PART I

UNDERSTANDINGS OF LEADERSHIP

Even though Christian leadership has created its own definition of leadership and its practices throughout Christian history, Christian leadership studies has not been recognized as an area of academic study within leadership studies. However, in recent years, it has become one of the most significant topics in the area of theological studies. It is deeply influenced by and actively interacts with business, management, and social psychology theories pertaining to leadership and its formation by analyzing who leaders are, what characteristics/behaviors they demonstrate, and how these characteristics function in organizations and in relation to others. Therefore, it is important to briefly explore prominent leadership theories in a secular context and how these theories understand, interpret, and evaluate leadership before exploring what Christian leadership is and how it is exercised in and beyond the Christian church.

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

Chapter 1

Leadership in a Secular Context

The word *leadership* appeared for the first time in Webster's *An American Dictionary of the English Language* (1818). It was defined as "the state or condition of a leader."[1] However, this word was often either absent or defined in a very simplistic manner in nineteenth-century dictionaries. Almost no definition existed. At the turn of twentieth century, all four dictionaries, *The Century Dictionary* (1889–1911), *Universal Dictionary of the English Language* (1898), *Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary* (1904), and Murray's *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (1908), defined *leadership* in a standardized manner, as an office or a position that intimates guidance or control.[2] After 1965, many dictionaries defined leadership in variations that encompassed two themes: 1) "the office or position of a leader" and 2) "the ability to lead."[3] Even though these dictionaries began to reflect different views of defining leadership, such as the social psychologist's and behaviorist's views, they did not illustrate the complexities of the concept of leadership. Definitions of leadership in dictionaries remained simplistic and instructive. However, these definitions influenced leadership studies and its assumptions in the early stage of the discipline.

Over the course of leadership studies' development as an academic discipline, there have been overwhelming numbers of definitions of leadership created. In fact, Joseph C. Rost counted 221 definitions of leadership from 1900 to 1990[4] and 110 definitions of leadership in 1980s literature alone.[5] As leadership studies develop, there are several prominent groups or approaches that represent common definitions of leadership. Some scholars emphasize leaders' traits, skills, or styles and others emphasize context, situation, or interpersonal relationship. For example, Jean Lau Chin classifies leadership in three distinct ways: by "leadership characteristics,"

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

"contextual leadership," and "interpersonal process of leadership,"[6] whereas other scholars, such as Victor Dulewicz and Malcolm Higgs, categorize these theories into six schools: "the trait school," "the behavioral or style school," "the contingency school," "the visionary or charismatic school," "the emotional intelligence school," and "the competency school."[7] Still others, such as Rost, categorize these definitions in different frameworks, such as "leadership as do the leader's wishes," "leadership as achieving group or organizational goals," "leadership as management," "leadership as influence," "leadership as traits," "leadership as transformation."[8]

Peter G. Northouse defines leadership as "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal," while he conceptualizes this definition based on four components: "1) Leadership is a process, 2) leadership involves influence, 3) leadership occurs in groups, and 4) leadership involves common goals."[9] Grounded on his own definition, he considers leadership through the lens of several approaches and theories, such as trait approach, skills approach, style approach, situational approach, contingency theory, path-goal theory, leader-member exchange theory, transformational leadership, servant leadership, authentic leadership, team leadership, psychodynamic approach, women and leadership, culture and leadership, and leadership ethics.[10]

The definition of leadership changes widely based on the perspectives of theorists. Joanne B. Ciulla sees these definitions as the key to explaining the same thing despite disagreement among scholars, and she claims these definitions have one purpose: "leadership is about one person getting other people to do something. Where the definitions differ is in how leaders motivate their followers and who has a say in the goals of the group or organization."[11] John Antonakis, Anne T. Cianciolo, and Robert J. Sternberg interpret these definitions as "the nature of the influencing process that occurs between a leader and followers, and how this influencing process is explained by the leader's dispositional characteristics and behaviors, follower perceptions, and attributions of the leader, and the context in which the influencing process occurs."[12]

Even though there is no single definition of leadership upon which all scholars agree, it is quite possible to agree about two assumptions. First, as Ciulla, Antonakis, Cianciolo, and Sternberg indicate, most of the current leadership theories are within the paradigm of one leader and multiple followers. These theories assume that only one person is a leader in any organization or situation. Others are exclusively treated as followers. Second, these theories assume a clear power difference between

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

leaders and followers and designate different roles for them. A leader is not just a leader. The position of the leader is understood to occupy the top of the power hierarchy. Each school or group has its own assumptions, but these two assumptions are commonly embraced by most leadership theories. These assumptions are explored in more detail along with three theories in the next sections. Instead of exploring all different leadership groups, let's consider three prominent theories that deeply engage Christian leadership: trait leadership theory, transformational leadership theory, and feminist leadership theory.

These three theories are the most influential in shaping how leadership, including that of countless Christian leaders, is practiced. As trait theory has been continuously studied from the premodern period to the modern period, common characteristics and features of leaders are collected and examined. Based on this research, the fundamental framework of leadership studies has been formed. Trait theory still strongly influences the formation of images of current leaders. Unlike trait theory, transformational leadership and feminist leadership theories have been intensely developed in recent years. However, because these theories challenge and reconceptualize traditional leadership, the meaning of leadership is continuously reconstructed. They greatly impact the development of a new concept of modern leadership. Therefore, it is important to explore these theories historically and culturally to understand how Christian leadership interacts with them throughout Christian history.

Trait Leadership Theory

Early classic leadership studies focused on the leader's innate personality characteristics. The common statement of this theory is: "He is born to be a leader."[13] It is the so-called great men theory. It claims that great leaders, great men, have biologically inherited certain qualities that make them uniquely fit for leadership. In 1869, Sir Francis Galton was among the first to make this statement. Studying the hereditary background of great men, he asserted that some individuals were natural leaders.[14] Several early theorists, such as Frederick Adams Woods and Albert Edward Wiggam, studied kings and the aristocratic class and postulated biological class differences between superior leaders and followers. Their studies reinforced the concept of leaders as great men who were born to be leaders. Jerome Dowd claimed that "there is no such thing as leadership by the masses.

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

The individuals in every society possess different degrees of intelligence, energy, and moral force, and in whatever direction the masses may be influenced to go, they are always led by the superior few."[15] The assumption of these early great men theorists is that leaders have distinctive inherited qualities of character and ability, implying, furthermore, that leaders are chosen by God or by natural selection. This assumption is the primordial foundation of modern trait theories of leadership, which have influenced many psychologists and social scientists.

Dimensionalizing Personality into Human Traits

In the twentieth century, Gordon Allport was one of the first scholars who initiated this discussion of the biological inheritance of human traits. Based on the contrasted notions of "nomothetic disciplines vis-à-vis idiographic ones," he believed that humanity "possesses a unique configuration and assortment of polymorphic traits found 'in any age or land' and, in an individual, 'personal dispositions.'"[16] He classified these as "cardinal, central, and secondary traits."[17] Cardinal traits pertain to an individual's prevalent personality and are deeply interrelated with emotions, cognitions, self-esteem, and certain behaviors, both private and public. Central traits are the same as cardinal traits, but several central traits can be exhibited simultaneously in the same individual whereas secondary traits are shown only in certain situations. Allport's understanding of these traits helped other theoreticians develop correlational approaches to trait formulation that impacted further development in this theory.

One of the most influential scholars in this theory is Raymond B. Cattell, who combined the mathematical skills of a statistician and the great skills of a clinician. As a nomotheticist, he developed this theory more analytically and structurally than others. Reducing forty-five hundred personality descriptors to under two hundred, he analyzed data and presented sixteen source traits. He generated sixteen primary factor descriptions (warmth, reasoning, emotional stability, dominance, liveliness, rule-consciousness, social boldness, sensitivity, vigilance, abstractedness, privateness, apprehension, openness to change, self-reliance, perfectionism, and tension) and five global-factor scale descriptors (extraversion, anxiety, tough-mindedness, independence, and self-control) along with constitutional traits and environmental-mold traits.[18] His profuse data and analysis became the critical resource of the five-factor model (the Big Five), one of the best-known current trait theories.

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

Like Cattell, Hans J. Eysenck is another scholar who devoted his work to dimensionalizing personality and developing measures for assessing those dimensions. He formulated personality in two dimensions, *introversion* and *extraversion*. He characterized extraversion as "quiet plausibility, spontaneity, expressiveness, impulsivity, optimism, gregariousness, assertiveness, and dominance," and he understood the characteristics of introversion as "shyness, pessimism, unobtrusive social behavior, a tendency to solitude and quietude, and inhibitedness."[19] Later, he added a third dimension, *psychoticism*, that "ranges from extreme emotional liability, moodiness and chronic anxiety, and depressed affect at the one pole to high levels of self-esteem, self-confidence, emotional stability, and calm, reasoned approaches to problem-solving at the other."[20] These three traits are often called the "three-factor model." His understanding of personality development is situated in both environmental and biological genetic factors but heavily relies on the emphasis of "genetic contribution to individual biological bases of temperament," especially to intelligence.[21] He set up the preliminary foundation of the modern work of personality theory.

Along with the three-factor model, one of the most influential trait theories is the Five-Factor Model theory (the Big Five) that has been widely accepted and used until now. Based on Cattell's data and his analysis, many scholars, such as Ernest Tupes, Raymond Christal, Donald Fiske, John M. Digman, Robert McCrae, Paul Costa, Lewis Goldberg, and others, intensely examined and formed this theory. Even though some scholars chose other terms, McCrae and Costa labeled neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness as the five higher-order factors:

> 1) Neuroticism is a factor to assess adjustment versus emotional instability in characteristics from worrying, nervous, emotional, and insecure to calm, relaxed, secure, and self-satisfied. 2) Extraversion is a factor to measure quality and intensity of interpersonal interaction and activity level from sociable, active, talkative, and person-oriented at the one pole to reserved, sober, and task-oriented at the other. 3) Openness to experience is a factor to assess proactive seeking and appreciation of experience for exploring the unfamiliar. The characteristics of the high scorer are curious, broad interests, creative, imaginative, and untraditional and that of the low scorer are conventional, narrow interests, and unanalytical.

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

> 4) Characterizing agreeableness from soft-hearted, good-natured, trusting, forgiving and straightforwardness, at one pole to cynical, rude, suspicious, uncooperative, and manipulative at the other, agreeableness is a factor to understand the quality of one's interpersonal orientation from compassion to antagonism in thoughts, feelings, and actions. 5) Conscientiousness is a factor to assess the individual's degree of organization, persistence, and motivation in goal-directed behavior. The characteristics of the high scorer are described in organized, reliable, hard-working, self-disciplined, punctual, ambitious and persevering and that of the low scorer are aimless, unreliable, lazy, careless, negligent, and weak-willed.[22]

McCrae and Costa developed widely accepted questionnaires for testing these factors and nurtured broader concepts of human dispositions and traits. Each factor was understood as an important characteristic that leaders should develop. Extraversion was considered the most significant trait for interpersonal relationships.

Reducing countless descriptors of human personality into certain traits, trait theories/personality theories try to identify the commonalities of personality descriptors. They wrestled with understanding human characteristics. However, these theories started from questions such as "why some persons are better able than others to exercise leadership."[23] They assumed that some people are better than others in terms of character and abilities, including the physical, psychological, intellectual, emotional, and spiritual dimensions of character and abilities. The assumptions of this study are based on hierarchal relationships between a leader who is better than others and the rest, who are less than the leader, even though the goal of these theories is to find commonalities in the human character. Individual differences are not treated as differences but as a source of dominance/submission. In other words, even though these theories provide the evidence to show in general how different and similar people are, they are used to prove that effective leaders share common traits that are innate.

Leadership Traits from the 1900s to the 1990s

According to Ralph M. Stogdill, leadership traits in 1904–1947 are different from those in 1948–1970. In 1904–1947, there were several surveys

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

that concluded that leaders demonstrated better traits than others when challenged in various situations. Fifteen or more surveys homogenously selected five traits ("intelligence, scholarship, dependability in exercising responsibilities, activity and social participation, socioeconomic status") in which leaders exhibited better traits than the average members of the group, and ten or more studies confirmed ten traits ("sociability, initiative, persistence, knowing how to get things done, self-confidence, alertness to and insight into situations, cooperativeness, popularity, adaptability, and verbal facility") as traits of leaders.[24] These surveys also illustrated what the highest overall correlation with leaderships is, such as "originality, popularity, sociability, judgment, aggressiveness, desire to excel, humor, cooperativeness, liveliness, and athletic ability, in approximate order of magnitude of average correlation coefficient."[25] These studies were based on biographical and historical data analysis along with direct observation about leaders, whereas the studies in 1948–1970 showed the awareness of situational approaches and different cultural expectations. Comparing to the studies in 1904–1947, the studies in 1948–1970 showed that physical characteristics such as physical body images and age showed little impact, whereas social status certainly provides an advantage to leaders in a higher political position. In the case of personality, studies both in 1904–1947 and in 1948–1970 listed alertness, originality, personal integrity, and self-confidence as positive characteristics.[26]

Looking at leaders and observing organizations, various trait theories try to find how leaders practice leadership. This methodology continued in the 1990s. In 1990, John Gardner published *On Leadership* and listed fourteen leadership attributes: "1) Physical vitality and stamina, 2) Intelligence and Judgment-in-Action, 3) Willingness (Eagerness) to accept responsibilities, 4) Task competence, 5) Understanding of followers/constituents and their needs, 6) Skill in dealing with people, 7) Need for achieve, 8) Capacity to motivate, 9) Courage, resolution, Steadiness, 10) Capacity to win and hold trust, 11) Capacity to manage, decide, set priorities, 12) Confidence, 13) Ascendance, Dominance, Assertiveness, 14) Adaptability, flexibility of approach."[27] These attributes are selected as the necessity for leaders to accomplish tasks. Intelligence and self-confidence are continuously selected as the best and most popular traits of leaders since the early stages of leadership studies.

In the 1990s, there was another trait theory that was popular and practiced by many practitioners—that is, emotional intelligence (EI). Referring to "an individual's capacity to process emotional information

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

in order to enhance cognitive activities and facilitate social functioning," emotional intelligence is defined "as the perception, use, understanding, and management of one's own and others' emotional states to solve problems and regulate behavior."[28] It includes the ability to understand one's own emotion as well as that of others and to express emotion effectively and appropriately in relation to others and the situation. Instead of emphasizing intelligence based on cognitive knowledge, this theory claims that emotional intelligence is a significant trait that a successful leader demonstrates in social relationships. However, there is one significant problem—that is, how to measure EI. Various scholars propose numerous methodologies to measure emotional intelligence—but the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) is the best-known test to measure EI.[29] Both cognitive and emotional intelligence along with social intelligence are recognized as the most important traits for leaders in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.[30]

Studying many organizations and interviewing hundreds of leaders, many trait theorists such as Gardner, Warren Bennis, James M. Kouzes, and Barry Z. Posner affirmed trait theories as a good way to understand leaders and leadership. Trait theories were popular in early leadership studies, and they continue to be useful in the twentieth and the twenty-first centuries. Based on the assumptions of differentiating leaders from followers, they characterize who leaders are, their personalities and temperaments, and how they work.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Trait theories have many strengths and criticisms. Behavioral theories and situational theories offer different perspectives. Instead of focusing on personality, behavioral theories focus on leader behaviors. Looking at the behaviors of effective leaders and ineffective supervisors and managers, researchers such as Rensis Likert, Robert Blake, Jane Mouton, and others, analyze leaders and define leadership styles. They carefully look at how effective leadership functions and ineffective leadership fails in similar circumstances.

Situational theories are similar to behavior theories. From three angles, that of "the leader, the follower, and the situation," situational theories examine one behavioral aspect of leadership.[31] The path-goal theory is a popular situational theory. The assumption of this theory is that leaders can change their styles of leadership depending on the sit-

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

uation and the group. The oppositional position of the path-goal theory is the LPC (Least Preferred Coworker) theory. LPC theory postulates that leaders hold certain behaviors and do not change general behaviors easily. This theory studies broad orientations of leader behaviors rather than behaviors that are changed by situations. Cognitive resources theory is in between behavior theories and traits theories. It observes leader behaviors in interaction with cognitive traits. In a similar manner, multiple linkage theory tests the interaction between "managerial" behaviors and situational factors" in the same way that the Life Cycle model theory seeks the correlations between "collaborators' job experience and emotional maturity."[32] There are also other theories, such as the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) model, that try to explain leadership in the dynamics between in-groups and out-groups along with characteristics of leaders.

Despite severe criticism, trait theories are considered classic but still very influential in current leadership studies. They have been adopted and used as an ideology to understand Christian leadership, which is explained later in this chapter. The study of leadership has transitioned from trait theories to situational and behavior theories or contingency theories. All these theories focus on an individual leader; they concern a single leader with mass followers. Trait theories depend heavily on leaders and their characteristics, behaviors, situations, and so forth. They do not give much attention to followers and their growth under the guidance of leadership. However, these trends are now challenged by another set of leadership theories, such as expectancy theories of motivation, transactional leadership, and transformational leadership that have great interest in followers and how they grow in their potential for leadership.

Transformational Leadership Theory

Transformational leadership theory is one of the most dominant modern leadership theories that has been developed and used by both management/business and the Christian church. It shows higher satisfaction and motivation from the followers, better job performance, and greater leader effectiveness.[33] It is also referred to as transactional leadership, charismatic leadership, inspirational leadership, and others. Some scholars use these names as synonyms for transformational leadership theory, whereas many others, such as James MacGregor Burns, Bernard M. Bass, Jane M. Howell, and Bruce J. Avolio, distinguish these names from transformational

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

leadership theory. Transactional leadership theory is often compared to transformational leadership theory in several distinct points. Therefore, before exploring transformational leadership theory, it is helpful to understand what transactional leadership is and how it is different from transformational leadership theory in practice.

Transactional Leadership

According to Burns, transactional leaders "approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions. Such transactions comprise the bulk of the relationships among leaders and followers, especially in groups, legislatures, and parties."[34] He defined a transactional leader who meets the needs of followers with an exchange for followers' services. While Burns understood a transactional leader in terms of exchange, Bass described a transactional leader in relation to followers: "1) Recognizes what it is we want to get from our work and tries to see that we get what we want if our performance warrants it. 2) Exchanges rewards and promise of reward for our effort. 3) Is responsive to our immediate self-interests if they can be met by our getting the work done."[35] He equates one's effort with the results of that effort. In his understanding, transactional leaders clarify the role of the followers and require them to finish the task on the level of desired outcome by recognizing what they need and want. It means that transactional leaders need to know their followers' needs and set goals for them without questioning the goals of their organizations and focusing on control and management.

All these scholars explain transactional leadership as an exchange of the needs of followers with expected outcomes. It stresses benefits for the followers and makes them satisfy organizational expectations. Transactional leadership emphasizes both the followers' and organization's needs. It does not challenge organizational goals and needs, but rather follows and supports them. The aim of this leadership is sustaining the current structure of the organization based on current employees' performance. Therefore, the role of the transactional leader is neither inspiring nor stimulating but controlling and managing within the existing structure and culture. These leaders control human resources and manage the tasks and outcomes rather than earning trust and respect. In this perspective, they are managers and monitors.

As transactional leaders manage followers, they practice two skills: contingent reward and management-by-exception. Contingent reward is a

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

part of the structure or program that many organizations have created and transactional leaders have performed. When organizations determine the designated goal, transactional leaders offer contingent reward depending on the followers' satisfactory performance.[36] Common practices of contingent reward are promotion, raises, special bonuses, among others. By offering these rewards, transactional leaders set high standards and facilitate goal achievement for followers.[37]

Management-by-exception is another practice that transactional leaders exercise. If contingent reward is a positive practice to facilitate the followers' higher achievement, management-by-exception is a negative practice to modify followers' performance.[38] When the expected outcome is not delivered, transactional leaders examine the problem, reprimand performance and deliver a penalty. They diagnose followers' performance and provide negative feedback. Their advice usually concerns what went wrong and how to fix it by punishment and "contingent aversive reinforcement."[39] They teach followers how to control problems and emphasize consistency and predictability. It means that a new challenge is not easily welcomed. As long as desired outcomes are delivered, these leaders do not seek to exceed current organizational expectations.

If transactional leadership is about meeting the existing needs of both followers and the organization in return for desired outcomes, transformational leadership is about motivating followers beyond given expectations and raising them to meet a higher level of needs and expectations. The focus of transactional leadership is an exchange between desired outcomes for the organization and the needs of followers, whereas the emphasis of transformational leadership is to expand followers' ability and performance by inspiration and stimulation from leaders. Transactional leaders tend to work within or follow organizational culture, and transformational leaders tend to not to work within organizational culture but to transform the culture itself. Transactional leaders set up the goal based on followers' current confidence, whereas transformational leaders create a vision based on the rise of followers' confidence.

Transformational Leadership

Many transformational leadership scholars, such as Bass, Howell, Avolio, and others, conducted factor studies and proposed four components of transformational leadership that differ from transactional leadership: "1) Charismatic leadership (or idealized influence), 2) Inspirational motivation, 3) Individual stimulation, and 4) Individualized consideration."[40]

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

> Leadership is charismatic such that the follower seeks to identify with the leaders and emulate them. The leadership inspires the follower with challenge and persuasion providing a meaning and understanding. The leadership is intellectually stimulating, expanding the follower's use of their abilities. Finally, the leadership is individually considerate, providing the follower with support, mentoring, and coaching.[41]

Transformational leadership expects to work for transformation. Bass elaborates the achievement of transformation by developing and nurturing followers' level of awareness, transcending their interests and passion to organizational goal, and increasing their needs.[42] For Bass, these interrelated ways are the core of transformational leadership because he recognizes the possibility of transformation in the consciousness or awareness of *followers* and in the process of transcending *follower's* individual interests and passion for the organizational goals. Unlike Burns, Bass gives more attention to followers and their consciousness rather than leaders and their consciousness. He emphasizes how to transform followers by leaders' abilities. However, it does not mean that Bass equalizes followers and leaders. For Bass, there is a clear boundary between leaders and followers, whereas there is no distinguishable boundary between leaders and followers for Burns. Bass requires more qualifications for leaders. He emphasizes the flawless ethical integrity and higher standard of trustworthiness of transformational leaders. Bass does not clarify whether followers can be leaders in his theory. However, for Burns, leaders do not have fixed positions. By training, mentoring, couching, and by inspiration from leaders, followers can be leaders and leaders can be followers. Both leaders and followers can challenge each other and raise one another. They transform together. Burns allows the possibility of exchange between leaders and followers.[43]

In order to transform, leaders are required to obtain certain qualifications or attributes. As Bass described above, first, Charisma is one of the most popular images or components of transformational leaders created by sociopolitical psychoanalytic scholars and various scholars. It is used to describe characteristics of war heroes, religious leaders, political leaders such as presidents, and civil rights leaders. Today, people look for this charismatic character in CEOs of multinational corporations and heroes in literature and movies who appear in actual or fictional times of great distress. Martin Luther King Jr., Abraham Lincoln, John F. Kennedy, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Thomas J. Watson (IBM), Andrew

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

Carnegie, and other male religious and political leaders are identified as charismatic leaders. Many of these leaders demonstrate the ability to understand the needs of people, to give their lives meaning and to provide hope for the future. A common attribute of these leaders is that all of them appear in times of stress and transition. The main traits of these transformational leaders are "self-confidence," "self-determination," "abilities required to be transformational," "resolution of internal conflict," among others.[44] However, certain personal flaws such as too ambitious, being too idealistic, too adventurous, inconsistency, unpredictability, and failure to assign or build a team are the pitfalls that transformational leaders often fall into.[45]

Robert J. House offered the charismatic leadership model in the context of complex organization with seven propositions:

> 1) Charismatic leaders are more dominant and self-confident; 2) Followers model these leaders' values, expectations, emotional responses, and attitudes toward work; 3) Charismatic leaders are more likely to engage in behaviors that give the impression of competence and success; 4) They are more articulate about ideological goals; 5) They engage with followers to increase goal achievement and to challenging performance standards; 6) They engage in behaviors that arouse motives related to the accomplishment of the mission; 7) They provide definable roles that appeal to followers.[46]

He pointed out these propositions as personality traits that charismatic leaders demonstrate for followers to model. Charismatic leaders should be respected and trusted. They are expected to be role models. A higher level of ethical and moral conduct is essential for charismatic transformational leaders.

Second, inspirational leadership is another component of transformational leadership, but it exists within charismatic leadership. Inspirational leaders use inspirational speech and emotional pleas to motivate followers to turn their own interests into a communal goal for the specific group. They use their charisma to evoke enthusiasm to build confidence among followers to deliver strong performances and achieve a higher level of group goals. In a ROTC and Air Force officer study, Gary A. Yukl and David D. Van Fleet reported that instilling confidence is the first and most important element for inspirational leaders.[47] Without this element,

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

it is impossible for followers to believe in a greater cause and be willing to work toward it. Essential concepts of inspirational leadership are found in the words of Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry Truman. Eisenhower defined leadership as "the ability to decide what is to be done, and then to get others to want to do it."[48] Similarly, Truman understood leadership as performed by "a man who has the ability to get other people to do what they don't want to do, and like it."[49] The purpose of this type of leadership is not only letting followers do more work than expected but also making them work with more enthusiasm, willingness, and confidence. Using power and authority, politicians such as Eisenhower and Truman manipulate the masses for more productivity and dedication to their own goals. By eloquently cultivating a vision or creating a goal, inspirational transformational leaders increase the fundamental values of goal achievement. They motivate followers to work beyond expectations. The original goal is discounted, and, as leaders raise the confidence of followers, the goal needs to be reset and reevaluated by the followers themselves.

Third, intellectual stimulation is the other component that transformational leaders provide. The meaning of intellectual stimulation is explained by various scholars. Robert E. Quinn and Richard H. Hall classify intellectual stimulation in four ways: rationality, existentialism, empiricism, and idealism.[50] Bass illustrates the importance of emotional stimulation along with intellectual stimulation turning "into consciousness-raising, thought reform, and brainwashing."[51] As many transformational scholars define these leaders as teachers who are better in terms of intelligence and emotional maturity, the role of transformational leaders is to educate followers to grow intellectually and emotionally. In fact, intellectual stimulation has not only been recognized as an important component of transformational leadership, but it is also already treated as one of the most significant characteristics of leaders in trait theory.

The last component of transformational leadership is that the leader be "individually considerate," providing followers with support, mentoring, and coaching. Transformational leaders must care for followers and support them to transform. They need to create new values and desired outcomes for followers. The designated outcomes move to the desired outcomes that the followers wish to create. The vision or goal that these leaders develop becomes the vision or goal of each follower personally with the leader's support and mentoring. As each follower shares this vision personally, this vision becomes the vision of the group. Thus, group identity is formed and nurtured. Reinforcing more commitment, involve-

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

ment, loyalty, and performance, transformational leaders invite followers to move beyond rational calculations.[52] Despite contingencies, leaders need to coach followers how to deal with problems in the existing order and to transform these problems and environments beyond the existing order.

Challenges of Transformational Leadership

Conveying the meaning of organizational goals and raising the follower's potential abilities to a higher level, transformational leaders need to demonstrate extraordinary ability, to inspire others, to exhibit skills to solve problems in an innovative way, and to care for others by nurturing and mentoring. Unlike transactional leaders who provide contingent reward in the exchange of desired outcomes and monitor the follower's errors and mistakes (managing-by-exception), transformative leaders need to model these outstanding individual abilities, behaviors, skills, knowledge, morality, and even hearts. Moreover, transformational leadership transforms not only followers and leaders but also values and environments.[53] Considering sociopolitical cultural values, time of distress and change, and organizational characteristics and environment, transformational leaders need to change or adjust their leadership. For example, if these leaders deal with a mechanistic inflexible organization that appears to function with strict bureaucratic control, they need to know that a reward system and management-by-exceptions will be more effective and change will be hard. If they deal with an organic organization that exhibits a more interdependent relational culture, they expect more variations, diversities, experimentation, imagination, and greater risk-taking.[54] Therefore, along with their extraordinary abilities and skills, transformational leaders need to know or learn how to understand the organization, how to read the times, and how to see sociopolitical cultural values.

Some scholars emphasize the importance of charisma in transformational leadership, others emphasize the leader's capacity for inspiration, stimulation, and individual caring. Transformational leadership transforms people, values, and environments. Its emphasis is to increase productivity beyond expectations. By providing charisma, inspiration, stimulation, mentoring, coaching, empowerment, and more, transformational leadership stresses the enhancement of communal organizational goals. Transformational leaders are expected to have superior power to lead followers on all levels and in all directions. They are expected to control the situation, change it, and challenge it by being a visionary, prophet, inspirer, supporter,

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

mediator, facilitator, encourager, and savior of the institution and individuals at the same time. It is not clear whether transformational leaders can be trained to have these abilities. However, it is clear that transformational leaders must have these abilities and characteristics as described earlier.

Feminist Leadership/Collaborative Leadership Theory

Deconstructing Male Leadership and Reconstructing Women's Experience

The focus of most leadership theories has been exclusively on male leaders. Studying political male leaders, male CEOs, and male religious leaders, these theories are focused on the traits, behaviors, and leadership styles of men. Female leadership theorists have begun to develop women's leadership based on the deconstructions of male leadership and the reconstruction of female experience. For example, trait theories are primarily male-dominated leadership theories. As trait theorists recognize men born to be leaders and examine leadership only from male leaders, the traits and characteristics of leadership become male-centric. Observing only male heroes and political leaders, trait theorists misread irreconcilable images of male leaders as "the" image of leaders. Another example can be found in transactional leadership theory. Feminist theorists point out that this theory sees a clear hierarchy between leaders (who happen to be men in most cases) and followers (who happen to be women in most cases) in power by setting rewards and punishments. As long as male leaders have power to dispense rewards and punishments and create the rules themselves, the relationship between male leaders and female followers is always fraught with hierarchical power dynamics. This theory reinforces the current patriarchal structure when it reinforces the roles of transactional leaders. Many feminist theorists criticize these prominent male-centered leadership theories and analyze the problems of inequality of patriarchal power.

Most leadership theories treat women as only subordinates or followers in organizations. Until the twentieth century, women's work was categorized as the "feminization" of clerical work and women's roles were limited to secretaries and wives of management men.[55] Women leaders were rarely seen. Gender roles and stereotypical images influenced the effect of leadership against women. By introducing the "Damned if she

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

does, damned if she doesn't" dilemma, Beth J. Haslett, Florence L. Geis, and Mae R. Carter show how these gender roles and stereotypes negatively influenced women's performance and leadership.[56] By analyzing the problems of masculine and feminine traits and recognizing the importance of female authority role models, they conclude that as women gain more experience in leadership, they gain more confidence and become better leaders. Many feminist leadership theories begin to analyze problems of gender roles and leadership effectiveness. They disclose the problems of various leadership theories and a lack of gender analysis.

Feminist leadership theory is not one specific theory, unlike transformational leadership theory and trait leadership theories. However, there is one theory that many feminist leadership theorists accept as a feminist approach. Jean Lau Chin, Margaret E. Madden, Marceline M. Lazzari, Lisa Colarossi, Kathryn S. Collins, and many other feminist theorists, whether they are social workers or psychologists, claim collaborative leadership as a way of defining feminist leadership. Even though collaborative leadership is a recent development in leadership theories, many feminist theorists consider this theory as feminist because it decenters the process of hierarchal decision-making and challenges a top-down power structure.

What is collaborative leadership? Traditional leadership assumes one person, usually a man, as a leader. Especially in large complex institutions or governments, organizational hierarchy is still considered the critical structure for leadership, and one single man is most often found at the top of this hierarchy. However, in recent decades, the feminist movement and postmodernism have challenged the exercise of authority and power. Feminist leadership theorists question the possibility of deconstructing the power structure between leaders and followers. One of the attempts to deconstruct this hierarchal structure is found in a reluctance to use the word "leader" by some female leaders. The research of Karen L. Suyemoto and Mary B. Ballou indicates that several feminist leaders hesitate to see themselves as leaders because of the connotations the word carries. With a keen awareness of the power of language, these female leaders resist the hidden supposition within the word leader that "differentiates" leaders and followers.[57] Many feminist leadership theorists contest the positionality of power between leaders and followers. They refuse to accept the hierarchal positioning of "a leader" and followers. They recognize the singularity of the leader and the anonymity of masses of followers. The language of leadership itself perpetuates male bias in the discipline. As feminists seek plural forms of leadership and dismiss the hierarchal positionality between

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany

a leader and followers, collaborative leadership comes into play. In fact, collaborative leadership is currently one of the most influential leadership styles. Even in the public domain, instead of hierarchal government styles of leadership, a collaborative process of leadership is expected.

When traditional governments and organizations exhibited hierarchal characteristics such as emphasizing authority, orders, and rules, a strongly top-down hierarchal leadership was encouraged. However, with the recent arrival of global networks characterized by the need for reciprocity, agreements, interdependence, mutual trust, and partnership, the hierarchal leadership is challenged. Different rules of the game are applied. The new rule is "leading together." As a hierarchical relationship between leaders and followers is refused, the passive position of followers is dismissed. Therefore, the language of followers is replaced by the language of participants. Particularly when many groups or various organizations work together, collaborative leadership is required and the language of participants becomes the language of co-leaders. Ensuring egalitarian participation in collaborative leadership is the foundation of feminist leadership.

Collaborative Leadership

The supposition of collaborative leadership is based on strong participation, which is the core of collaborative leadership. However, strong participation does not occur easily. When many groups or various organizations work together, it is especially difficult. These groups are easily led by the strong and equal participation is resisted. Therefore, the role of collaborative leaders is making sure to bring all participants to the table with equal access and encouraging them to actively engage with each other. Collaborative leaders must allow participants to recognize the importance of interdependence as they work together in respect. The role of collaborative leaders is empowering participants to take responsibility for outcomes in a process of mutual engagement. Creating a common ground, these leaders negotiate, set, and guide rules of engagement together with participants and build trust with each other. Some scholars, such as Roz D. Lasker and Elisa S. Weiss, for instance, illustrate collaborative leaders as those who "have the skills to 1) promote broad and active participation, 2) ensure broad-based influence and control, 3) facilitate group dynamics, and 4) extend the scope of the process."[58] David D. Chrislip and Carl E. Larson describe these leaders as stewards of the process, and Chris

© 2020 State University of New York Press, Albany