, and staff leadership as opposed to leadership of operational units. Clearly, the Air-War College model is a particularly useful framework for assessing leaders and their leadership in the military context. This model is useful in helping leaders adapt their leadership style to the situations in which they find themselves.

Because of the widespread use of the Situational Leadership Model, various training programs exist for developing situational leadership skills. Most training programs begin by measuring the leaders adaptability using the Leaders Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (Butler & Reese, 1991). From there, training consists of teaching the principles of Situational Leadership through a variety of modalities including instructional seminars, role-playing, and interactive videodisc programs (Geber, 1990). Subsequent to Situational Leadership training, an assessment tool entitled the Situational Leadership Skills Assessment is available which identifies how well managers are practicing Situational Leadership on a day-to-day basis, according to those they manage. The assessment is to be completed within three to six weeks after completing Situational Leadership training (Blanchard, 1990).

Impression management involves what individuals do to create and maintain desired perceptions in others about themselves (Schlenker, 1980). In terms of leadership, such perceptions are important as they affect the degree to which a leader is held in esteem by his or her subordinates, and therefore, to what extent the leader can be successful in influencing them. Jones and Pittman (1982) assert that there are five impression management strategies that leaders use in order influence the perceptions of others. However, these five impression management strategies may not be applicable to the military context. For example, a military leader is unlikely to be concerned with enhancing his or her likeability or attractiveness to followers, which is the first impression management role. Moreover, military leaders do not behave in ways that present them as incompetent in order to elicit help from others, a further impression management strategy. In addition, in the case of those impression management roles which are consistent with military leadership, such as being highly skilled, and morally worthy, it is unlikely that the military leader consciously emphasizes these characteristics to their subordinates. Rather it is assumed that these characteristics are exemplified in the leaders every-day behaviours and dealings with subordinates. Thus, although impression management training is available (Kacmar, Delery, & Ferris, 1992) it is not deemed to be applicable to the military context.

Figure 1 summarizes the above discussion. It presents the key concepts of each leadership theory, related leadership training or developmental programs, and our estimate of its applicability to a military environment. Figure 1 suggests that although each type of leadership theory adds significantly to the leadership body of knowledge, no model alone successfully encompasses what is necessary to describe military leadership

as a whole. Moreover, each of the dominant theory types, and many of the specific theories complement each other by adding on to preceding models and theories. Thus the military may need to focus on the key behaviours that the different theories have identified and work to enhance those behaviours without regard for their theoretical basis.

Table 1

**SUMMARY OF KEY CONCEPTS: VARIOUS THEORIES AND THEIR  
APPLICABILITY TO THE MILITARY CONTEXT**

<b>Model</b>	<b>Key Features</b>	<b>Training</b>	<b>Applicable to the Military</b>
Warrior Model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conflict and opposition</li> <li>- Flows of information</li> <li>- Achieving results at all costs</li> <li>- Having knowledge of subordinates and enemies.</li> <li>-Selecting battles carefully.</li> <li>- Avoiding unnecessary fighting.</li> <li>- Preparing for the future.</li> </ul>	Theoretical model - no formal training available.	Certain themes are applicable and others are outdated and therefore not applicable.
Stratified Systems Theory	A leader's cognitive complexity must match what his or her organizational level requires.	Training requires an effort spanning several years and encompassing several aspects of life. Training aids in reaching upper limit of cognitive ability.	Applicable.
Mintzberg's Managerial Roles	Leadership is a key component to being a good manager.	Two-day executive development session, and/or an International Masters Program in Practising Management.	<p>Concept is applicable.</p> <p>Managerial training is not applicable.</p>



<b>Model</b>	<b>Key Features</b>	<b>Training</b>	<b>Applicable to the Military</b>
Competing Values Framework	Leaders emphasize different leadership styles: rational, existential, empirical, or idealistic	Training involves three steps: 1) self-assessment, 2) change strategy, and 3) implementation of change strategy	Applicable.
Charismatic Leadership	Motivation, inspiration, vision, and insight.	Training programs focus on enhancing the behavioural components of charismatic leadership	Highly applicable.
Transformational Leadership	Instilling in subordinates the desire to perform their best.	Training programs identify and build on existing transformational skills.	Highly applicable.
Leader-Member Exchange	Maintaining quality relations with subordinates.	Leadership training programs teach leaders to develop quality relations with each subordinate.	Highly applicable.
Path-Goal Theory	Adapting leader behaviour to subordinate needs.	Formal training not available.	Applicable.
Attributional Leadership Theory	Leaders and subordinates attribute successes and failures to each other regardless of whether or not they are the actual cause.	Training focus is on discussion and demonstration of attribution principles, and correction and direction-taking training.	Applicable.
Situational Leadership – Air War College Model	Leaders adapt leadership style according to requirements of environment and subordinates.	Training assists individuals in adapting an appropriate leadership style in accordance with existing situation.	Highly applicable.

<b>Model</b>	<b>Key Features</b>	<b>Training</b>	<b>Applicable to the Military</b>
Contingency Model	Placing the right leader in the right situation according to leadership style.	Leader-Match training teaches leaders how to change the situation so that it is favourable to them.	Somewhat applicable.
Normative Decision-Making Model	Selecting the appropriate decision-making style based on the problem at hand.	Individuals sequentially respond to a series of questions thereby analyzing the attributes of the problem.	Not applicable.
Cognitive Categorization	Matching observed stimuli with prototypes.	Formal training not available.	Somewhat applicable.
Pygmalion Effect	Maintaining high expectations of subordinates.	Pygmalion training teaches Pygmalion concepts and skills.	Applicable.
Impression Management	Creating and maintaining desired perceptions in others about oneself.	Impression management training available.	Not applicable.

## **PART V**

### **CONCLUSION**

By reviewing the relevant leadership doctrine, we see that in order to develop a conceptual model that can be successfully applied to various HR processes in the military, such as selection, assessment and training, we must incorporate relevant theory from each of the dominant theory types. The cognitive models of leadership are useful for their consideration of perceptual biases made both by leaders and subordinates. The contingency models of leadership provide us with insight into the importance of leaders to use varying leadership styles according to the characteristics of the subordinates and the environment. The behavioural theories stress the significance applying rewards contingent to subordinate performance in order to increase subordinate performance and satisfaction.

It is from relevant leadership theory that we also learn that a military leaders' cognitive complexity must match what is required by his or her military rank, with military leaders at the highest level being able to understand conceptually complex, volatile and probabilistic environments. Military leaders possessing charismatic and visionary qualities can influence followers to make self-sacrifices, and to commit to difficult objectives. Similarly, the transformational leader is thought to influence follower behaviour by a process that gets the follower to internalize key values and beliefs specific to the organization. Thus, transformational leadership, like charismatic and visionary leadership, encourages subordinate commitment and results in a level of performance beyond anticipation. In addition, relevant theory emphasizes the importance of quality leader-subordinate relationships, and the value of expressing high expectations

to subordinates. Of particular value to military leadership is the Air-War College model, which addresses several situations that are particularly relevant to the military context such as the level at which leadership is exercised, peacetime leadership as compared to wartime operations, service, and staff leadership as opposed to leadership of operational units.

## REFERENCES

### CF Manuals

LEADERSHIP: *A Manual of Military Leadership for the Canadian Forces*, May 1978, DND Canada.

UNIT MORALE PROFILE: Description of Measures, 2001.

### Reports

Donoghue, E., Wild, B., Lapierre, L. *Leadership, selection and assessment standards in the Canadian Forces*. Paper prepared for the Director Military Employment Policy and the Director Military Human Resource Requirements, January 2001, Human Resource Systems Group Ltd., ON.

O'Keefe, D.F. *Investigating the use of occupational personality measures in the Canadian Forces*. Paper presented at the 41<sup>st</sup> Annual Conference of the International Military Testing Association (IMTA), November 1999, Monterey, CA.

Stouffer, J.M. (1994). *Elements of Effective Junior Combat Arms Officer Leadership*. CFPARU Technical Note 2/94.

Tzvetanka-Dobрева-Martinova. (1999). *Psychometric Analysis of the Unit Climate Profile Questionnaire Based on Surveys of Deployed Forces Personnel*. DHRREE Sponsor Research Report, 99-3, February, 1999.

### Books and Periodicals

Aviolo, B. J., Bass, B. M. & Jung, D. I. (1996). Construct validation on the multifactor leadership questionnaire MLQ-Form 5x (CLS Report 96-1. Binghamton, NY: Center for Leadership Studies, Binghamton University, State University of New York.

- Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81 (6), 827-832.
- Bartunek, J. M., & Louis, R. M. (1988). The design of work environments to stretch managers' capacities for complex thinking. HR. Human Resource Planning, 11 (1), 13-23.
- Bass, B.M. (1960). Leadership, psychology, and organizational behaviour. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bass, B. M. (1985a). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985b). Leadership: Good, better, best. Organizational Dynamics, 13 (3), 26-40.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformation leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. Research in Organizational Change and Development, 4, 231-272.
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Hare & Row.
- Blanchard, K. (1990). Assessing Your Leadership Skills. Executive Excellence, 7 (5), 21-23.
- Bluedorn, A.C., Johnson, R.A., Cartwright, D.K., & Barringer, B.R. (1994). The interface and convergence of the strategic management and the organizational environment domains. Journal of Management, 20, 201-262.

- Bognar, A. J. (1998). Tales from twelve o'clock high: Leadership lessons for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Military Review, 78 (1), 94-100.
- Bowers, D. G., & Seashore, S. E. (1966). Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership. Administrative Science Quarterly, 11, 238-263.
- Brown, D. J., & Lord, R. G. (1999). The utility of experimental research in the study of transformational/charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 10 (4), 531-540.
- Burke, M. J., & Day, R. R. (1986). A cumulative study of the effectiveness of managerial training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 232-246.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper Colophon
- Butler, J. K., Jr., & Reese, R. M. (1991). Leadership Style and Sales Performance: A Test of the Situational Leadership Model. The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 11, (3), 37-47.
- Calder, B.J. (1977). An attribution theory of leadership. In B.M. Staw and G.R. Salancik (Eds.), New directions in organizational behavior. Chicago: St. Clair.
- Case, R. (1998). Leader member exchange theory and sport: Possible applications. Journal of Sport Behavior, 21 (4), 387- 396.
- Chemers, M.M (1997). An integrative theory of leadership. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Cronshaw, S. F., & Lord, R. G. (1987). Effects of categorization, attribution, and encoding processes on leadership perceptions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 97-106.
- Crouch, A., & Yetton, P. (1988). Manager-subordinate dyads: Relationships among task and social contact, manager friendliness and subordinate performance in

- management groups. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 41, 65-82.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). Behavioral dimensions of charismatic leadership. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.). Charismatic leadership, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). Training charismatic leadership: A risky and critical task. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.). Charismatic leadership, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. (1998). Charismatic leadership in organizations. California, US: Sage Publications.
- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N. & Menon, S.T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21 (7), 747-767.
- Crawford, K. S., Thomas, E. D., & Fink, J. J. (1980). Pygmalion at sea: Improving the work effectiveness of low performers. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 16, 482-505.
- Davidson, O. B., & Eden, D. (2000). Remedial self-fulfilling prophecy: Two field experiments to prevent golem effects among disadvantaged women. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85 (3), 386-398.
- Davis, T.R.V., & Luthans, R. (1979). Leadership re-examined: A behavioural approach. Academy of Management Review, 4, 237-248.
- deBono, L. (1984). Tactics- the art and science of success. Boston: Little, Brown..
- Eden, D., Geller, D., Gewirtz, A., Gordon-Terner, R., Inbar, I., Liberman, M., Pass, Y., Salomon-Segev, I., & Shalit, M. Implanting Pygmalion Leadership Style through



- workshop training: Seven field experiments. Leadership Quarterly 11 (2), 171-210.
- Eden, D., & Leviatan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behaviour scales. Journal of applied psychology, 60, 736-741.
- Eden, D., & Ravid, G. (1981).
- Eden, D., & Shani, A. B. (1982). Pygmalion goes to boot camp: Expectancy, leadership, and trainee performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 194-199.
- Edwards, J.E., Rode, L.G., & Ayman, R. (1989). The construct validity of scales from four leadership questionnaires. The journal of general psychology, 116 (2), 171-181.
- Elliott, J. (1996). Requisite Organizations: The CEO's guide to creative structure and leadership, 2nd Ed. Virginia: Cason Hall.
- Ferris, G. R. (1985). Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process: A constructive replication. Journal of Applied Psychology, 70, 777-781.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1967). A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fiedler, F. E., Mitchell, T. R., & Triandis, H. C. (1971). The culture assimilator: An approach to cross-cultural training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 95-102.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). Social cognition. New York: Random House.
- Fenno, R. (1978). Home style. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Foster, D. A. (2000). A leader-subordinate fit model of the path-goal theory of leadership. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering, 60 (9-B), 4943.

- Geber, B. (1990). Steelcase's Self-Directed Learning Center. Training, 27 (12), 95-96.
- Gerstner, C.R., & Day, D.V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of Leader-Member Exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82 (6), 827-844.
- Graen, G., & Cashman, J. (1975). A role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larsen (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers* (pp. 143-165). Ohio: Kent State University Press.
- Graen, G., Liden, R. C., & Hoel, W. (1982). Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 868-872.
- Green, S.G., & Mitchell, T.R. (1979). Attributional processes of leaders in leader-member interactions. Organizational behaviour and human performance, 23, 429-458.
- Graen, G., Novak, M., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of *leader-member exchange* and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 30, 109-131.
- Graen, G. B., & Schiemann, W. (1978). *Leader-member* agreement: A vertical dyad linkage approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 206-212.
- Green, S. G., & Mitchell, T. R. (1979). Attributional processes of leadersw in leader-member interactions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23, 429-458.
- Hershey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1982). Management of Organizational Behaviour: Utilizing Human Resources, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Hoojberg, R., & Quinn, R. E. (1992). In R. L. Phillips, J. G. Hunt (Eds), Strategic leadership: A multiorganizational-level perspective. Connecticut, US: Quorum Books/Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Horner, Jr., Donal, H. (1996). A different twist: Nonrational views of leadership. Military review, 79 (6), 45.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 321-338.
- House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R. J., & Dessler, G. (1974). The path goal theory of leadership: Some post hoc and a priori tests. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (Eds.), Contingency approaches to leadership. Carbondale, Illinois: University Press.
- Hughes, R.L., Ginnett, R.C. & Curphy, G.J. (1998). Contingency theories of leadership. In Hickman, G.R, Leading Organization. USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hunt, J.G., & Schuler, R. S. (1976). Leader reward and sanctions: Behavior relations criteria in a large public utility. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University. Department of Administrative Sciences.
- Jacobs, T.O., & Jaques, E. (1987). Leadership in complex systems. In J. Zeidner (Ed.), Human productivity enhancement. New York: Praeger.
- Jensen, A. R. (1969). How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 39.

- Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-preservation. In J. Suls (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on the self. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Kacmar, K. M., Delery, J. E., & Ferris, G. R. (1992). Differential effectiveness of applicant impression management tactics on employment interview decisions. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *22* (16), 1250-1272.
- Kane, T. D., & Tremble, T. R. Jr. (2000). Transformational leadership effects at different levels of the army. Military Psychology, *12*(2), 137-160.
- Kozlowski, S.W., & Doherty, M. L. (1989). Integration of climate and leadership: Examination of a neglected issue. Journal of Applied Psychology, *74*, 546-553.
- Latham, G. (1988). Human resource training and development. In Rosenzweig, M. R., Porter, L. W. (Eds), Annual review of psychology, *39*, 545-582.
- Leboeuf, M. K. (1999). Developing a leadership philosophy. Military Review, *79* (3), 28-33.
- Leister, A., Borden, D., & Fiedler, F. E. (1977). Validation of contingency model leadership training: Leader Match. Academy of Management Journal, *20* (3), 464-470.
- Matsui, T., & Ohtsuka, Y. (1978). Within-person expectancy theory predictions of supervisory consideration and structure behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, *63*, 128-131.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). The nature of managerial work. New York: Harper & Row.

- Mitchell, T. R., & Wood, R. E. (1979). An empirical test of an Attributional model of leaders' responses to poor performance. Paper, Symposium on Leadership, Duke University, Durham, NC.
- Nanus, B. (1998). Why does vision matter? In Hickman, G. R., Leading Organizations: Perspectives for a new era. USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Nebeker, D. M., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Leader behavior: An expectancy theory approach. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 11, 355-367.
- Nice, D. C. (1998). The warrior model of leadership: Classic perspective and contemporary relevance. Leadership Quarterly, (9), 3, 321-333.
- Northouse, P. G. (1997). Leadership theory and practice. US: Sage Publications.
- Palich, L. E., & Hom, P. W. (1992). The impact of leader power and behavior on leadership perception: A test of an expanded categorization theory of leadership model. Group and Organization Management, 17 (3), 279-296.
- Parker, C.P. (1999). The impact of leaders' implicit theories of employee participation on tests of the Vroom-Yetton model. Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 44 (1), 45-62.
- Paul, R. J., & Ebadi, Y. M. (1989). Leadership decision making in a service organization: A field test of the Vroom-Yetton model. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 62 (3), 201-211.
- Pervin, L.A. (1985). Personality: Current controversies, issues and directions. Annual review of psychology, 83-114.
- Phillips, J. F. (1984). The accuracy of leadership ratings: A cognitive categorization perspective. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 33, 125-138.

- Phillips, R. L., & Hunt, J. G. (1992). Strategic leadership: A multiorganizational-level perspective. Connecticut, US: Quorum Books/Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- Pfeffer, J. (1977). The ambiguity of leadership. Academy of Management Review, *2*, 104-112.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Todor, W.D., & Skow, R. (1982). Effect of leader contingent and non-contingent reward and punishment behaviors on subordinate performance and satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, *25*, 810-821.
- Quinn, R. E. (1988). Beyond rational management: Mastering the paradoxes and competing demands of high performance. California: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.
- Quinn, R. E. & McGrath, M. R. (1982). Moving beyond the single-solution perspective: The competing values approach as a diagnostic tool. The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, *18* (4), 463-472.
- Quinn, R.E. & Hall, R.H. (1983). Environments, organizations, and policy makers: towards an integrative framework.. In R.H. Hall & R.E. Quinn (Eds.). New Futures: The challenge of transition management. New York: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Quinn, R.E. & McGrath, M.R. (1985). The Transformation of Organizational Cultures: A Competing Values Perspective. In P.J. Frost, L.F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, J. Martin, Organizational Culture. USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Reisweber, D. (1997). Battle command: Will we have it when we need it? Military Review, *77* (5), 47-55.
- Rensheng, H. (1998). Experimental study on attributional retraining in primary and middle school students. Acta Psychologica Sinica *30* (4), 442-451.

- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectations and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Ross, A. (1992). The long view of leadership. Canadian Business, 65, (5), 46-51.
- Scandura, T. A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). Moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of leadership intervention. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 428-436.
- Scandura, T. A., Graen, G. B., & Novak, M. A. (1986). When managers decide not to decide autocratically: An investigation of *leader-member exchange* and decision influence. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 579-584.
- Schachter, H. (1996). My way. Canadian Business, 69 (12), 60-67.
- Schrank, W. R. (1968). The labelling effect of ability grouping. Journal of Educational Research, 62, 51-52.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. Organization Science, 4 (4), 577-594.
- Shamir, B., & Howell, J. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 10 (2), 257-283.
- Shaw, J. B. (1990). A cognitive categorization model for the study of intercultural management. Academy of Management Review, 16, 626-646.
- Sims, H. P. (1977). The leader as manager of reinforcement contingencies: An empirical example and a model. In J.G. Hunt, & L.L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press..

- Srivastava, B.N., & Sett, P.K. (1998). Managerial attribution and response: An empirical test of an Attributional leadership model in India. Journal of Social Psychology, 138 (5), 591-598.
- Stodgill, R.M. (1974). Handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.
- Stoner, J. A. F., Freeman, R. E., & Gilbert, D. R. (1994). Management. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Theodory, G. C. (1982). The validity of Fiedler's contingency logic. The Journal of Psychology, 110, 115-120.
- Tritten, J. K., & Keithly, D. M. (1996). Charismatic leadership: Costs and benefits. Military Review, 76 (1), 82-86.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Leadership in organizations (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Vecchio, R. P., & Gobdel, B. C. (1984). The vertical dyad linkage model of leadership: Problems and prospects. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34, 5-20.
- Vroom, V.H. & Yetton, P.W. (1973). Leadership and decision-making. New York: Wiley.
- Waddell III, D. E. (1994). A situational leadership model for military leaders. Airpower Journal, 8(3), 10-24.
- Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Adding to contingent reward behavior: The augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. Group and Organization Studies, 15, 381-394.



- Walsh, J. P. (1988). Selectivity and selective perceptions an investigation of manager's beliefs structures and information-processing. Academy of Management Journal, 31, 873-896.
- Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and *exchange* quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 487-499.
- Weber, M. (1947). Theory of social and economic organization. In A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons (Eds.). Illinois: The Free Press.
- Weiner, B., Frieze, I., Kukla, A., Reed, L., Rest, S., & Rosenbaum, R. (1972). Perceiving the causes of success and failure. In E. Jones, D. Kanouse, H. Kelley, R. Nisbett, S. Valins, & B. Weiner (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behaviour. NJ: General Learning Press.
- Wofford, J. C. (1999). Laboratory research on charismatic leadership: Fruitful or futile? Leadership Quarterly, 10 (4), 523-530.
- Zaccaro, S.J. (1996). Models and theories of executive leadership: A conceptual/empirical review and integration. U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioural and Social Sciences.