

Attributes, such as shyness, laziness, and aggressiveness, are considered the antithesis of characteristics a leader should possess. An example of a physical attribute associated with leadership is height (i.e., a tall person may be able to look down on others and, therefore, may cut an imposing figure of authority). The converse may be true as well. Some individuals believe if someone is born shorter than most people, the individual may have to be more assertive or aggressive and those behaviors may result in the development of a strong leader.

Personality traits or characteristics associated with leaders include intelligence, self-confidence, charisma, initiative, self-awareness, self-control, the ability to communicate effectively with individuals and in groups, goal orientation, self-directedness, the ability to assume consequences for actions and decisions, and the ability to tolerate stress. In lesser leadership positions, technical competence is important because it would be difficult to establish rapport with group members if the leader did not understand the technical details of the work (DuBrin, 2007). For example, Richard, as a CNS whose clinical area of expertise is cardiovascular nursing, would probably have a difficult time assuming the position of Director of Neuroscience Services because of the level of technical expertise required in neuroscience nursing.

Research studies designed to test trait theories of leadership have been inconsistent. The trait theories are limited by focusing only on leadership characteristics to the exclusion of the environment, the situation, and other possible confounding variables. Additionally, they focus on the attributes the leader brings to a particular situation rather than focusing on what specific actions the leader takes to address the situation.

Research attempts to identify traits consistently associated with leadership over time have been successful. Six traits have been identified that seem to best delineate the differences between leaders and nonleaders. These leader traits are the desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, drive, intelligence, and job-relevant knowledge (Drafke, 2009).

Emotional Intelligence

An interest in the inner or personal qualities of leaders has recently reemerged, particularly with respect to ethical qualities and charisma. This interest has been fueled by the demand for leaders with vision and charisma. Personality traits and characteristics have an important influence on leader effectiveness. The traits and characteristics that are most relevant tend to vary with the situation at hand. A foundational trait for leadership effectiveness that does not vary from situation to situation is self-awareness (DuBrin, 2007).

Self-awareness is one of the four key factors in emotional intelligence (EI). According to Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2001), EI is a major contributor to leader effectiveness. The concept of EI refers to managing one's self and one's relationships effectively. EI includes the abilities of self-confidence, empathy, and visionary leadership. Passion for the work and for the people who do the work is particularly important to a leader with a high degree of EI. It is difficult, if not impossible, to inspire or motivate others if the leader is not passionate about the major work activities. The leader with high EI is able to sense and articulate a group's shared, yet possibly unexpressed, feelings and is able to develop a mission that inspires others to achieve a common goal (DuBrin, 2007). EI includes understanding one's own feelings, sensitivity, and empathy for others and the regulation of emotions.

Goleman and colleagues (2001) define four key competencies of EI:

- Self-awareness—the ability to understand and modulate one's own emotions. Goleman and colleagues (2001) contend this is the most essential of the four major competencies. A self-aware individual knows his or her own strengths

and weaknesses and has a high level of self-esteem. The self-aware leader seeks feedback continually to determine how well his or her actions and decisions are received by others.

- Self-management/self-control—the ability to control one’s emotions; control over mood and temper. The leader who is self-controlled acts with honesty and integrity in a consistent and dependable manner.
- Social awareness—the leader has empathy for others, including subordinates, and is intuitive about organizational “political” forces. The socially aware leader shows genuine care for others in the organization.
- Social skills/relationship skills—the ability to communicate clearly and convincingly. The leader who has social and relationship skills disarms conflicts; builds strong personal and professional bonds; uses social skills to spread enthusiasm and to solve disagreements and problems; uses kindness and humor often; and constantly expands network of contacts and supporters within and outside of the organization (DuBrin, 2007; Hellriegel et al., 2008).

Goleman and colleagues (2001) discovered that the most effective leaders are alike in one essential way—they all possess a high degree of EI. Without a high degree of EI, some experts contend a leader will never become a great leader (DuBrin, 2007).

Behavioral Theories of Leadership

Movement away from trait theories to explain and define leadership began as early as the 1940s. Leadership research from the 1940s through the mid-1960s focused instead on behavioral styles that leaders demonstrated (i.e., specific behaviors of leaders that make some more effective than others) (Hitt, Black, & Porter, 2009). This set of theories is referred to as the behavioral or functional theory of leadership. The major difference between trait theories and behavioral theories is that trait theories are concerned with the leader’s individual characteristics, whereas behavioral theories seek to explain specific actions taken by the leader (Wagner & Hollenbeck, 2010).

Lewin and Lippitt conducted some of the first studies of leadership behavior at the University of Iowa in the late 1930s. The researchers, using an after-school study group of 20 boys, aged 11 years, explored autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership behaviors or styles. The results of this study revealed that when the boys had a democratic leader, groups were more cohesive, the boys were more motivated, and originality of work was

higher. With a democratic leader, the boys produced less work, but the work was of a higher quality than the work produced when the group leader used an authoritarian or laissez-faire leadership style. Nineteen of the 20 boys preferred the democratic style of group leadership over the other two styles (Lewin & Lippitt, 1938).

Other studies of autocratic versus democratic leadership styles concluded that democratic leadership styles produced higher performance results in some studies, whereas in other studies, performance was higher in groups with an authoritarian leader. However, what was consistent among study groups was that the level of satisfaction of group members was higher with the democratic style of leadership than with other styles.

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) further explored satisfaction with leader style and developed a model known as the continuum of leader behavior. This model provides for a range of leadership behaviors from leader centered (autocratic) to employee centered (laissez-faire). In determining which leader behavior the manager

should implement, the authors proposed that the manager evaluate the following three variables: characteristics of the manager (i.e., experience with a certain leadership style), characteristics of the employees (i.e., level of experience with the process/job), and characteristics of the situation (i.e., offering a new product or service for the first time). Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) recommended an employee-centered approach or style because this approach most often led to increased employee satisfaction, motivation, and high performance and quality of the work product.

Leader–Member Exchange Theory

Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) Theory was developed by George Graen and James Cashman. The central focus of LMX theory is the relationship and interaction between the supervisor (leader) and the subordinate (group member). The exchange between the superior and the subordinate is the unique, underlying premise of LMX. Interest in LMX has increased in recent years, leading to many field studies to test the propositions of the theory.

The theory recognizes that superiors develop unique working relationships with each subordinate or group member. According to LMX theory, leaders categorize subordinates into one of two groups: the in-group (high-quality relationship with the leader) or the out-group (low-quality relationship). Often, the leader's first impression of the subordinate's competence heavily influences the leader's assignment of the subordinate to the in- or the out-group. The theory proposes that leaders do not interact with subordinates equally because supervisors have limited time and resources (Graen & Cashman, 1975).

Members of the in-group often have attitudes and values similar to the leader and interact frequently with the leader. They have a special exchange or relationship with the leader. In-group members perform their jobs in accordance with the expectations of their employment contracts. In addition, they can be counted on by the leader to volunteer for extra work and to take on additional tasks and responsibilities. As a result, in-group members are given additional rewards (increased job latitude, extra attention from the leader, and inside information that is not available to all employees), responsibility, and trust by the supervisor in exchange for their loyalty and performance. Research on LMX in field studies reveals that members of the in-group enjoy higher degrees of autonomy, job satisfaction, and trust from the supervisor as compared to members of the out-group.

Out-group members have less in common with the leader and are detached from the leader. There is limited reciprocal trust and support in the leader–subordinate relationship.

Members of the out-group receive few rewards from supervisors and are more likely to quit because of job dissatisfaction.

Supervisors who aspire to be the most effective leaders create a special exchange relationship with all of their subordinates (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005). The intent is not necessarily to treat all employees the same. Those subordinates who by virtue of their position in the organization have greater responsibility or administrative authority will have a deeper level of exchange with the superior. However, it is possible and highly desirable that the leader engender relationships of mutual trust, respect, and support with all followers.

LMX theory postulates that the quality of the subordinate's relationship with the supervisor has a large impact on job behavior and performance and that the quality of that relationship has important job consequences (Bolino, 2007). Therefore, it is imperative that subordinates be evaluated based on their competencies rather than on the leader's favoritism (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Motivational Theories of Leadership

The motivational theories expanded on the behavioral theories of leadership by focusing on factors that enhance worker/employee satisfaction and motivation and identifying factors that have a negative impact on those factors. Many of the motivational theories were based on the work of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory (1968). Maslow's work included the concepts of five basic needs (i.e., physiologic, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization), which he described as being the driving forces or motivators of human behavior. Lower level physiologic needs, including food and rest, must be satisfied before an individual can work on accomplishing higher level needs such as self-esteem and self-actualization. Even though his theory was derived as a motivational theory, Maslow's early works were not originally applied to motivation in the workplace.

Theory X and Theory Y

Douglas McGregor first published his work on Theory X and Theory Y in an article in 1957. McGregor was influenced by the works of Maslow, Herzberg, Argyris, and Likert. McGregor believed the structure of bureaucratic organizations, as well as prevailing management philosophy and policies, resulted in a situation in which power resided exclusively with management. In this structure, the role of management was to direct workers under the assumption that all workers were unmotivated, unambitious, lazy, and preferred to be led. These assumptions were labeled by McGregor as Theory X. McGregor's theory was that workers who had no input in the performance of the job lacked interest in the job and satisfaction with the work, resulting in resistance to change.

McGregor proposed a different set of assumptions and practices for meeting organizational goals in a more effective, humanistic manner; he designated this Theory Y. Management's priorities in Theory Y are to develop worker potential, remove obstacles, create opportunities for worker growth, and provide guidance, rather than control direction, for the worker. Theory Y encourages worker responsibility and participation in decision making. McGregor believed this style of participatory management would result in greater productivity, creativity, and worker satisfaction.

Because McGregor failed to operationalize concepts in his theories, there have been few direct tests of his theories. When the theories were tested, conflicting results were obtained (Caplan, 1971; Gray, 1978; Green, 1981; Kay, 1973; Malone, 1975; Morse & Lorsch, 1970). Most recently, Kopelman, Prottas, and Davis (2008) attempted to test the substantive validity of

McGregor's theory by measuring the focal construct of the central concept utilizing an investigator-developed Theory X/Y attitude measure. The researchers viewed this as a critical first step in testing the many assumptions of the theory. The new measure is content valid and has adequate reliability. Finally, although a few contemporary companies are using Theory X management, many companies subscribe to the tenets of Theory Y (Daft & Marcic, 2009).

Motivation–Hygiene Theory (Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory)

Motivation–hygiene, or two-factor theory, was established by psychologist Frederick Herzberg in 1959. Herzberg sought to describe the differences between factors that are true motivators for individuals (i.e., recognition for a job well done, opportunities for promotion or advancement, challenging and rewarding work) and hygiene or maintenance factors. Examples of hygiene or maintenance factors include salary, quality of supervision, interpersonal relationships with coworkers, and good working conditions (Herzberg, 1966).

According to Herzberg (1966), hygiene factors, although they keep workers from becoming dissatisfied, do not act as real motivators. Hygiene factors are most often extrinsic and usually cannot be changed by employee behaviors; hygiene factors do not motivate employees. Motivators are most often intrinsic factors and are correlated with increased job satisfaction. Thus, when managers want to motivate employees, motivators should be emphasized.

Contingency Theories of Leadership: Leadership and Management by Situation

As research into leadership became increasingly complex, it was recognized that leader characteristics, traits, and behaviors were not sufficient to explain the concept. The focus of research then shifted to include components of the situation or the environment into the equation as well. In other words, various external factors, such as conditions in the situation and the nature of the task to be accomplished, help to determine the leadership style that would be most effective in a particular situation.

The Fiedler Contingency Theory of Leadership

One of the earlier efforts to address contingencies in leadership situations was the Fiedler Contingency Theory of Leadership (Fiedler, 1967). Fiedler, Chemers, and Mahar (1976) state:

This theory holds that the effectiveness of a group or organization depends on two interacting or 'contingent' factors. The first is the personality of the leaders to determine their leadership style. The second factor is the amount of control and influence which the situation provides leaders over the group's behavior, the task, and the outcome. This factor is called situational control (p. 3).

Fiedler (1967) developed the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) Scale to determine and classify leadership styles. The instrument, an 18-item semantic differential scale, uses contrasting adjectives (e.g., friendly/unfriendly, open/guarded, and insincere/sincere) to direct the leader to describe an LPC. From the leader's responses on the scale, an LPC score is obtained. A leader with a high LPC score describes an LPC in a generally favorable manner. Fiedler believed this leader tends to be relationship oriented and considerate about the feelings of coworkers. Conversely, a leader with a low LPC score would be described by Fiedler as task oriented. Leaders who fall in the midrange of scores are a mix of the two types of leaders and should determine for themselves to which group they ultimately

belong. Fiedler's assumption is that a leader's style is innately either relationship or task oriented and that style cannot be changed as the situation changes (Fiedler et al., 1976).

Once the leader's style has been determined by the LPC score, the next step is to match or fit the leader with the situation. Fiedler used the term "situational control" to describe three major group classifications or variables that may be used to evaluate an individual situation (Box 16-1).

Box 16-1: Group Classifications

- *Leader-member relations*: Confidence in the leader and support of the group is effective in influencing the group's performance. (This is the most important factor in determining the leader's control and influence over the group.)
- *Task structure*: Structure of the task is on a continuum from a well-defined, step-by-step procedure to a vague and undefined one.
- *Position power*: Authority is vested in the leader's position by the organization.

Leader–member relations can be classified as good or poor, task structure as high or low, and position power as strong or weak. According to Fiedler, the better the leader–member relations, the higher the task structure; the stronger the position power, the more control or influence the leader has. For example, a nurse who is in an autonomous position as the vice president of patient care services (strong position power) is highly respected (good leader–member relations) by a group of nurse practitioners (high task structure) and is employed by the hospital is influential to the nurse practitioner group.

In Fiedler's studies of more than 1,200 groups since the 1950s, the low LPC leader (task oriented) has been found to be most effective in very favorable situations (position power is strong and leader–member relations are strong) and in very unfavorable situations (position power is weak and leader–member relations are weak). Also, the low LPC leader is most effective when tasks are clear and highly structured. The high LPC leader (relationship oriented) is most effective in moderately favorable situations when position power is weak, task structure is low, and leader–member relations are good (Hitt et al., 2009).

Numerous studies have been undertaken to test the validity of the contingency model's assumptions (Chemers, Harp, Rhodewalt, & Wysocki, 1985; Fiedler, 1969; Minor, 1980). These comprehensive studies, including a meta-analysis of 125 tests of the contingency model, provide strong support for the model's validity.

Path–Goal Theory

Robert House (1971, 1996) developed the Path–Goal Theory as an extension of the earlier work of Georgopoulos, Mahoney, and Jones (1957) and from research related to the expectancy theories of motivation (Vroom, 1964). Situational factors that are examined in this theory include the nature and scope of the task to be accomplished, the employee's perceptions and expectations of the task, and the role of the leader in the work process. Expectations of the leader in this theory are to assist followers in determining and attaining goals and to provide the necessary direction and support to ensure that employee goals are compatible with those of the organization. The role of the leader is also to provide motivation and some type of reward (i.e., recognition for the employee once the task has been completed or the goal has been reached) (Podsakoff, Bommer, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2005). The leader is responsible for helping the employee determine and clarify the path the worker is to take to reach the goal. An important aspect of the leader's role is to identify and remove obstacles from the path of the worker to enable him or her to successfully attain the goal.

House (1971) identified four leadership behaviors to test the assumptions of his theory. The *directive* leader provides specific guidance and direction to workers on how the task is to be accomplished; the *supportive* leader is concerned with the accomplishment of the task as well as the needs of the worker; the *participative* leader involves workers in making decisions about how the task or goal should be accomplished; and the *achievement-oriented* leader sets challenging goals and has high expectations that employees will perform at the highest level. House assumes leaders are flexible and are able to use any of these leadership behaviors as the situation warrants.

The Path–Goal Theory also proposes two sets or classes of situational or contingency variables that influence the relationship between the leadership behavior and the outcomes. These two variables are environmental variables (those outside of the control of the employee) and variables that are part of the personal attributes of the employee. Examples of environmental variables include the nature and structure of the task or the goal to be accomplished and the composition of the work group to which the employee has been assigned. Employee contingency factors include ability,