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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Scope

This project is designed to help those individuals who are called upon to train effective leaders. Through systematic exploration of concepts and theories presented herein, leadership consultants should arrive at a better understanding of why they themselves have adopted certain behaviors while serving in leadership roles. Moreover, by virtue of these insights, individuals should then arrive at a clearer understanding of their own leadership style and why it has been productive for them. An in-depth appreciation of the reasons for leadership success should enable consultants to more selectively draw on their past experiences so as to better facilitate leadership development in their consultees.

The major theories explored as part of this project deal with leadership traits and styles. Blake and Mouton's (1964) Managerial Grid, McGregor's (1960) Theories of worker motivation, Berne's (1977) Transactional Analysis with its underlying variations on the theme of "I'm okay; You're okay", Coleman and Hammen's (1974) concepts of power, Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs, and the hygiene/motivator factors of Herzberg (1959) form the base for the project. Finally, a leadership style assessment instrument developed by Hall, Harvey, and Williams (1964) will be analyzed to aid the leadership consultant.
to more objectively determine how a consultee balances worker and production concerns. This can afford the consultant a viable starting point from which particular intervention strategies can be devised as deemed appropriate.

A clear understanding of one's own leadership style is essential for anyone who aspires to facilitate individuals who are trying to become better or more effective leaders. In the past, leadership education has frequently not been a main area of concern for management and attempts to change a leader's way of operating have frequently been seen as synonymous with punitive action against leaders who have failed to perform up to expectations (Betz, Note 1). Moreover, the very presence of a person who has been hired to evaluate leadership practices may imply that the responsibility for any problems that arise in the work setting rests solely with the leaders and that if they can be "corrected", then the whole situation will be rectified. Because of this attitude which suggest that the leader be studied to the exclusion of all other group and situational factors, leadership experts seem to be allowed much more flexibility in the eyes of the users when they are entitled "consultants". With this title, they are permitted and even expected to take into account a wide range of variables rather than just leadership per se (Betz, Note). Moreover, this title also seems to be considered less threatening by the leaders in our society today.

To a large degree these consultants seem to be individuals who have demonstrated leadership success. Therefore, they are called upon
to help others achieve similar degrees of success. It is often erroneously believed that they are successful leaders; therefore, they have a solid understanding of leadership theories, principles and have an in-depth appreciation of their own pragmatically sound philosophy which they can share with aspiring leaders. Unfortunately, the potential benefit that these "gifted" leaders have to offer is frequently not fully actualized because they do not have a good understanding of their own leadership styles and techniques which could greatly enhance their effectiveness by enabling them to more selectively draw on their experiences when relating to a problem situation. In short, even though these consultants may resolve leadership problems based on their experiences, they may well be doing so without an understanding of the philosophic "why", which could greatly increase their flexibility and hence overall effectiveness (Betz, Note 1). The reason why it is of paramount importance for consultants to understand why they have been effective leaders in the past is that, through their in-depth insights and appreciation of the complexities of leadership, they can draw on their own experiences and assist practicing leaders to learn techniques and styles which will enable them to more effectively exercise their leadership.

Leadership Definition

Leadership is defined as the process of influencing human behavior so as to accomplish the goals prescribed by the appointed or accepted leader. This is an adaptation of the definition set forth by Henderson
and Campbell (1972). The process of influencing other people to perform a given task has been the subject of much discussion and three traditional perspectives on how this occurs have been developed (Ross & Hendry, 1957). However, these different theories are not mutually exclusive and, in fact, as each is explored in more detail, their overlapping nature becomes more apparent. In short, because leadership is an interactional phenomenon, the study of all three perspectives is necessary for arriving at a complete understanding of this complex phenomenon (Ross & Hendry, 1957).

According to Ross and Hendry (1957), the earliest leadership studies concentrated on the leader as a person and assumed that leadership was an inherent characteristic. This gradually developed into the "great man" theory which postulated that a person was born to greatness. As research continued, attempts were made to isolate the underlying attributes which earmarked a "leader," and so the emphasis shifted to an exploration of leadership traits which would prove to be associated with certain occupations involving leadership functions.

Early research by Bird (1940) identified seventy-nine traits which were mentioned in twenty different studies, but only five percent were common to four or more investigations. As related by Ross and Hendry (1957),

The most comprehensive and the most recent survey was made by Stogdill in 1948. The more commonly identified, so-called "leadership traits" reported by Stogdill include the following: (1) physical and constitutional characteristics: height; weight; physique; energy; health; appearance; (2) intelligence;
(3) self-confidence; (4) sociability; (5) will (initiative, persistence, ambition); (6) dominance; and (7) surgency (i.e., talkativeness, cheerfulness, geniality, enthusiasm, expressiveness, alertness, and originality) (p. 18).

Other researchers have focused on types of persons who can cause something to be accomplished. The experimental work of Reid (1942) isolated ten actual leader types of persons as follows: Patriarchial Sovereign, Leader, Tyrant, Love Object, Object of Aggression, Organizer, Seducer, Hero, Bad Influence, and Good Example. A common theme to all of these approaches is that the leader, as a person, has certain attributes which can be employed with virtually any group in virtually any situational context and achieve results.

A second approach to leadership views it as a function of the group. This occurred as some came to see that group structure and interpersonal relationships within that group had as much, if not more, to do with effective leadership than the personality of one person (Krech, 1948). In short, leadership became defined more in terms of structure and less in terms of a person (Herbert, 1954). Cartwright and Zander (1953) summarize this perspective quite well:

...Research conducted within this orientation does not attempt to find certain invariant traits of leaders. Rather, it seeks to discover what actions are required by groups under various conditions if they are to achieve their objectives, and how different group members take part in these group actions. Leadership is viewed as the performance of those acts which help the group achieve its objective. Such acts as may be termed group functions...In principle, leadership may be performed by one or many members of the group (p. 538).

Although this view tends to make leadership "group property", nonetheless, it does not downplay the importance of the individual.
abilities and talents which each person brings to the group (Ross & Hendry, 1957):

Irrespective of whether leadership is viewed as individually or group based, there arise times when operational changes have to be made in response to situational changes and thus the third perspective of leadership arises; i.e., leadership as a function of the situation. This study of leadership involves four elements: (1) structure of interpersonal relationships; (2) group characteristics; (3) characteristics of the context or culture from which the members have been drawn; and (4) physical conditions/tasks which confront the group (Gibb, 1954). Gibb further suggests that in a non-imposed leadership situation, leadership will change in response to how much and how well certain individuals contribute to a given task. Thus, the same leader in one situation, may not be the leader of the same group in a different situation (Gibb, 1954). The importance of considering all three of these perspectives (i.e., leadership as a function of: certain individual traits, the group process, or the situation at hand) en route to a fuller understanding of leadership is well made by Ross and Hendry (1957) who explain that all three theories offer valuable insights into the phenomenon of leadership but each is lacking a certain depth when considered to the exclusion of the others. Thus, it has to be concluded that leadership is a shifting and dynamic concept that can be adequately viewed only when all three research perspectives are merged.
Therefore, to better understand the underlying "why" of effective leadership behavior, several different theories and sources of ideas relating to leadership styles, the concept of self and others, power, needs, communication, and motivation have been combined so that a multidimensional view of leadership can emerge. The resulting perspective can serve as a viable starting point for anyone who desires to serve as a leadership consultant in many contexts.

Thus, a foundation will be presented which is designed to help consultants to more effectively assess an aspiring leader's potential so that appropriate recommendations can be made to assist that person to become more efficient. Throughout this project, reference will be made to all three areas of leadership research; i.e., the leader as an individual, the group with which that person is working, and the situational context in which a goal or task must be accomplished (Fiedler, 1967).
CHAPTER II

LEADERSHIP TRAITS

A fundamental concept which must be initially explored in an examination of leadership is that of leader/follower, how they interrelate and what attributes or characteristics differentiate them. Traditionally, these two realms have been viewed as being mutually exclusive. Drawing a distinction between these two separate "types of people" resulted in the popular depiction of a group situation as a pyramid wherein the leader(s) rest at the pinnacle while the followers populate the pyramidal base (Jacobs, 1970). Although this dichotomous leader/follower distinction was held to be true for some time, more recent research by Hollander (1959) now suggests that this may not be correct. A more accurate picture of leader/follower characteristics with respect to similarity and dissimilarity can better be achieved in terms of the member's relative position along a group competence dimension (Jacobs, 1970).

In a study by Hollander and Webb (1955), Naval Academy Cadets in their last week of training were used as subjects in an experiment which assessed perceived leadership potential through a group competence dimension. In this study, each cadet was asked to assume that they were assigned to a special unit which had an undisclosed mission to complete. The experimenter than asked each subject to name the three persons, in order, from their unit whom they considered best qualified
to lead that unit and similarly, the three least qualified. In a second exercise, which was designed to assess followership, the same subjects were asked to assume that they were the leaders of the unit and to select the three people from their sections whom they would most like to have in their units, and the three whom they would least want to serve for them. Analysis of the data from this study yielded a correlation of .92 between leadership and followership, almost the maximum strength such a relationship could have and suggesting that a cadet who was cited as a leader was also nominated to be a desirable follower. The study suggests that a pyramidal model is incorrect and in contrast suggests that a diamond shaped model, as shown in Figure 1, would be more accurate (Hollander & Webb, 1955).

![Figure 1. Group Member Competence Dimension. From Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organizations by Jacobs, 1970, 97.](image)

This model indicates that there are two major dichotomies within a group with respect to leadership/followership. The first can be seen as isolating the highly potential leaders into the leader/"preferred" follower category. Potential leaders or desirable group members would
constitute a second category while the low potential leaders; i.e., undesirable group members would comprise the third category. These undesirable group members were possibly perceived as being detrimental to the group's accomplishment of its goal if they were in any way associated with that group (Jacobs', 1970).

A question is raised here as to what characteristics or behavioral traits did the subjects employ in their selection process which resulted in this untraditional grouping. In addition, it is noted that no group or situational specific factors were introduced as part of this experiment. Further, no leadership traits or criteria were specified in the experimental design. However, because the fourteen leadership traits (see Table 1) listed in Department of the Army Field Manual 22-100 are also used in the instruction of Naval Cadets, it seems reasonable to suggest that these military leadership traits came into play in the selection process. These traits are considered by the military to be overt manifestations of an individual's attitude about work and leadership.

Table 1

This table shows the fourteen Military Leadership Traits as set forth in the Department of the Army Field Manual 22-100, 1965.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bearing</th>
<th>Courage (Moral &amp; Physical)</th>
<th>Decisiveness</th>
<th>Dependability</th>
<th>Endurance</th>
<th>Enthusiasm</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Loyalty</th>
<th>Tact</th>
<th>Unselfishness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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The exercise of these traits "on the job" is considered for the armed services to be synonymous with the individual's attitude about work and leadership. These attitudes/traits are an expression of the person's values which, in turn, are seen as beliefs which a person has come to hold as important. These beliefs can be seen as an accumulation of facts, data or information which make sense to the person holding them. Thus, these leadership traits or attitudes develop when groups of beliefs are clustered to yield values that are, in turn, congealed into patterns which provide individually logical meaning to overt behaviors (attitudes) (Field Manual 22-100, 1965). These traits or behaviors may well have served as the criteria against which the cadets judged their peers' leadership abilities.

The study also had impact on followership in that it suggested that certain select followers are also perceived as leaders even though they may not at that given moment in time be serving in a leadership role. In short, what is suggested is that a person's leadership traits may well be very instrumental in causing that person to be selected for a leadership position as well as enabling that person to function successfully in a leadership role. In view of these research findings, the concept of leadership styles will be explored as the first of several variables which are important to consider in order to arrive at a better understanding of why a leader is successful.
CHAPTER III

LEADERSHIP STYLES

When considering the three styles of leadership, it is important to first examine the leader/group interactional patterns and some of the advantages and disadvantages which each style offers. In Table 2, a summary of both concepts is presented.

Table 2

This table combines information from Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939), Browne (1955), and Fielder and Chemers (1974).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP STYLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Patterns:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages/Disadvantages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader is responsible for decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader works with limited data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditional leadership styles have been primarily studied in a political context, and, as a result, "authoritarian" (autocratic) and "democratic" have emerged as the most common styles. This interpretation...
has spawned the development of a spectrum which has autocracy and anarchy in polar positions with democracy in the center. Such an approach has relegated the laissez-faire style to a possible variation of the democratic style as shown in Figure 2 (Browne, 1959).

![Figure 2. A continuum of Leader/Group Control with laissez-faire as a variable from A Review of General Semantics by Browne, 1955, 65.](image)

Although this may well be the case in purely political spheres, this project is not primarily concerned with political philosophies but rather with arriving at an understanding of leadership principles which can be successfully employed in political as well as other realms. Moreover, active laissez-faire leadership is considered to be a viable and, when properly employed, very productive alternative style of leadership. It is important to note that this style of leadership requires the leader to take an active role in establishing and preserving the environment in which the group will function. This leader's actions will permit (laissez); i.e., make it possible that the work can be done (faire) by the group. An example of when this would be the case is in research where the team members are highly and intrinsically motivated and primarily require a resource type leader who can "free" them so that they can conduct their research.
It should be noted at this point that the term "active laissez-faire" will be used exclusively in this project. This style of leadership can only fulfill the definition of leadership when the leader actively influences people to accomplish a goal or mission. Unfortunately, a fairly common belief has developed that a laissez-faire leader does nothing and completely divorces himself/herself from any group involvement. This "hands off" style of behavior does not constitute a viable style of leadership. Leadership by definition requires that a leader who is exercising any style of leadership become involved with and exert an influence upon the group. This interpretation of active laissez-faire leadership falls directly in line with the styles of leadership definitions as set forth by Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) in Table 3. These definitions which were first published over forty-one years ago still offer a viable starting point for examining leadership styles.

Pure authoritarian leadership is commonly associated with totalitarian or dictatorial rulers who possess all power. The group members are followers who must do their leaders' bidding or incur their wrath. Such historical figures as Adolph Hitler or more recently Idi Amin Da Da of Uganda can be seen as representations of this style. Authoritarian leadership has certain distinct advantages and disadvantages. With it, the power to make decisions rests solely with the leaders and so decisions can be made very quickly. However, the leaders are solely responsible for the outcome of that decision and since this style may preclude them taking advantage of any group
### Table 3

Leadership Styles as Defined by Lewin, Lippitt, and White in 1939.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Laissez-faire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All determination of policy by the leader.</td>
<td>1. All policies a matter of group discussion and decision, encouraged and assisted by the leader.</td>
<td>1. Complete freedom for group or individual decision, without any leader participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Techniques and activity steps dictated by the authority, one at a time, so that future steps were always uncertain to a large degree.</td>
<td>2. Activity perspective gained during first discussion period. General steps to group goal sketched, and where technical advise was needed the leader suggested two or three alternative procedures from which choice could be made.</td>
<td>2. Various materials supplied by the leader, who made it clear that he would supply information when asked. He took no other part in work discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The leader usually dictated the particular work task and work companions of each member.</td>
<td>3. The members were free to work with whomever they chose, and the division of tasks was left up to the group.</td>
<td>3. Complete non-participation by leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The dominator was &quot;personal&quot; in his praise and criticism of the work of each member, but remained aloof from active group participation except when demonstrating. He was friendly or impersonal rather than openly hostile.</td>
<td>4. The leader was &quot;objective&quot; or &quot;fair-minded&quot; in his praise and criticism, and tried to be a regular group member in spirit without doing too much of the work.</td>
<td>4. Very infrequent comments on member activities unless questioned, and no attempt to participate or interfere with the course of events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
synergism or even group input, they may be forced to work with very limited data.

The second, or democratic leader style, will normally share power with the group and decisions are arrived at through a process of leader/group interactions. This may well result in a consensus or compromise decision making process which is slow when compared to the authoritarian style. However, there is greater input of information from group members and synergism can come into play. Further, the responsibility for any decision is shared by both the leader and the group, and should there be occasion to find fault with a decision, no one party can be held solely responsible. Thus, the inherent risks with decision making are greatly lessened. In point of fact, it is generally felt that if someone is held to blame for a mistake, all must be considered responsible, since all had the opportunity for participation in the decision making process.

Permissive leaders who are herein considered to be exercising a viable leadership style when they are actively involved in group preservation and protection can be seen by some as figurehead or token leaders. Here the leaders have relatively little power and may be required to do the bidding of the group (Stogdill, 1948). These individuals are considered to be in leadership roles because there is a commonly recognized difference which distinguishes them from the other participants in the group process. In this situation where the real power resides "behind the throne", an emergent leader normally arises from within the group. Moreover, because of the inevitable conflicting
factions in any group, this leader may tend to be democratic so as to
guide group members toward a compromise of their individual interests
in the interest of the group as a whole. Thus, laissez-faire leader-
ship actually operates in the context of an active democracy (Browne,
1955). As a result of this, the same operational principles as were
found with democratic leadership will come into play; i.e., decision
making will be slow, responsibility will be diffuse, and much data
and synergism will be available. As previously cited, an example of
when active laissez-faire leadership may be desirable can be found in
modern research where the leader's primary job is to actively work
to provide the highly skilled team with the best possible environment
within which they can conduct their research (Stogdill, 1948).

These three styles of leadership are important, but what is
equally important is that a leader have the ability to appraise the
situational context within which he/she must function, assess the
assigned mission and the people available to discharge this mission
in conjunction with any other qualifying constraints such as time,
urgency, etc. The leader must then decide which leadership style
would be most conducive to mission accomplishment here and now. In
order to be able to do this, the leader has to have a range of leader-
ship styles available. This range of styles will enable the leader
to adapt to the situational dictates at hand rather than attempting
to change the situation into one which would suit a favorite or
unitary leadership style.
Lastly, it is felt that a range which clusters around the center of the spectrum offers the leader the most latitude in a choice of styles. Moreover, any required deviation toward a polar style will be perceived as less threatening by the group when it occurs from a centrally based or democratic position because less actual deviation occurs. In modern society, any of the three leadership styles may be needed to accomplish a goal; however, the democratic style seems to offer the most flexibility. No person can be seen as omniscient, and if expertise is gained in one area, this expertise has been acquired at the expense of ignorance in other areas. Hence, the diffusion of leadership responsibilities to other group members frequently becomes necessary in our society, and the democratic style of leadership best permits this diffusion (Smith, 1936). Under any conditions, the selection of the most viable leadership style is a crucial factor in leadership success.

The selection of a particular leadership style has to take into account numerous variables. Two of these variables are a concern for the workers and a concern for production. The relative importance which each style of leadership gives to these key areas of concern will be the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

LEADERSHIP GRID

The Managerial Grid, developed by Blake and Mouton (1964), represents a two-dimensional analysis of managerial/leadership behaviors and will serve as the keystone for the development of a better understanding of the principles of leadership. This Managerial Grid was adapted by Jacobs (1970) to a Military Leadership Grid as shown in Figure 3 so that more emphasis could be placed on leadership behavior. In this adaptation, the five benchmark definitions remained constant but the title for each was changed from "Managerial" to "Leadership".

In this model, the two most important basic concerns of the manager or leader are considered to be workers and production. Therefore, these have been selected as the two dimensions along which varying degrees of managerial concern will fall with the abscissa indicating the degree of worker concern and the ordinate showing the degree of production concern. Managers, of course, have individual personal "theories", or philosophies, about how these concerns should be related to one another, and depending upon the particular philosophy held, a manager will adopt a particular set of behaviors which will satisfy these concerns. Over a period of time, these behaviors will serve to constitute a style of management or leadership.
Figure 3. The Military Leadership Grid. From Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organizations by T. O. Jacobs, 1970, 34.
Three general philosophies for relating these concerns have been identified and these give rise to the five distinct or benchmark type of leaders. As this model indicates, a special grid notation is used in identifying managerial/leadership styles, with the value 9 denoting maximal concern and the value 1 indicating minimal concern. Thus, the 9/1 leader style reflects a maximal concern for production with minimal concern for people. By contrast, the 1/9 style would show maximal concern for people and minimal concern for production. Because 1/1 style leaders reflect minimal concern for both dimensions, they are considered failures and do not represent a viable leadership style. The 5/5 manager/leader has a realistic and balanced concern for both people and production, while the 9/9 style represents an ideal toward which the 5/5 leader is striving. Upon attainment of a 9/9 style, maximal concern could be accorded both workers and production (Blake & Mouton, 1964).

Figure 4. The Leadership Grid of Jacobs (1970) with the leadership styles of Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939), and Browne (1955) superimposed.
The three leadership styles: authoritarian, democratic, and active laissez-faire can be superimposed on the Leadership Grid as shown in Figure 4 to more clearly depict the relative production/people concerns. Because authoritarian (9/1) leaders are production or goal oriented, people are a commodity to be used to meet this goal. On the other hand, democratic leaders will achieve a realistic (5/5) balance of concern for people and production. Further, these 5/5 leaders have an ideal style (9/9) which they can strive to develop. With this style, they can simultaneously give maximal concern to both workers and production. Active laissez-faire or permissive (1/9) leaders will focus on the workers' welfare and to some extent will have to hope that production will result as a byproduct of this orientation (Blake & Mouton, 1964). Lastly, the 1/1 style is actually "anarchistic" with respect to leadership and, in fact, it may not even constitute a viable worker attitude for any meaningful job setting. Such an individual who reflects minimal concern for the job and for fellow workers or employees would probably not be found discharging other than the most menial labors in today's societies (Blake & Mouton, 1964).

The superimposition of these leadership styles on the Leadership Grid can be of further value when viewed in light of the idea of a major and minor leader as set forth by Second (1974). As previously stated, the 9/1 leader is primarily task oriented and views the job as one where he/she supplies ideas and guides the group toward the accomplishment of a mission in the most expeditious manner possible.
The 1/9 leader is primarily people oriented and is concerned with the social/emotional welfare of the group (Bales, 1953). As a result, this leader strives to boost morale and release tensions. In most groups which are dominated by one of these leadership styles, a complementary or minor style is likely to emerge to balance out the major leader. When these two forces are working in concert, then the group can remain effective over a long period of time. If, however, the major leadership force suppresses his counterpart too much, then group productivity will suffer. As a result, a unique and flexible equilibrium will have to be established for the group to exist and to meet changing job requirements (Second & Buckhorn, 1974). However, in the 5/5 or democratic leadership style, both major and minor leadership forces are present in one individual and so any changes of balance can be achieved more quickly by that individual once mutual agreement has been obtained. This stance will tend to lessen interpersonal power struggles within the group; however, this leader does not work alone. On the contrary, the 5/5 leader will probably have minor advisors for both task and worker concern areas. As the 5/5 leader and the group evolve toward the 9/9 ideal democratic operational style, the importance of the various minor advisors will be lessened as worker and production concerns merge (Bales, 1953).

Group dynamics become important in any of the benchmark leadership styles if the group is to continue to exist. In the case of the 1/1 failure, however, even the group dynamics may not be sufficient
to prevent group dissolution. In fact, if enough of the group members develop this perspective, their impact on group dynamics will tend to be very adverse (Blake & Mouton, 1964).

In order to better understand why a leader would adopt any one of these leadership styles, the degree of concern shown for the workers should be examined. This degree of worker concern will depend to a large extent on how the leader believes the employees feel about their work, and this will be the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER V

LEADERSHIP AND MCGR EGOR'S THEORIES X & Y

An understanding of the way a leader views the workers or group can afford valuable insight into why a particular leadership style is preferred. A leader may adopt a certain style depending on whether he/she views the workers in terms of McGregor's (1960) Theory X or Y or in terms of an integration of some of the principles from each theory. The basic assumptions of McGregor's theories are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

McGregor's definition for Theories X and Y as given in The Human Side of Enterprise, 1960, 137.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY X</th>
<th>THEORY Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.</td>
<td>The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest. The average human being does not inherently dislike work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.</td>
<td>External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEORY X (Con't)

The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has little ambition, and wants security above all.

THEORY Y (Con't)

Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.

The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility.

The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.

Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentials of the average human being are only partially utilized.

These theories can be superimposed on the Leadership Grid as shown in Figure 5. When this is done, the theory which would best fit the various styles of leadership becomes more apparent.

9 1/9 Theory Y Laissez-faire (Active) 9/9 Integration of X & Y Democratic (Ideal)

5/5 Integration of X & Y Democratic (Realistic)

Theory X

1/1 "Anarchistic" (Failure) 9/1 Authoritarian

Figure 5. McGregor's (1960) Theories X & Y superimposed on the Leadership Grid of Jacobs (1970).
Authoritarian leaders (9/1) tend to see the workers as lazy, shiftless, primarily avoiding work and needing a source of extrinsic motivation before they will undertake and complete a task; i.e., they are viewed as Theory X workers (Meyer, 1968). On the other hand, permissive or active laissez-faire leaders (1/9) would probably view the workers as enlightened, naturally desiring to work, seeking responsibility, and intrinsically job oriented; i.e., they are considered Theory Y workers (Graham, 1969). Democratic leaders (5/5) would exhibit the principle of integration whereby some elements of each theory with a heavier emphasis of Theory Y would be brought into play as the situation, job, and personnel variables dictated. Finally, the "anarchistic" person (1/1) would probably adopt a Theory X perspective toward other workers, but at the same time he/she would lack the motivation to employ the necessary punitive means available to elicit production. Reflection on this person's part might reveal that he/she tends to epitomize the Theory X individual and as such would probably be classified as a poor follower, let alone leader, who will function at a minimal performance level (Blake & Mouton, 1964). This type of individual might well be accurately described by the old joke about the assembly line worker who when questioned by a foreman as to why he was only coming to work four days out of the week (rather than the traditional five), replied, quite simply, that he could not live on what he earned if he only worked three days a week! 
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In conclusion, there does not seem to be any one style of leadership which is universally productive. The leader, the group, the goal, and the situational work contexts all have to be considered before a certain leadership style is selected (Fiedler, 1967). MacDonald (1967) studied all three styles in the Job Corps and found that the permissive style was associated with higher rates of truancy and delinquency, while groups with dominant leadership showed the highest ability to change their behavior in response to situational variations. The democratic group showed slow initial progress but soon developed an ability to also change fairly rapidly.

An excellent summary of some recent research is given by Stogdill (1974) who further supports the contention that multiple variables have to be considered in the selection of a leadership style. He explains that there have been numerous studies undertaken to determine which leadership style is more universally effective. This research has primarily focused on laissez-faire versus directive patterns of leadership. No significant findings have been arrived at to suggest that one of these styles can be more universally successful for a leader as many other variables such as how the leader views the group's motivation to work, the group, the situation, and the task all influence the appropriateness of a given leadership style. The leaders' beliefs about the employees' reasons for working is an important variable. However, another potentially significant leadership factor is how leaders view themselves as individuals. This self-perception can influence which leadership
they choose to exercise. This will be the subject of the next chapter.
McGregor (1960) provides an excellent insight into the rationale behind a leader's actions because of the way that he/she views the workers and their primary sources of motivation. However, there are still important questions to be answered about how that leader views himself/herself if one is to arrive at a more complete understanding of why certain styles are selected by a given leader. Valuable insights into this dual perspective of self and others are afforded by Berne (1977) and his Transactional Analysis Model. When variations on his theme of "I'm okay; You're okay" are superimposed on the Leadership Grid as shown in Figure 6, the rationale underlying why a leader may adopt certain behaviors becomes clearer. Berne defines the concept of being okay as synonymous with good mental health and a feeling of self-worth and dignity which causes one to feel that they have value. The idea of being not okay is just the opposite of this; namely, that the individual's basic fibre is seen as undesirable and reprehensible (Berne, 1977).

Authoritarian leaders (9/1) view themselves in all probability as being okay, healthy, and right, but find that their employees are not okay. As a result, they deal with them as little as possible and normally only in formal business settings (Blake & Mouton, 1964).
Authoritarian leaders may even regard it as their obligation to attempt to "save" the workers from their ways and seek to impose their beliefs, values and work attitudes on them with religious fervor. Unfortunately, they realize that if they are successful, they will probably be replaced by one of their followers and so because of this fear, their attempts are primarily manipulative and actual employee education is kept minimal (Blake & Mouton, 1964).

Active Laissez-faire leaders (1/9) may have difficulty with their self-image because of the nature of the group that they are supporting, and may not be sure if they are okay, but would come to find themselves reliant upon the group to provide them recognition which could confirm
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their worth. They do view the group as being okay and so will hope that their service to that group will result in confirmation of their value coming from a respected and healthy source. Also, because of their association with this group of okay people and as their representative, these leaders can present the public image of personifying the group's okay nature to the world. This, in itself, can be very satisfying to their possible unsure self-image. In the long run, they hope that, by association, they will someday emerge as leaders who can operate independently of the group. They take a definite step in this direction when they actively engage in assisting the group to meet its needs. This involvement can be the vehicle whereby active laissez-faire leaders can develop more confidence and a better self-image. In the long run, this will permit the active laissez-faire leader to either derive adequate enjoyment from serving the group in a meaningful and necessary way, or would free them to break away and seek other leadership roles.

Democratic leaders (5/5) regard themselves as being okay and, in fact, they also view the group members as okay. As a result an atmosphere of mutual trust should ideally emerge as the leader and the group progress toward an ideal (9/9) relationship. Both the leader and the group will be willing to share their ideas and talents without the fear of these being turned back against either party. In this context, there is ample room for both parties to share in the mastery of their organizational fate (Blake & Mouton, 1964).
Finally, 1/1 "anarchistic" individuals view themselves as not being okay or healthy. They may even go so far as to feel that the group or organization members have caused this to happen to them. Consequently, they are not okay because the group has perpetrated this cruel deed against its own leaders. They want no part of the group or the job, but at least have come to recognize the practical necessity that they have to associate with both to meet their basic needs. Moreover, these leaders will generally feel that there is no way that their involvement with their work or other employees could possibly change their life circumstances. They are hopelessly mired in their own worthlessness and will likely contaminate the whole work environment unless they can be assisted in changing their attitudes (Blake & Mouton, 1964). Later, we will see how leadership counseling can help those individuals to first recognize a need for change and then facilitate their transition to a more meaningful life style both on and off the job.

Thus, the leaders' opinion of their own self-worth and the value of the workers becomes an important consideration for a leadership consultant to keep in mind. It is also important to examine the situational contexts of the work group to see which styles of leadership it permits or even encourages. For example, 1/1 "anarchistic" leaders may be so well protected by bureaucratic "red tape" that their jobs are secure (Blake & Mouton, 1964). When this is the case, it is particularly challenging to the facilitator to help not only those individuals, but to communicate to the
persons who have established and are maintaining that type of environment that change may be desirable or even necessary if the group is to survive as a viable and productive entity.

Transactional Leadership Communication

A second aspect of Transactional Analysis deals with communicational patterns and affords some valuable insights into how the various styles of leadership are maintained. The pivotal concept of this aspect of Berne's (1977) theory is that within each of us there are three distinct ego states which are constantly vying for dominance. They are the Parent, Adult, and Child as shown in Figure 7.

Transactional Leadership Communication

![Transactional Communication Diagram]

Figure 7. Transactional Communication from *The Games People Play* by Berne, 1977.

The parent is the rule giver and teacher, and a dispenser of rewards and punishments as a means of controlling the child and the environment. The adult is described as an analytic and cognitive.
person whose primary method of operation is rational and logical. Finally, the child is seen as an emotional, whimsical, and affective person whose behavior focuses on immediate gratification, pleasure seeking, and pain avoidance (Berne, 1977). These three aspects of an individual's personality are always important, but their significance is greatly increased when social interaction occurs. Herein, both parties have to have what Berne refers to as compatible perspectives or else conflict will result when the "wires" are crossed as shown in Figure 8.

![Diagram showing acceptable and unacceptable communicational patterns](https://example.com/diagram.png)

**Figure 8. Examples of acceptable and unacceptable communicational patterns from *The Games People Play* by Berne, 1977.**

Compatible communicational perspectives have to be agreed upon and maintained for any interaction that does not produce tension and manipulation. Just as between two persons, the leader and the group must also establish compatible communicational patterns or else the inevitable resulting conflict will make goal attainment impossible. With these considerations in mind, Figure 9 shows the transactional patterns which may be used by different leadership styles.
Authoritarian (9/1) leaders view themselves as parents to their group of children and so they establish this basic communicational pattern which they use their jealously guarded power to enforce. In order to retain this pattern of communication, however, they may have to oversupervise their employees. Moreover, they may well find themselves being overly critical of work efforts as they feel that it is their responsibility to control not only their workers, but also the work environment. They may even go so far as to attempt to extend their control into personal realms of the employees' lives (Blake &
In the military, this extension is in many cases actually fostered as unit commanders are commonly held responsible for insuring that "their people" properly discharge tasks which normally would fall within their personal pervue. For example, unit commanders have to insure that everyone in their units has their own vehicles properly registered on the installation, that the living quarters or barracks are neat and well cared for, that counseling is provided for legal infractions (speeding tickets), etc. The likening of military commanders, especially at low level units (i.e., squad, platoon, or company), to surrogate parents has particular significance in light of Berne's work. Unfortunately, this type of control which is situationally dictated in a combat zone, may well foster over-dependence in a non-hostile environment. As a result, many individuals may come to expect to have a "babysitter" available to assume responsibility for actions for which they would otherwise be held personally responsible.

Laissez-faire leaders (1/9) tend to view themselves as children and the group members as parental figures (Blake & Mouton, 1964). Thus, they look to the group for help and guidance, and may even offer their power to the group in exchange for this service. As previously stated, they are dependent upon the group as a source of rewards and will likely heed the group's sanctions because of a degree of uncertainty about their own leadership competence (Berne, 1977). They may even enjoy the luxury of being held only minimally responsible
for their actions as their impact on the mission accomplishment may be primarily supportive, and the importance of even this function could be determined by the group. In short, they serve at the pleasure of the group, and because of situational necessity, they may function as caretakers who serve the group well so that their service will produce recognition from the group. This recognition, when it is brought about by the leaders' active involvement in group protection and preservation, can be an important way that laissez-faire leaders can improve their self-image.

Democratic leaders (5/5) view themselves as adults and rationally set about to do their best on the job. Moreover, since they also view their group members as adults, their communicational patterns with the group will primarily be based on logic and rationality. As a result, a comparable adult response should be elicited from them. This dialogue should result in the establishment of realistic production targets, potentially motivating working conditions, and an atmosphere within which there can occur an evolution toward a logical integration of task and personal satisfactions. Here the term target rather than goal is used to imply something which is aimed at and which may not be met or may be exceeded. It is a much more flexible operational rationale than "casting a goal in concrete", so to speak, right from the onset (Blake & Mouton, 1964).

"Anarchistic" individuals view themselves as children and their rational game is to elicit a childish response in their fellow workers and supervisors (Ellis & Harper, 1961). Their minimal job and personnel
concern will normally succeed in eventually causing others to angrily confront such leaders either because they are not doing a fair amount of work or because, in either their supervisor's or peers' eyes, their lack of production is causing everyone to have to work harder to support this deficient behavior. The basic communicational game of these leaders is one whereby they manipulate their supervisors and peers to the point where they stoop to the failure's level because of their anger and, therefore, respond to the 1/1 person as another child. In so doing, the supervisor or co-worker has, in the failure's eyes, been defeated because they have been shown to be no better than he/she is (Ellis & Harper, 1961).

A good leader/follower communicational pattern is important for insuring effective production and hence group survival. When, however, incompatible patterns are established on either a surface or ulterior level, then the need arises for communicational games. When these games are used, it may appear to the user that they are furthering the organization's interests; however, they are, in fact, detrimental to the organization's effectiveness. The leadership consultant has to not only be aware of the games which particular organizational members are playing, but there is also a need to uncover the dysfunctional communicational patterns and the individual self and other concepts which, in the eyes of the user, necessitated the institution of these games. In short, the leaders/followers must be guided in how to effectively terminate the games by eliminating the pay off or "strokes" and how to prevent a remanifestation of the manipulative game playing.
behavior. Next, the individuals involved must be aided to explore why they feel a need to engage in such activities and be shown how these games are counterproductive to the organization's mission accomplishment (Berne, 1977; Steiner, 1974).

The communicational patterns between leader and workers can frequently afford insights into the dynamics of power possession in the work situation. How this power is shared and exercised by various styles of leaders will next be addressed.
CHAPTER VII

POWER AND MOTIVATION

Power

Any discussion of leader/group interaction would be incomplete without an examination of how the concept of power interrelates between these two entities. In line with this, Coleman and Hammen (1974) have developed a "Hierarchy of Power" which delineates five levels of power as follows:

1. Force. Authority exercised through the use of any kind of force. It is the most primitive kind of authority, seen among animals as well as man. He who is the strongest has the most authority.

2. Law. Authority of the community. Legal codes may be based on the will of the majority or they may represent the will of the strong or influential. Compliance is compelled by force when necessary.

3. Role. Authority of custom and tradition. Right to act is based on playing a designated role. Compliance is achieved mostly by application of pressures within the primary groups.

4. Ability. Authority based on respect. Power is based on knowing how to do things valued by others. Once established, tends to function through prestige. Most important to leadership.

5. Spirit. Authority that appeals to the minds or soul of those who follow. It is the authority of truth, justice, and inspiration. This is the power of the poet, the prophet, the friend, the loving person (p. 243).

It would seem to be ideal to rely most on the authority of the spirit, then ability, then role, then law and to use a minimum of force (Coleman...
& Hammen, 1974). Throughout this chapter, the general term power will be used and will indicate a compilation of the various levels of power. However, with respect to each of the leadership styles, certain specific levels of power will be cited as they tend to dominate when a given style is employed. Also, Coleman and Hammen's (1974) Hierarchy of Power will later be amalgamated with Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs to further clarify the interaction of these two concepts.

In the authoritarian (9/1) style, the leader reserves and jealously guards all available power so that the group is kept impotent. In the permissive (1/9) style, the group, for all practical purposes, has all the power which may be exercised through an emergent leader while the supportive leader's power is derived from the significance of his/her contributions in support of the group and the emergent leader. It is noted that in both of these cases, but especially the former, that power possession is an all or none phenomenon, and an exchange of power is likely to occur along the lines of the same principle. For example, the overthrow of a dictator can easily result in the substitution of a new dictator. This state may well be the result of the mutual \textit{einstellung}, or mind set, between a leader or group members as to traditional role power. However, it is possible that a reallocation of power to both parties can occur and will result in a shift from either authoritarian or permissive (i.e., active laissez-faire) leadership toward a more democratic power sharing. It is highly improbable that a total power reversal, which...
results in a formerly powerless entity acquiring all power, is likely to occur. However, if such a shift did transpire, an extended period of adjustment would take place, and this transitional period would adversely affect the organization's productivity during that time (Coleman & Hammen, 1974).

The democratic leader shares power with the group at all levels, and a given balance may change as situational factors change or take on different meanings to participants. With this middle of the road balance, there is present a range of power sharing options which will afford the organization the most latitude or flexibility to move in either direction (namely, approaching either authoritarian or permissive leadership styles) with the least degree of actual deviation from the traditional operational norm. Moreover, since both the group and leader have experienced some degree of power use, any increasing or decreasing of the leader/group power equation will necessitate only a change in the degree of activity as opposed to a much more drastic change in the very nature of their activity as shown in Figure 10.

![Figure 10. Relative power distribution between leader and group for the three styles of leadership.](image-url)
As the ideal democratic (9/9) style is approached, power sharing becomes equalized as its mutually beneficial properties become more evident to the users. Because of this, power exercised by both parties is viewed not only as legitimate by virtue of the organization, but its joint exercise results in compliance with minimal resistance (Jacobs, 1970). Thus, the compromising aspect of power at the democratic realistic level is lessened as growth is made toward the 9/9 ideal situation (Blake & Mouton, 1964). The anarchistic leader may or may not have power, but the more power that that individual possesses, the more counterproductive he/she can be to the mission accomplishment (Ellis & Harper, 1961). This distribution of power can be seen more easily when it is superimposed on the Leadership Grid in Figure 11.

Power is an important concept as it is employed by the leader to motivate group members, by the group to motivate itself, or by the leader and the group together as a source of mutual motivation. In any of these various combinations, the ability of power to serve as a source of motivation constitutes an underlying theme, which enables the leader, the group, or both working in unison to accomplish a goal through the use of power to satiate human needs.

Motivation and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Any exploration of motivation must address the concept of human needs and how they play a part in generating, preserving, or changing particular styles of leadership. Herein, Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs can serve as a viable starting point for arriving at a better
| 9 | 1/9 | No power or power received from the group |
|   |     | Child to Parents |
|   | 9/9 | Leader and group power merged |
|   |     | Adult to Adults |
|   | 9/9 | I'm okay; You're okay |
|   |     | Integration of Theory X & Y |
|   |     | Democratic (Ideal) |

| 5/5 | Power shared between leader and group |
|     | Adult to Adults |
|     | I'm okay; You're okay |
|     | Integration of Theory X & Y |
|     | Democratic (Realistic) |

| 1/1 | No or little power |
|     | Child to Children |
|     | I'm not okay; You're not okay |
| 1   | "Anarchistic" (Failure) |
| 9/1 | Leader has all power |
|     | Parent to Children |
|     | I'm okay; You're not okay |
| 9   | Authoritarian |

1 | Concern for Production | 9

understanding of leadership motivation. His concept of a need as a motivator can be generally defined as a perceived gap between what is and what ought to be (Maslow, 1954). This hierarchy is traditionally depicted as a pyramid as shown in Figure 12. Certain rules must be observed if an individual is to ascend that pyramid.

![Hierarchy of Needs](image)

Figure 12. Hierarchy of Needs from *Motivation and Personality* by Maslow, 1954.

The most basic needs are physical in nature and revolve around the necessities for survival and species perpetuation. Such things as food, water, air, rest, and procreation fall into this category. The safety needs center around a feeling of personal security and the necessity to secure both those things which are needed for survival and unnecessary but desirable possessions. Social needs focus in on the affirmation of our presence and existence and hence worth as judged by others. Human beings are social by nature and as such find comfort in relating to others. It may well be that these interpersonal relationships spawn the development of higher mental faculties
which qualitatively differentiate humans from other animals. This may well be why feral children do not respond well to remedial measures after they have experienced periods of social deprivation (Maeson, 1972). Herein, a social context for recognition is important. Finally, the need for self-actualization rests at the pinnacle of the pyramid. This need can be viewed as the self-recognition and acceptance of individual worth and dignity. Unlike the other lower needs where gratification can be derived from extrinsic sources, the self-actualization need is unique in that it can only derive satisfaction from the intrinsic appreciation of self-worth. The qualitative differentiation of self-actualization from the other need categories is important to keep in mind (Maslow, 1970).

One common manifestation of the attainment of this level of need, which can take a myriad of different forms, is exhibited "on the job" through a demonstrated sense of pride in one's work. The distinction sharply differentiates the artist or craftsman from a common laborer. A linguistic perspective is helpful for clarifying this very important differentiation. Herzberg, Mauerman, and Synderman (1959) give an excellent summary of this point by Arendt (1958) who distinguishes on a linguistic basis between "labor" and "work".

Apparently almost all Indo-European languages have two terms for productive human activity. Œuvre and travail, werk and arbeit are examples. Labor is related to the cyclical and biological nature of man; it produces objects which are essential to life but are immediately consumed. It is related to reproduction (the term is the same) and thus inferentially to pain. Work is a function of man the fabricator. Its
products are lasting and are a source of satisfaction in themselves, not only because they fulfill biological needs. Labor is private activity; it leads to no increase in renown for the individual. Work is public, and its fruits are productive of history and of individual reputation (Arendt, p. 47).

A second differentiating characteristic of the self-actualization need is that its attempted satiation tends to produce a horizontal effect wherein the more that need is addressed, the more new areas of potential satiation seem to arise. Maslow in his later writings began to extrapolate this idea to the point where high levels of addressing this need resulted in the person's asymptotically approaching an understanding of the abstract concepts of truth and beauty (Maslow, 1970).

In order for an individual to gain an appreciation of how Maslow's need categories serve to motivate an individual, it is necessary to examine the rules whereby they operate. The first rule is that, all things being equal, the lowest need tends to dominate. Thus, if a person is dying of thirst or hunger, then the satiation of that need is more important than the need to resolve any social or perhaps even safety needs. Secondly, only an unsatisfied need can motivate a person. Therefore, if a person has an amount and quality of food or beverage which is perceived to be adequate, then these needs would not constitute important sources of motivation for that individual. Thirdly, at any moment in time, there are multiple needs influencing us, and they are constantly changing. The last rule is very important because it not only suggests that our needs can progress up the hierarchy, but they will probably vacillate greatly on a daily basis. Moreover, how we
perceive an environment will greatly influence what we expect to derive from that situation in terms of need satisfaction (Maslow, 1970).

It is quite logical that when a person attains a certain degree of need satisfaction in multiple need categories, if a lower need should "flare up", upon satiation of that need, one can then return to addressing a higher order need. For example, a person could be satisfying self-esteem needs at work, self-actualization needs through a hobby, and social needs through club membership, and there has not been time for breakfast or lunch. At this particular point in time, they may focus upon satiation of that physical need of hunger, but once that has been accomplished, they would return to the environment of the previous need pattern and would not have to "start over" and work through all intermediate need levels before the self-actualization needs can again be addressed via a hobby (Maslow, 1970).

The importance of understanding needs and other types of employee motivation in the work setting cannot be overstressed for leaders. If they fail to perceive their significance and the rules for their effective utilization, then they, in all probability, will be poor leaders (Field Manual 22-100, 1965). In all three styles, leaders have to be able to utilize the situation to first meet their own needs and then in one fashion or another be instrumental in the group members' satiation of some of their needs. Although these two precepts will apply with all three styles of leadership, the rationale behind the leaders addressing their own needs and those of
the group as well as the amount of attention they will pay to each are very different. However, before these two areas are elaborated upon in detail, an examination of some of Herzberg, Mauserman, and Synderman's (1959) work on motivation will serve as a meaningful transition.

Herzberg's Hygiene and Motivator Factors

Herzberg's (1966) work has proved very useful in providing insights into some of the factors which provide job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, as well as those which serve a mere but necessary maintenance function versus true motivators. His research has indicated that employee needs fall into two distinct categories. One group revolves around the need to develop in one's occupation as a source of growth. The second group operates to establish a firm base for the former through acquisition of fair treatment in compensation, supervision, working conditions, and administrative practices (i.e., the attainment of the maintenance factors). However, the fulfillment of the needs of the second group does not motivate the individual to high levels of job satisfaction, nor will it result in the worker applying any more than a minimal amount of effort on the job. All that can be expected from satisfaction of the second group of needs is a neutral balance point where minimal job performance occurs from which the liberation of the individual worker to progress upward may occur. This can be affected only if motivators are brought into play (Herzberg, 1966).
In this context, a need is still defined as a perceived gap between what an individual considers to be and what that same individual also perceives ought to be. With this in mind, Herzberg has labelled his aforementioned two categories of needs as either hygiene or motivator factors. When this dichotomy is superimposed on Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs, the following comparison emerges as shown in Figure 13.

![Figure 13. Hygiene and Motivator Factors as Herzberg (1976) permitted them to be related to Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs.](image)

The presence or absence of these factors in a job environment will likely result in the following employee responses which are shown in Table 5.

It is interesting to note that some jobs may have neither Hygiene nor Motivator Factors present. If this should occur, the job itself would be perceived as intolerable and the likely result would be that the workers will seek out any opportunity to terminate their employment in the position (Herzberg, 1959). The 1/1 style leader may well cause this type of situation to develop and thereby
be very instrumental in the destruction of any production effort.

Table 5

Herzberg's (1966) Hygiene and Motivators as they relate to the work setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Motivators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 9/1 style of leader may well provide hygiene support but little in the way of motivators and as a result an environment of no dissatisfaction but little satisfaction will result. The 1/9 leader may provide satisfaction of employees' hygiene concerns; however the potential for the motivators to come into play will never materialize if the group is disbanded for lack of production. A worker may love to do this type of work and to work in this type of environment, and, in fact, may even do so with inadequate maintenance factors present. This may explain why some starving artists continue to try to live by that profession. The 5/5 style leader will wisely recognize the need for insuring job completion so that the hygiene factors are met by virtue of this employment. Then, the motivators can be provided most meaningfully and only after adequate satisfaction of the hygiene needs have permitted the individual workers to be concerned with the motivators. When the
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9/9 style is approached more closely by the leader/group team effort, they can focus more on the motivators in the work setting.

With an understanding of need systems and how they interrelate with the work environment, one can now examine how the leader and/or the group will probably derive varying degrees of benefit from exposure to different leadership styles. In the authoritarian situation, leaders will attempt to insure that hygiene needs are lessened so as to not interfere with production. The situation may be well controlled so that the subservient group frees the leader to move beyond the neutral point so that there can be concern with the motivators. The leader could feel justified in doing this as the workers are viewed as a commodity to be used to insure that the leader's goals are achieved (Maslow, 1970). These leaders will be very desirous of being sufficiently freed to move up Maslow's Hierarchy and even to begin self-actualizing (in Maslow's sense) in this leadership style at the expense of the group. During such a growth process, the group may feel pressured to continue their leader serving role as the leader becomes evermore aware of how much satisfaction they can be forced to provide in support of the leader's personal goals. The leader may also consciously or unconsciously take appropriate action to stunt the group's growth in the fear that the group might rebel should its members attain some glimpse of the good life which the leader is experiencing. Any attempt on the part of the workers to change; i.e., disagree with the leader or attempts to improve their "lot" would likely be met with suppression which is the basic rule.
of the 9/1 leader's game (Blake & Mouton, 1964).

By contrast, active laissez-faire leaders, through a caretaker function, if adequate attention is given to task completion, should successfully eliminate the group's concern for hygiene needs so that the group members can address motivational factors; i.e., self-esteem and self-actualization (Argyris, 1976). However, their growth may well exclude and, in fact, be at the expense of the 1/9 leader. It is even possible that laissez-faire leaders who are giving everything to the group in the hope that the group members will parentally reciprocate and help the leaders to grow to their level, are in point of fact encouraging the group to move farther away from them, thereby lessening the likelihood that the group will be concerned with the leader's situation. If the laissez-faire leader has been actively working to support the group, recognition should be forthcoming. This recognition could enable the 1/9 leader to lessen dependence on the group to begin independent pursuit of work related motivators.

Democratic (Realistic) leaders will be first concerned with eliminating any dissatisfaction which would result from hygiene factors being present in the work environment. Both the leader and the group could then progress into the realm of the motivators. As a result, growth will be a corporate venture, and neither group nor the leader will be victimized en route to employment related self-actualization. As both parties make the quantum leap into the addressing of work motivators, they cross the dividing line into 9/9 democratic functioning. It is interesting to note that such a
transition has to be a joint venture, and although the leader is primarily responsible for setting the stage, unless the actors fulfill their obligation to perform, the stage set is wasted. At this point they are pivoting on Herzberg's Neutral Point from which motivators are able to come into play (Herzberg, 1959). The 5/5 style leaders have grown with the group, not at their expense, and so they are striving to assist the group to grow with them so that the benefits can be shared and that these motivators can become a permanent part of the work environment. Leader and group members are working for themselves as for all concerned. The corporate interests and their own have merged, and as the locus of reward moves from external to internal, they can self-actualize on the job (Blake & Mouton, 1964).

Maslow's Hierarchy Related to Leadership Styles

At this point perhaps an example of the underlying rationale for the addressing of certain need levels, in the Maslowian sense, would be helpful for clarifying the chasmic differences between these styles of leadership. When this information is superimposed on the Leadership Grid of Jacobs (1970), as shown in Figure 14, the differences become much more apparent.

1/1 style leaders are permanently mired in addressing personal, physical and safety needs, and without a changed attitude, they will not be able to grow. 9/1 leaders will address personal physical and safety needs, and those of the employees, so that the leaders can be freed to move to higher levels of need satisfaction. However, this
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern for People</th>
<th>Concern for Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>9/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9 Leader addresses workers' Basic/Safety/Social Needs because of a real concern for the workers. Laissez-faire (Active)</td>
<td>9/9 Leader and workers Self-actualizing together. Democratic (Ideal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5 Leader addressing workers' Basic/Social/Safety Needs because of a real concern for both the workers and production. Democratic (Transitional)</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1 Leader only has self-concern for Basic/Safety Needs</td>
<td>1/1 &quot;Anarchistic&quot; (Failure) 9/1 Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Concern for Production</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
addressing of the employees' low level needs is necessitated by a concern for a lower level of production which would result if the workers remain concerned with their own physical and safety needs. Thus, the leader would insist upon close adherence to all safety rules so that an employee would not have an accident which would result in a production loss. By contrast, the 1/3 leaders would insure that all employee physical and safety needs are met so that "their people" would be protected. They might insist upon strict adherence to safety rules as vehemently as the authoritarian leaders, but would do so out of a real concern for the welfare of the employees. Lastly, the democratic leader would be concerned with the meeting of physical and safety needs because of genuine interest in both the workers and in production.

Authoritarian leaders may free the workers to explore social needs, but may not provide them with an "on the job" vehicle for accomplishing this. By contrast, laissez-faire leaders' very style of operation is defined in terms of how well they help their group members to satiate their social needs in the work environment. Democratic leaders would probably recognize the pressure to work through this interim need level on the job. Perhaps one way to further distinguish the various leaders' methods of need satisfaction is to label the most likely avenues of growth under each. Authoritarian leaders would be most likely to begin self-actualization on the job at the expense of the group, while the laissez-faire leader may be victimized by the group's self-actualizing on the job. In a
democratic setting, it is possible for both leader and group to commence self-actualizing together without either party falling victim to the other's growth.

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and The Hierarchy of Power

When the idea of human needs is joined with the types of power previously addressed, a better understanding of how these needs can motivate the group emerges. These two hierarchies are combined in Figure 15.

![Hierarchy of Needs and Power](image)

**Figure 15.** Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs merged with Coleman and Hammen's (1974) Hierarchy of Power.

First, the five levels of power can be viewed as serving the different leadership styles along a continuum. Herein, the power of force and law would likely be opted for by an authoritarian leader, but a realistic democratic leader may find role and ability power more appropriate. Secondly, the ideal democratic leader/group might be inclined to strive to develop a situation wherein the power of spirit rule would prevail. However, the style that a leader employs
does not solely determine the source of power which will be tapped. The use of power, and the reason for it to exist as an entity, is tied into how it can be employed as a motivational tool.

When Coleman and Hammen's (1974) Hierarchy of Power are joined with Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs, it becomes clearer how these powers can be used to motivationally satiate or not satiate the different need levels. Here, the brute power of force can be seen as a likely option for a person who is trying to satisfy physical needs. This is the dominant type of power in the animal world, and when a person is lowered to having to fight for existence, on a level where physical needs are the primary motivators, it is likely that force may well be resorted to in order to insure survival "of the fittest". In most modern societies, the power of law is used to provide a secure environment and to satisfy the safety needs of the members of that society. The role(s) which a person is (are) discharging in a societal context all carry with them certain expectations and can accord that person a certain degree of positive or negative recognition, prestige, and/or power. As a result, a person may well attempt to satisfy social or ego needs through the exercise of the powers or recognitions afforded various roles.

The power of ability also requires an external source of recognition for it to become a motivating factor, and through the recognition of a person's ability, the need of self-esteem can be satisfied. The power of spirit can be seen as being most befitting for beginning to satisfy the self-actualization need. This power
is qualitatively different from the other four just as self-actualization is qualitatively different from the other need levels. The difference in kind rather than degree is because, in an Adlerian sense, it has an internal rather than an external locus of generation. The poet, the prophet, and the artist know that they are right and are satisfying their self-imposed needs of expressing growth and commitment as a way of approaching an understanding and enjoyment of the concepts of truth and beauty (Maslow, 1970). The power of spirit is the only way that satiation of the self-actualization need can be initiated, and a 9/9 ideal work situation can be approached if the leader and the group are viewing the accomplishment of their tasks as a source of growth and a place where their creative talents (oeuvre versus labor) can be applied.
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

As previously stated, the purpose of this project is to provide leadership consultants with a better understanding of why leaders may adopt certain leadership styles and methods of operation while attempting to complete job related tasks. Thus, an overall summary of the various concepts and theories explored in this endeavor will be given. Next, the most likely candidate for personal counseling; i.e., the individual who falls at or near the benchmark style of 1/1 will be examined in isolation. However, no attempt will be made to recommend one particular theory/technique as being universally productive for all leadership consultants who may attempt to facilitate operational changes for a 1/1 style person. The choice of approach will be left entirely up to the discretion of the individual consultant. Finally, a recommendation will be made as to an assessment tool which may aid a consultant in the more rapid determination of the styles of leadership that are present in a given work setting.

When the various concepts and theories which have been presented in this project are tied together, as shown in Figure 16, their interlocking nature becomes more evident. When considered wholistically, they can help the leadership consultant to not only better assess what leadership style a person is exercising, but also to better determine
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern for People</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>1/9</th>
<th>Democratic (Active)</th>
<th>Laissez-faire (Active)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm not sure I'm okay; You're okay</td>
<td>I'm not sure I'm okay; You're okay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child to Parents</td>
<td>Adult to Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Y</td>
<td>Integration of Theory X &amp; Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little power or power given back to group</td>
<td>Leader and group power merges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for Basic/Safety/Social Needs for the workers' sake</td>
<td>Leader and group address Self-esteem/Self-actualizing needs together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group may be freed to pursue Self-esteem/Self-actualizing Needs at the leader's expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic (Ideal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm okay; You're okay</td>
<td>I'm okay; You're okay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult to Adults</td>
<td>Adult to Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Theory X &amp; Y</td>
<td>Leader and group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader and group power merges</td>
<td>Leader and group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader and group address Self-esteem/Self-actualizing needs together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5 Democratic (Realistic)</td>
<td>Integration of Theory X &amp; Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm okay; You're okay</td>
<td>Leader and group both concerned with Basic/Safety/Social Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult to Adults</td>
<td>so both can be freed to grow to higher needs together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Theory X &amp; Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of power between leader and group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader and group both concerned with Basic/Safety/Social Needs so both can be freed to grow to higher needs together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1 Authoritarian</td>
<td>&quot;Anarchistic&quot; (Failure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not okay; You're not okay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child to Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader has little or no power</td>
<td>Leader concerned with Basic/Safety Needs so production is not adversely affected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader has self-concern for Basic/Safety Needs</td>
<td>Leader may pursue Self-esteem/Self-actualization Needs at group's expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1 &quot;Anarchistic&quot; (Failure)</td>
<td>Leader has little or no power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not okay; You're not okay</td>
<td>Leader has self-concern for Basic/Safety Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child to Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader has little or no power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader has self-concern for Basic/Safety Needs</td>
<td>9/1 &quot;Anarchistic&quot; (Failure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16. Leadership Grid of Jacobs (1970) with the leadership styles of Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939), Browne (1955), Berne's (1977) "I'm okay; You're okay", Berne's (1977) Parent, Adult, Child Communicational Patterns, the power concepts of Coleman and Hammen (1974), and Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs superimposed.
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why that person may believe that this style is appropriate. In other words, the consultant can focus in on all of the following factors: how well that style is being used, its appropriateness for a given group/situational context, what specific individual believes the leader holds with respect to his/her self-worth, the worth of the workers, their presumed source of motivation, the relative degree of concern which is being accorded the workers and production, the prevalent attitude about power sharing, and which need areas the work setting is designed to satisfy for both the leader and workers. When these factors are considered, an in-depth appreciation of the existing leadership process can be seen. This understanding can, in turn, serve as a viable starting point from which a consultant can determine the type of intervention which would be employed to facilitate leadership improvement in the work setting in question.

A likely candidate for individual assistance would virtually always be the individual who falls at or near the 1/1 leadership style benchmark. An individual who reflects minimal concern for both production and other workers is potentially the most detrimental force not only to production, but to the very existence of the group if his/her presence is ignored. If such individuals are isolated, the question then arises as to how the consultation process can help them, and how subsequent job performance might indicate the extent of attitude change on the part of the 1/1 individual.

If the consultant should consider it appropriate, and recommends that the 1/1 individual seek further assistance, his very recommendation
is saying to the 1/1 person that he/she is a worthwhile individual who should be helped. Herein, because it may be inappropriate for the consultant to conduct extensive one to one counseling with this person, how the consultant meaningfully refers him/her is very important. If the client is able to perceive this concern by the consultant and later by a counselor is genuine, then it is very likely that a change in job performance will occur. Again, the techniques employed to facilitate the client's arrival at these insights are a matter of the referred counselor's personal choice. The initial insight by the client that he/she is okay and that an increased concern for production would be in his/her best interest should be followed by the realization that the consultant and counselor are also okay for trying to help him/her. This second insight by the client could logically be extrapolated to a realization that other people in the work setting are also okay, especially if they are supportive of attempts to change job related behaviors.

Once this dual perspective change whereby both self and others are now seen as being okay is effected, then continued growth by that person on the job can be fostered by effective communication techniques. An attitude change by the 1/1 style person will greatly enhance their opportunities for advancement within that organization. If they should feel that their present job is mundane and undesirable, they may now have a viable escape route because of their increased job proficiency (Fiedler, 1967).
As part of this general guide for a leadership consultant, there are certain "built in" ways of determining whether or not the referred counselor has actually facilitated the client's changing both self-perception and the perception of others, or has resulted in a change with respect to only one of these elements. Possible job related avenues of growth for the 1/1 style individual that are opened up by an attitude change are illustrated in Figure 17.

Figure 17. The leadership styles of Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939), Berne's (1977) "I'm okay; You're okay" superimposed on the Leadership Grid of Jacobs (1970) to show possible routes for leadership evolution from a 1/1 leadership style as determined by differing changes in self-perception and the perception of others.
If for example the 1/1 style person decides that they are okay and that their fellow employees are also okay, then growth along democratic lines can be anticipated. If, however, they should decide that they are okay, but no change occurs with respect to their opinion of their fellow workers, then leadership will likely occur along authoritarian lines. If, by some chance, the client arrives at the conclusion that the referred counselor and therefore the fellow workers are okay, but no change in self opinion is effected, then on the job changes would likely occur which would indicate that that person is developing into a laissez-faire style leader. Thus, the style of leadership that the former 1/1 style person evolves toward over a period of time may provide valuable insight as to how successful the referred counselor's interventions have been. It is hoped that additional research will verify the validity of this type of longitudinal double-check hypothesis for ascertaining the degree and type of impact which the overall leadership consultation process has achieved.

It should be noted that the type of tasks being performed and the situational contexts within which it is being discharged may favor or even dictate the development of a certain leadership style. Even though the democratic style may be the most flexible, it may not be best suited for some situations especially if rapid decisions have to be made and responsibility for these actions can not be diffuse. With this in mind, it becomes even more critical for the consultant to first assess the situational context where the task is
being addressed, with particular attention being paid to extenuating circumstances, such as critical time factors, which would dictate that either an authoritarian or an active laissez-faire style of leadership would be more appropriate. For example, in a hospital emergency room, an authoritarian style would be required by the life and death situation. On the other hand, in some situations where a high degree of creativity is required such as when research is being done for new vaccines or medical cures, an active laissez-faire, or leader acting as a support person, might be required to foster maximum productivity. In short, the consultant must approach an undertaking open-mindedly and not attempt to mold all leaders into preconceived notions of the "best" leadership style.

Recommendations

When a leadership consultant approaches a new undertaking, the realistic constraints of time may well limit the extent to which he/she may research the leadership styles which are currently being employed in the job situation under appraisal. Because of this real world consideration, The Styles of Management Inventory which was developed by Hall, Harvey, and Williams (1964) is offered as a possibly beneficial tool (see Note 2). This inventory is based on the Managerial Grid of Blake and Mouton (1964). It can be administered in approximately fifty minutes, and manual scoring can be accomplished in about twenty minutes per test. Scoring can be done in part or completely by the testee or the consultant.
The inventory is valuable not only in that it helps assess the dominant and back-up styles that a manager or leader employs, but it also differentiates among four parts of the management/leadership process. Primary and back up styles are determined for the following areas: Philosophy of Management, Planning and Goal Setting, Implementation, and Evaluation Practices. The final scoring of the inventory consists of plotting the testee's results which have been converted to T Scores on four graphs. An example of how these graphs are constructed is shown in Figure 18.

Figure 18. Sample graph from Hall, Harvey, and William's (1964) Styles of Management Inventory.
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The normalized scores which are depicted on each graph as shaded areas (for reproduction purposes they are herein hatch marked) are based on sample data accumulated in 1963 and 1964 from 1316 tested managers. This sample drew from industrial, governmental, and service organizations. Approximately 24% of the sample was from top management levels while 30% was from middle management, and 12% represented lower managerial levels. The authors report that the remaining 30% of the standardization sample could not be specifically identified with respect to exact managerial echelon (Hall, Harvey, and Williams, 1964).

One aspect of this instrument which can further assist a practicing consultant is that the four resulting graphs clearly illustrate that in any of the phases of management/leadership, there are no "pure" benchmark type leaders. Rather, there are elements of all the various styles present in everyone, and so if the consultant should attempt to alter a leader's method of operating, they would be changing, in all probability, that person's leadership equation rather than attempting to introduce a completely new style of leadership with which that person has absolutely no familiarity. This should aid the consultant to isolate and facilitate the leader in question to improve upon the presently possessed abilities which could foster more effective leadership in the job setting under advisement.

This instrument has potential value in that it can afford the consultant insights to one aspect of the situation under investigation;
namely, the leader. However, as previously stated, it is imperative that the consultant also explore both the group and the situational dynamics in order to develop an appreciation of the contexts within which a given style of leadership is being exercised (Fiedler, 1974).

This project has attempted to tie together certain key concepts and theories of leadership which will assist the consultant to more readily discern why certain styles of leadership are being exercised, their appropriateness, and possible areas where changes may be required. Any changes should, of course, enhance the overall effectiveness of the leadership while taking into account the group and the situational contexts within which people are being influenced to accomplish goals or tasks (Henderson & Campbell, 1972).

2. The Styles of Management Inventory developed by Hall, Harvey, and Williams was copyrighted in 1964 and is available from Teleometrics Int’l, P. O. Drawer 1850, Conroe, TX 77301. A request was made to Dr. Hall’s office for permission to include this test as an appendix to this project. This request was denied as Dr. Hall’s office felt that distribution of the test as part of this project would jeopardize the validity of their test.
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