

From:

Joanne B. Ciulla (editor), *Ethics: The Heart of Leadership*, 2nd edition.

Pages 3-24.

1

Leadership Ethics: Mapping the Territory

Joanne B. Ciulla

We live in a world where leaders are often morally disappointing. Meticulous biographers sometimes diminish the image of great leaders such as Martin Luther King, Jr., and George Washington by probing their ethical shortcomings. It's difficult to have heroes in a world where every wart and wrinkle of a person's life are public. Ironically, the increase in information that we have about leaders has increased the confusion over the ethics of leadership. The more defective our leaders, the greater our longing to have highly ethical leaders. The ethical issues of leadership not only are found in public debates but lie simmering below the surface of the existing leadership literature.

Most scholars and practitioners who write about leadership genuflect at the altar of ethics and speak with hushed reverence about its importance to leadership. Somewhere in almost any book devoted to the subject, one finds either a few sentences, paragraphs, pages, or even a chapter on how integrity and strong ethical values are crucial to leadership. Yet, given the central role of ethics in the practice of leadership, it's remarkable that there has been little in the way of sustained and systematic treatment of the subject by scholars. A literature search of 1800 article abstracts from psychology, business, religion, philosophy, anthropology, sociology, and political science yielded only a handful of articles that offered any in-depth discussion of ethics and leadership.

Articles on ethics and leadership are either about a particular kind of leadership (i.e., business leadership or political leadership) or a particular problem or aspect of leadership, or they are laudatory articles about the importance of honesty and integrity in leadership. There are also a number of studies that measure the moral development of managers.¹ The state of research on leadership ethics is similar to the state of business ethics 20 years ago. For the most part, the discussion of ethics in the leadership literature is fragmented; there is little reference to other works on the subject, and one gets the sense that most authors write as if they were starting from scratch.

In this chapter, I map the place of ethics in the study of leadership. I argue that ethics is located in the heart of leadership studies and not in an appendage. This chapter consists of three parts. The first part discusses the treatment of ethics within existing research in leadership studies. In the second part, I look at some discussions concerning the definition of leadership and locate the place of ethics in those discussions. In the third part, I examine two normative leadership theories and use them to illustrate how more rigorous work in the area of leadership ethics will give us a more complete understanding of leadership itself.

Throughout the chapter, I use the term *leadership ethics* to refer to the study of the ethical issues related to leadership and the ethics of leadership. The study of ethics generally consists of the examination of right, wrong, good, evil, virtue, duty, obligation, rights, justice, fairness, etc. in human relationships with each other and other living things. Leadership studies, either directly or indirectly, try to understand what leadership is and how and why the leader-follower relationship works (i.e., What is a leader and what does it mean to exercise leadership? How do leaders lead? What do leaders do? Why do people follow?).² Since leadership entails distinctive kinds of human relationships with distinctive sets of moral problems, I thought it appropriate to refer to the subject as *leadership ethics*; however, my main reason for using the term is that it is less awkward than using expressions such as *leadership and ethics*.

TREATMENT OF ETHICS IN LEADERSHIP STUDIES

Ethics without Effort

Ethics is one of those subjects that people rightfully feel they know about from experience. Most people think of ethics as practical knowledge, not theoretical knowledge. One problem in applied ethics is that scholars from other fields sometimes feel that their practical knowledge and common sense (and exemplary moral character) are adequate for a discussion of ethics in their area of research. Their research is sometimes good, sometimes awful, but without some background in ethics, it is

simply not very informative. Philosophical writings on ethics are frequently (and sometimes understandably) ignored or rejected because they appear obtuse and irrelevant to people writing about ethics in their own area of research or practice.³

What is striking about leadership studies is not the absence of philosophic writings on ethics, but the fact that authors expend so little energy on researching ethics from any discipline. To some extent this is even true of Joseph Rost's book, *Leadership in the Twenty-First Century*, which contains one of the better critiques of the field of leadership studies. I will frequently comment on Rost's book in this chapter because it is an important new contribution to the field. It is extensively researched and contains a terrific 24-page bibliography. However, the chapter on ethics stands out because of its paucity of references. After a very quick run through utilitarian, deontic, relativistic, and contractarian ethics, Rost concludes that "None of the ethical systems is particularly valuable in helping leaders and followers make decisions about the ethics of the changes they intend for an organization or society."⁴ He condemns all ethical theories as useless, using only two books, James Rachels' *The Elements of Moral Philosophy* and Mark Pastin's book, *The Hard Problems of Management*.^{5,6}

Scholars who either reject or ignore writings on ethics usually end up either reinventing fairly standard philosophic distinctions and ethical theories, or doing without them and proceeding higgledy-piggledy with their discussion. Rost concludes his chapter on ethics: "Clearly, the systems of ethical thought people have used in the past and that are still in use are inadequate to the task of making moral judgments about the content of leadership."⁷ Citing the work of Robert Bellah et al., William Sullivan, and Alasdair MacIntyre, Rost proposes "a new language of civic virtue to discuss and make moral evaluations of the changes they [leaders] intend."⁸ (He fails to notice that the language of civic virtue is quite old.) After dismissing ethical theory, Rost goes on to say that out of this new language there will "evolve a new ethical framework of leadership content, a system of ethical thought applied to the content of leadership, that actually works."⁹ Rost does not really tell us what will take the place of all the theories that he has dismissed, but rather he assures us that a new system of ethics will emerge. At least Rost pays some attention to the literature in ethics; however, he spends most of his time throwing it out and then runs out of steam when it comes to offering anything concrete in regard to leadership, except for some form of communitarianism.

Another more significant example of the paucity of research energy expended on ethics is *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, hailed by reviewers as "the most complete work on leadership" and "encyclopedic."¹⁰ This is considered the source book on the study of leadership. The text is 914 pages and contains a 162-page bibliography. There are 37

chapters, none of which treat the question of ethics in leadership. If you look ethics up in the index, five pages are listed. Page 569 contains a brief discussion of different work ethics, page 723 is a reference to the gender differences in values, and page 831 refers to a question raised about whether sensitivity training is unethical. The reader has to reach a subsection of the last chapter called "Leadership in the Twenty-First Century" before there is a two page exposition on ethics. What we are treated to on the first page of the handbook is a meager grabbag of empirical studies and one fleeting reference to the James MacGregor Burns argument that transformational leaders foster moral virtue.¹¹

The empirical studies include a 1988 Harris poll of 1031 office workers that revealed 89 percent of employees thought it was important for managers to be honest, upright and so on; J. Weber's study of 37 managers that led to the conclusion that managers reasoned to conform to majority opinion rather than universal rules;¹² and Kuhnert and Lewis' discussion of how transformational leaders develop and move up Kohlberg's scale from concern for personal goals to higher levels of values and obligations.¹³ Final references are to a study of seven mainland Chinese factories, hospitals, and agencies, which included, among many other questions, survey questions on the character function of leadership and moral character.¹⁴ The last part of this subsection on ethics contains a paragraph describing how professional associations such as the American Psychological Association set standards of ethical behavior.

The second section on ethics, "A Model for Ethical Analysis," sounds more promising. Bass, the author, defines ethics as a "creative searching for human fulfillment and choosing it as good and beautiful." He goes on to argue that professional ethics focuses too much on negative vices and not on the good things. Bass' definition of ethics and sole reference on ethics in this section is taken from *The Paradox of Poverty: A Reappraisal of Economic Development Policy* by Paul Steidlmeier.¹⁵ The model for ethical analysis that it suggests "determines the connection between moral reasoning and moral behavior and how each depends on the issue involved."¹⁶ After reading these two pages, one gets little information about ethics and leadership.¹⁷ Most remarkable about this section of the book is that it offers little insight into what the questions are in this area. It is not surprising that the standard reference work on leadership does not carry much information on ethics, in part because not much research is available.¹⁸ Nonetheless, for all of the research that went into this book, Bass seems to wing it when it comes to talking about ethics.¹⁹

Leadership and the Rosetta Stone

As Rost points out in his book, one of the problems with leadership studies is that most of the work has been done from one discipline and

a large part of the research rests on what he calls the industrial paradigm, which views leadership as good management.²⁰ (Bass and Stogdill are both management scholars.) Rost also criticizes the field for overemphasis on things that are peripheral to leadership such as traits, group facilitation, effectiveness, or the content of leadership, which includes the things that leaders must know to be effective.²¹ This is clearly the case if you look at the contents of Bass and Stogdill. The largest section in the book is on the personal attributes of leaders.

Marta Calas and Linda Smircich also offer a provocative critique of the field that indirectly helps to explain why there has been little work on ethics in leadership studies. Along with Rost, they point out the positivist slant in much of the leadership research (particularly research on leadership in psychology and business). According to Calas and Smircich, the "saga" of leadership researchers is to find the Rosetta stone of leadership and break its codes. They argue that since the research community believes that society puts a premium on science, researchers' attempts to break the Rosetta stone have to be "scientific." Hence the "scientists" keep breaking leadership into smaller and smaller pieces until the main code has been lost and can't be put together.²² This fragmentation accounts for one of the reasons why Rost urges us to focus the essence of leadership, and it also explains why there is so little work on ethics and leadership. Ethical analysis generally requires a broad perspective on a practice. For example, in business, ethical considerations of a problem often go hand in hand with taking a long-term view of a problem and the long-term interests of an organization.

Calas and Smircich also observe that the leadership literature seems irrelevant to practitioners, whereas researchers don't feel like they are getting anywhere—nobody seems happy. They believe that leadership researchers are frustrated because they are trying to do science, but they know they aren't doing good science. The researchers are also trying to do narrative, but the narrative is more concerned with sustaining the community of researchers than helping explicate leadership. Calas and Smircich, like Rost, point to the necessity of a multidisciplinary approach to leadership. All three scholars emphasize the importance of narratives such as case studies, mythology, and biography in understanding leadership.

It is interesting to note that the two most respected and quoted figures in leadership studies, John W. Gardner and James MacGregor Burns, both take a somewhat multidisciplinary approach to the subject. John W. Gardner's book, *On Leadership*, is a simple and readable outline of the basic issues in leadership studies. Gardner writes as a practitioner. He has held many distinguished posts in the government and in business and has taught at Stanford. He offers a good commonsense

discussion of ethics and leadership in his chapter “The Moral Dimension.” The phrase, “the moral dimension of leadership,” is now frequently used in the leadership literature. The conceptualization of morality as a *dimension* of leadership, rather than a part or element, is significant in that it implies that it is another way of seeing the whole of leadership rather than simply investigating a part of it.²³

Gardner’s chapter on ethics is a thoughtful piece that uses examples from several disciplines. It is often quoted because Gardner is a talented wordsmith; he uses engaging examples, and he offers wisdom that comes from experience. Gardner lines up the usual suspects of evil leadership, such as Hitler and the Ku Klux Klan, and peppers his discussion with a diverse set of examples from history and politics. For the most part, his discussion of ethics is hortatory. He says that we should hope that “our leaders will keep alive values that are not so easy to embed in laws—our caring for others, about honor and integrity, about tolerance and mutual respect, and about human fulfillment within a framework of values.”²⁴ Gardner offers some good advice on ethics, but that’s about all.

James MacGregor Burns’ book, *Leadership*, is considered by many to be the best book to date on leadership. Burns, a political scientist, historian, and biographer, is probably the most referenced author in leadership studies. Burns’ theory of transforming leadership is built around a set of moral commitments. I will discuss Burns’ work later in this chapter because his work is central to my contention that ethics is at the heart of leadership.

In this section I have discussed some representative examples of the ways in which ethics has been treated in the leadership literature. Most of what is considered leadership literature comes from the social sciences of psychology, business, and political science. The scarcity of work done on leadership in the humanities is another reason why there is little done on ethics. Burns, the most quoted scholar in the field, takes a multidisciplinary approach to leadership. However, it is not the number of disciplines that makes Burns’s work compelling, it is the fact that he tries to understand leadership as a whole and not as a combination of small fragments.

Paradigm, Shifting Paradigm, or Shifty Paradigm?

For an investigation into leadership ethics to be meaningful and useful, it must be embedded in the study of leadership. Again, it is worthwhile to make an analogy to business ethics. If courses and research on business ethics ignore existing business research and practice, then the subject of ethics would become a mere appendage, a nice but not a crucial addition to a business school curriculum and our

knowledge about business. Research and teaching in areas like business ethics and leadership ethics should aim not only at making business people and leaders more ethical, but at reconceptualizing the way that we think about the theory and practice of business and leadership. This is why both areas of applied ethics have to embed themselves into their respective fields.²⁵

There are two ways to understand the current state of leadership studies using Thomas Kuhn's analysis in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Given the criticisms of the field, one might argue that there exists a paradigm of leadership studies, based primarily on the work done in business and psychology.²⁶ Kuhn says that one way you can tell if a paradigm has been established is if scientists enhance their reputations by writing journal articles that are "addressed only to professional colleagues, the men whose knowledge of a shared paradigm can be assumed. . . ." Before the establishment of a paradigm, writing a textbook would be prestigious, because you would be making a new contribution to the field.^{27, 28} Using Kuhn's criteria, there is evidence for the existence of a paradigm of leadership studies. The evidence is Bass and Stogdill's handbook (now in its third edition), various symposia on leadership,²⁹ the kinds of leadership articles that are accepted to journals, and the literature that is cross-referenced in these journals.

According to Kuhn, when a paradigm is established and researchers engage in "normal science," there is little discussion of rules or definitions because they become internalized by researchers working in that paradigm. Kuhn says, "lack of a standard interpretation or of an agreed reduction to rules will not prevent a paradigm from guiding research."³⁰ He points out that over time, the meaning of important terms can shift along with theories, which seems to be what has happened in leadership studies. Kuhn believes that scientific progress would be impeded if the meaning of terms were overly rigid.

Rost criticizes some research in leadership studies because researchers don't define leadership. But as Kuhn points out, this sort of definition is not really necessary if researchers are working in a paradigm, because definitions are internalized and unarticulated. Rost's second charge is that researchers all have different definitions of leadership and that the field cannot progress unless there is a shared definition of leadership.³¹ If Rost is correct and researchers have radically different definitions of leadership (meaning that leadership denotes radically different things), then either there never was a well-formed paradigm (so leadership studies is in a preparadigm phase), or there exists a paradigm, and that paradigm is shifting. In both cases, there would be considerable debate over definitions. However, if there is a paradigm of sorts and researchers are still arguing over definitions, then there is a third alternative. There is a paradigm of leadership studies but it is a

shifty one. By that I mean, scholars don't really trust this paradigm, but they nonetheless stick to it and keep doing research in the same old ways.³²

LOCATING ETHICS

What Do the Definitions Really Tell Us?

Leadership scholars have spent a large amount of time and trouble worrying about the definition of leadership. Rost analyzes 221 definitions to make his point that there is not a common definition of leadership. What Rost does not make clear is what he means by a definition. Sometimes he sounds as if a definition supplies necessary and sufficient conditions for identifying leadership. He says: "Neither scholars nor the practitioners have been able to define leadership with precision, accuracy, and conciseness so that people are able to label it correctly when they see it happening or when they engage in it."³³ He goes on to say that the various publications and the media all use leadership to mean different things that have little to do with what leadership really is.³⁴ In places Rost uses the word *definition* as if it were a theory or perhaps a paradigm. He says that a shared definition implies that there is a "school" of leadership. When the definition changes, there is a "paradigm shift."³⁵

Rost's claim that what leadership studies needs is a common definition of leadership is off the mark for two reasons. One would be hard-pressed to find a group of sociologists or historians who shared the exact same definition of sociology or history. It is also not clear that the various definitions that Rost examines are that different in terms of what they denote. I selected the following definitions from Rost's book on the basis of what Rost says are definitions most representative of each particular era. We need to look at these definitions and ask: Are these definitions so different that there is no family resemblance between them? (i.e., Would researchers be talking about different things?)³⁶ What do these definitions tell us about different periods of history? What do these definitions tell us about the place of ethics in leadership studies?

- 1920s [Leadership is] the ability to impress the will of the leader on those led and induce obedience, respect, loyalty, and cooperation.³⁷
- 1930s Leadership is a process in which the activities of many are organized to move in a specific direction by one.³⁸
- 1940s Leadership is the result of an ability to persuade or direct men, apart from the prestige or power that comes from office or external circumstance.³⁹

- 1950s [Leadership is what leaders do in groups.] The leader's authority is spontaneously accorded him by his fellow group members.⁴⁰
- 1960s [Leadership is] acts by a person, which influence other persons in a shared direction.⁴¹
- 1970s Leadership is defined in terms of discretionary influence. Discretionary influence refers to those leader behaviors under control of the leader, which he may vary from individual to individual.⁴²
- 1980s Regardless of the complexities involved in the study of leadership, its meaning is relatively simple. Leadership means to inspire others to undertake some form of purposeful action as determined by the leader.⁴³
- 1990s Leadership is an influence relationship between leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes.⁴⁴

If we look at the sample of definitions from different periods, we see that the problem of definition is not that scholars have different meanings of leadership. Leadership does not denote radically different things for different scholars. One can detect a family resemblance between the different definitions. All of them talk about leadership as some kind of process, act, or influence that in some way gets people to do something. A roomful of people, each holding one of these definitions, would understand each other.

The definitions differ in their connotation, particularly in terms of their implications for the leader-follower relationship. In other words, *how* leaders get people to do things (impress, organize, persuade, influence, and inspire) and *how* what is to be done is decided (forced obedience or voluntary consent, determined by the leader, and as a reflection of mutual purposes) have normative implications. Perhaps what Rost is really talking about is not definitions, but theories about how people lead (or how people should lead) and the relationship of leaders and those who are led. His critique of particular definitions is really a critique of the way they do or don't describe the underlying moral commitments of the leader-follower relationship.⁴⁵

If the preceding definitions imply that leadership is some sort of relationship between leaders and followers in which something happens or gets done, then the next question is: How should we describe this relationship? For people who embrace the values of a democratic society such as freedom, personal autonomy, and equality, the most morally unattractive definitions are those that appear to be coercive, manipulative, and dictatorial. Rost clearly dislikes the theories from the 1920s, 1970s, and 1980s, not because they are inaccurate, but because he

rejects the authoritarian values inherent in them.⁴⁶ Nonetheless, theories from these decades may be quite accurate descriptions of the way some corporate and world leaders behaved back then and today.

The most morally attractive definitions hail from the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and Rost's own definition of the 1990s. They imply a noncoercive participatory and democratic relationship between leaders and followers. There are two morally attractive elements of these theories. First, rather than *induce*, these leaders *influence*, which implies that leaders recognize the autonomy of followers. Rost's definition uses the word *influence*, which carries an implication that there is some degree of voluntary compliance on the part of followers. In his chapter on ethics, Rost says: "The leadership process is ethical if the people in the relationship (the leaders and followers) *freely* agree that the intended changes fairly reflect their mutual purposes."⁴⁷ For Rost, consensus is an important part of what makes leadership leadership, and it does so because free choice is morally pleasing. The second morally attractive part of these definitions is that they imply recognition of the beliefs, values, and needs of the followers. Followers are the leader's partners in shaping the goals and purposes of a group or organization.

The morally attractive definitions also speak to a distinction frequently made between leadership and headship (or positional leadership). Holding a formal leadership position or position of power does not necessarily mean that a person exercises leadership. Furthermore, you do not have to hold a formal position to exercise leadership. Leaders can wield force or authority using only their position and the resources and power that come with it.⁴⁸ This is an important distinction, but it does not get us out of "the Hitler problem," that is, how do you answer the question, "Is Hitler a leader?" Under the morally unattractive definitions he is a leader, perhaps even a great leader, albeit an immoral one. Ron Heifetz argues that under the great man and trait theories of leadership, you can put Hitler, Lincoln, and Gandhi in the same category because the underlying value of the theory is that leadership is influence over history.⁴⁹ However, under the morally attractive theories, Hitler is not a leader at all. He's a bully or tyrant or simply the head of Germany.

To muddy the waters even further, according to one of Warren Bennis' and Burt Nanus' characterizations of leadership—"The manager does things right and the leader does the right thing"—one could argue that Hitler is neither unethical nor a leader; he is a manager.⁵⁰ Bennis and Nanus are among those management writers who talk as if all leaders are wonderful and all managers morally flabby drones. However, what appears to be behind this in Bennis and Nanus' work is the idea that leaders are supposed to be morally a head above everyone else.⁵¹

So what does this all mean? It looks like we are back to the problem of definition. The first and obvious meaning is that definitions of leadership have normative implications (the old, "there is no such thing as a value-free social science"). Leadership scholars such as Bennis and Nanus are sloppy about the language they use to describe and prescribe. While it is true that researchers have to be clear about when they are describing and when they are prescribing, the crisp fact/value distinction will not in itself improve our understanding of leadership.

Leadership scholars who worry about constructing the ultimate definition of leadership are asking the wrong question, but inadvertently trying to answer the right question. As we have seen from the examination of definitions, the ultimate question in leadership studies is not "What is the definition of leadership?" The ultimate point of studying leadership is "What is *good* leadership?" The use of the word *good* here has two senses; morally good and technically good or effective. These two senses form a logical conjunction. In other words, for the statement "She is a good leader" to be true, it must be true that she is effective and she is ethical.⁵² The question of what constitutes a good leader lies at the heart of the public debate on leadership. We want our leaders to be good in both ways. It's easy to judge if they are effective, but more difficult to judge if they are ethical because there is some confusion over what factors are relevant to making this kind of assessment.

Ethics and Effectiveness

The problem with the existing leadership research is that few studies investigate both senses of good and when they do, they usually do not fully explore the moral implications of their research questions or their results. The research on leadership effectiveness touches indirectly on the problem of explicitly articulating the normative implications of descriptive research. The Ohio and Michigan studies both measured leadership effectiveness in terms of how leaders treated subordinates and how they got the job done. The Ohio studies measured leadership effectiveness in terms of consideration, the degree to which leaders act in a friendly and supportive manner, and initiating structure, or the way that leaders structure their own role and the role of subordinates in order to obtain group goals.⁵³ The Michigan studies measured leaders on the basis of task orientation and relationship orientation.⁵⁴ These two studies generated a number of other research programs and theories, including the situational leadership theory of Hersey and Blanchard, which looks at effectiveness in terms of how leaders adapt their leadership style to the requirements of a situation. Some situations require a task orientation, others a relationship orientation.⁵⁵

Implicit in all of these theories and research programs is an ethical question. Are leaders more effective when they are nice to people, or are leaders more effective when they use certain techniques for structuring and ordering tasks?⁵⁶ One would hope that the answer is both, but that answer is not conclusive in the studies that have taken place over the last three decades. According to Gary Yukl, the only consistent findings that have come from this research is that considerate leaders usually have more satisfied followers.⁵⁷ The interesting question is, What if this sort of research shows that you don't have to be kind and considerate of other people to run a country or a profitable organization? Would scholars and practitioners draw an *ought* from the *is* of this research?⁵⁸ It's hard to tell when researchers are not explicit about their ethical commitments. The point is that no matter how much empirical information we get from the "scientific" study of leadership, it will always be inadequate if we neglect the moral implications. The reason why leadership scholarship has not progressed very far is that most of the research focuses on explaining leadership, not understanding it.⁵⁹

The discussion of definition locates where some of the ethical problems are in leadership studies. As we have seen, ethical commitments are central to how scholars define leadership and shape their research. Leadership scholars do not need to have one definition of leadership to understand each other; they just need to be clear about the values and normative assumptions that lie behind the way that they go about researching leadership.⁶⁰ By doing so, we have a better chance of understanding the relationship between what leadership is and what we think leadership ought to be.⁶¹ This state of affairs would represent a marked shift in the existing Bass/Stogdill-type paradigm (and maybe finally put to rest the pretensions of value-free social science).

THE NORMATIVE THEORIES

Transforming Leadership

So far we have located the place of leadership ethics in definitions and in some of the empirical research on leadership. Now we look at two normative leadership theories.

James MacGregor Burns' theory of transforming leadership is compelling because it rests on a set of moral assumptions about the relationship between leaders and followers.⁶² Burns' theory is clearly a prescriptive one about the nature of morally *good* leadership. Drawing from Abraham Maslow's work on needs, Milton Rokeach's research on values development, and research on moral development from Lawrence Kohlberg, Jean Piaget, Erik Erickson, and Alfred Adler, Burns argues that leaders have to operate at higher need and value levels than

those of followers.⁶³ A leader's role is to exploit tension and conflict within people's value systems and play the role of raising people's consciousness.⁶⁴

In Burns' account, transforming leaders have very strong values. They do not water down their values and moral ideals by consensus, but rather they elevate people by using conflict to engage followers and help them reassess their own values and needs. This is an area where Burns differs from Rost. Burns writes that "despite his [Rost's] intense and impressive concern about the role of values, ethics and morality in transforming leadership, he underestimates the crucial importance of these variables." Burns goes on to say, "Rost leans towards, or at least is tempted by, consensus procedures and goals that I believe erode such leadership."⁶⁵

The moral questions that drive Burns' theory of transforming leadership come from his work as a biographer and historian.⁶⁶ When biographers or historians study a leader, they struggle with the question of how to judge or keep from judging their subject. Throughout his book, Burns uses examples of a number of incidents where questionable means, such as lying and deception, are used to achieve honorable ends or where the private life of a politician is morally questionable.⁶⁷ If you analyze the numerous historical examples in Burns' book you find that two pressing moral questions shape his leadership theory. The first is the morality of means and ends (and this also includes the moral use of power) and the second is the tension between the public and private morality of a leader. His theory of transforming leadership is an attempt to characterize good leadership by accounting for both of these questions.

Burns' distinction between transforming and transactional leadership and modal and end-values offers a way to think about the question, "What is a good leader?" in terms of the relationship to followers and the means and ends of actions. Transactional leadership rests on the values found in the means of an act. These are called modal values and include responsibility, fairness, honesty, and promise-keeping, among others. Transactional leadership helps leaders and followers reach their own goals by supplying lower level wants and needs so that they can move up to higher needs. Transforming leadership is concerned with end-values, such as liberty, justice, and equality. Transforming leaders raise their followers up through various stages of morality and need.⁶⁸ They turn their followers into leaders and the leader becomes a moral agent.

As a historian, Burns is very concerned with the ends of actions and the change that they initiate. In terms of his ethical theory, at times he appears to be a consequentialist, despite his acknowledgment that, "insufficient attention to means can corrupt the ends."⁶⁹ However, because Burns does not really offer a systematic theory of ethics in the way that a philosopher might, he is difficult to categorize. Consider, for

example, Burns' two answers to the Hitler question. In the first part of the book, he says quite simply that once Hitler gained power and crushed all opposition, he was no longer a leader. He was a tyrant.⁷⁰ Later in the book, he offers three criteria for judging how Hitler would fare before "the bar of history." Burns says that Hitler would probably argue that he was a transforming leader who spoke for the true values of the German people and elevated them to a higher destiny. First, he would be tested by modal values of honor and integrity or the extent to which he advanced or thwarted the standards of good conduct in humankind. Second, he would be judged by the end-values of equality and justice. Last, he would be judged on the impact that he had on the well-being of the people he touched.⁷¹ According to Burns, Hitler would fail all three tests. Burns doesn't consider Hitler a leader or a transforming leader because of the means that he used, the ends that he achieved, and the impact of Hitler as a moral agent on his followers during the process of his leadership.⁷²

By looking at leadership as a process and not a set of individual acts, Burns' theory of good leadership is difficult to pigeonhole into one ethical theory and warrants closer analysis. The most attractive part of Burns' theory is the idea that a leader elevates his or her followers and makes them leaders. Near the end of his book, Burns reintroduces this idea with an anecdote about why President Johnson did not run in 1968. Burns tells us: "Perhaps he did not comprehend that the people he had led—as a result in part of the impact of his leadership—had created their own fresh leadership, which was now outrunning his." All of the people that Johnson helped—the sick, the blacks and the poor—now had their own leadership. Burns says: "Leadership beget leadership and hardly recognized its offspring. Followers had become leaders."⁷³

Burns' theory has inspired a number of descriptive studies on transformational and leadership. For example, Bernard Bass studies transformational leadership in terms of the impact of leaders on their followers. In sharp contrast to Burns, Bass removes Burns' condition that leaders have to appeal to higher order needs and values. Bass was originally willing to call Hitler a transformational leader, but in his work in the late 1990s he argues that unethical leaders like Hitler are not authentic transformational leaders but rather pseudo-transformational leaders.⁷⁴ A number of other researchers are writing about transformational leadership, including Judith Rosner, who uses transformational leadership as a means for understanding how women lead.⁷⁵

The other area of research related to transformational leadership is charismatic leadership. Charismatic leaders, according to Jay Conger, "hold certain keys to transformational processes within organizations."⁷⁶ Bass believes that charismatic leadership is a necessary ingre-

dient of transformational leadership.⁷⁷ Research on charismatic leadership opens up a wide range of ethical questions because of the powerful emotional and moral impact that charismatic leaders have on followers.⁷⁸ Charismatic leadership can be the best and the worst kind of leadership, depending on whether you are looking at a Gandhi or a Charles Manson.⁷⁹ Leadership ethics clearly finds a place in this literature where the moral problems are near the surface, but not explicitly explored.

Servant Leadership

The second example of a normative theory of leadership is servant leadership. Robert K. Greenleaf's book, *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*, presents a view of how leaders ought to be. However, the best way to understand servant leadership is to read *Journey to the East*, by Hermann Hesse.⁸⁰ Hesse's story is about a spiritual journey to the East. On the journey, a servant named Leo carries the bags and does the travelers' chores. There is something special about Leo. He keeps the group together with his presence and songs. When Leo mysteriously disappears, the group loses their way. Later in the book the main character, HH, discovers that the servant Leo was actually the leader. The simple but radical shift in emphasis is from followers serving leaders to leaders serving followers. It is a very old normative view of leadership that can be found in ancient Eastern and Western thought.

Servant leadership has not gotten as much attention as transformational leadership in the literature, but students and business people often find this a compelling characterization of leadership.⁸¹ According to Greenleaf, the servant leader leads because he or she wants to serve others. People follow servant leaders freely because they trust them. Like the transforming leader, the servant leader elevates people. Greenleaf says servant leadership must pass this test: "Do those served grow as persons? Do they *while being served* become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?" He goes on and adds a Rawlsian proviso, "And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society?"⁸² As normative theories of leadership, both servant leadership and transforming leadership are areas of leadership ethics that are open to ethical analysis and provide a rich foundation of ideas for developing future normative theories of leadership.

CONCLUSION: ETHICS AT THE HEART OF LEADERSHIP

In this chapter I have mapped the territory of ethics in leadership studies. I have argued that the definition question in leadership studies is not really about the question, "What is leadership?" It is about the

question, "What is *good* leadership?" By good, I mean morally good and effective. This is why I think it's fair to say that ethics lies at the heart of leadership studies. Researchers in the field need to get clear on the ethical elements of leadership in order to be clear on what the term *leadership* connotes.

Existing theories and empirical literature have strong normative implications that have not been fully developed by their authors. A second place for ethics in leadership studies is expanding the ethical implications of these theories and research findings. Normative theories of leadership, such as transforming leadership and servant leadership, are not well developed in terms of their moral implications. They require more analysis as ethical theories and more empirical testing. One reason why the body of research on transformational leadership looks promising is that it contains empirical research on a theory that was constructed to address some of the basic moral challenges of leadership. It offers a richer understanding of leadership than theories that are just about ethics or just about leader behavior.

Leadership ethics can also serve as a critical theory that opens up new kinds of dialogues among researchers and practitioners. Lastly, work in leadership ethics should generate different ways of thinking about leadership and new ways of asking research questions. To some extent, the ideas of servant leadership and transforming leadership have already done this.

The territory of ethics lies at the heart of leadership studies and has veins that run through all leadership research. Ethics also extends to lands waiting to be explored. As an area of applied ethics, leadership ethics needs to take into account research on leadership, and it should be responsive to the pressing ethical concerns of society. Today the most important and most confusing public debate is over what ethical issues are relevant in judging whether a person *should* lead and whether a person is capable of leadership. Research into leadership ethics would not only help us with questions like, "What sort of person should lead?" and "What are the moral responsibilities of leaders and followers?" It should give us a better understanding of what leadership is and what it ought to be.

NOTES

1. These Kohlberg-type studies can be interesting for leadership ethics if you put all these studies together. However, taken one by one, they give a very small snapshot of a group. Kohlberg's work on moral development also has the problems that Carol Gilligan has articulated. A number of philosophers also have problems with Kohlberg's description of the highest stage of development. Nonetheless, some of the most fascinating research that uses this approach is

cross-cultural. For example, see: Sara Harkness, Carolyn Pope Edwards, and Charles M. Super, "Social Roles and Moral Reasoning: A Case Study in a Rural African Community," in *Developmental Psychology*, vol. 17, no. 5 (1981): 595–603. Also see: Anne Marie Tietjen and Lawrence J. Walker, "Moral Reasoning and Leadership Among Men in a Papu New Guinea Society," *Developmental Psychology*, vol. 21, no. 6 (1985): 982–992.

2. Many areas of leadership literature from psychology focus on different types of relationships. For example contingency theories focus on the relationship of the leader and the group in a given situation. See Fred Fiedler, *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), and Victor H. Vroom and Paul W. Yetton, *Leadership and Decision-Making* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973). The vertical dyad linkage model focuses on dyads such as the relationship between leaders and managers. See: Fred Dansereau, Jr., George Graen, and William J. Haga, "Vertical Dyad Linkage Approach to Leadership within Formal Organizations: A Longitudinal Investigation of the Role Making Process," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13 (1975): 46–78.

3. Some of the most frequently cited ethics texts in leadership articles and books are from business ethics. The reasons for this might be that researchers are often in business schools, business ethics texts are written for a broad audience, and the content of business ethics research into managerial ethics and organizational ethics is relevant to leadership.

4. Joseph Rost, *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Praeger, 1991), 172.

5. James Rachels, *The Elements of Moral Philosophy* (New York: Random House, 1986). Mark Pastin, *The Hard Problems of Management: Gaining the Ethics Edge* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986). I am not arguing about the quality of these books, but rather the quantity of research done by Rost.

6. The chapter also contains pronouncements, and generalizations are not well supported. For example, he says: "The first thing that I want to emphasize is that the ethics of what is intended by leaders and followers in proposing changes may not be the same as the ethics of those changes once they have been implemented. This troubling distinction is not often developed in books on professional ethics, but it does turn up time and time again in real life" (Rost, 168). A number of Kantians who write about professional ethics would take issue with this claim.

7. Rost, 177.

8. *Ibid.*, 177. The works cited in his argument are Robert Bellah et al., *Habits of the Heart* (New York: Harper & Row, 1985); William M. Sullivan, *Reconstructing Public Philosophy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986); and Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue* (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984). Rost seems to miss the point that all three of these books are reapplications of older traditions of ethics. Bellah et al. and Sullivan make this point clear in their books. Rost does not discuss virtue ethics in this chapter, so it is not clear whether he means to discard this too when he rejects "ethical theory."

9. *Ibid.*, 177.

10. Bernard M. Bass, *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, 3rd edition (New York: The Free Press, 1990). The quotes are taken from the back jacket of the book.

11. From James MacGregor Burns' book, *Leadership* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1978).

12. J. Weber, "Managers and Moral Meaning: An Exploratory Look at Managers' Responses to Moral Dilemmas," *Proceedings of the Academy of Management* (Washington, DC: Academy of Management, 1989), 333–37.

13. K. W. Kuhnert and P. Lewis, "Transactional and Transformational Leadership: A Constructive/Developmental Analysis," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 12 (1987): 648-57.

14. M. F. Peterson, R. L. Phillips, and C. A. Duran, "A Comparison of Chinese Performance Maintenance Measures with US. Leadership Scales," *Psychologia—An International Journal of Psychology in the Orient*, vol. 32 (1989): 58-70.

15. P. Steidlmeier, *The Paradox of Poverty: A Reappraisal of Economic Development Policy* (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1987).

16. Bass and Stogdill, 906.

17. This is not to say that articles that are cited in Bass and Stogdill are not good, but rather, they are focused studies that taken together would not give the reader much of a perspective on ethics as it pertains to leadership.

18. For example, John Gardner is well known in the leadership area. His leadership paper, "The Moral Aspect of Leadership," was published in 1987. Burns' book was published in 1978 and contained a wealth of references that might have been useful.

19. Bass is working on a 4th edition of *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, and he promises to offer a more extensive discussion of ethics and leadership.

20. Rost, 27.

21. *Ibid.*, 3.

22. Marta Calas and Linda Smircich, "Reading Leadership as a Form of Cultural Analysis," in James G. Hunt, B. Rajaram Baliga, H. Peter Dachler, and Chester A. Schriesheim, eds., *Emerging Leadership Vistas* (Lexington, MA.: Lexington Books, 1988), 222-26.

23. For example see, Thomas Sergiovanni, *Moral Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992), xiii. Sergiovanni argues that "rich leadership practice cannot be developed if one set of values or one basis of authority is simply substituted for another. What we need is an expanded theoretical and operational foundation for leadership practice that will give balance to a full range of values and bases of authority." He refers to this expanded foundation as the *moral dimension in leadership*.

24. John Gardner, *On Leadership* (New York: Free Press, 1990), 77.

25. Since most of my work has been in business ethics, I use that field as an example. Few philosophers would attempt to write about a topic in business ethics without doing research into that area of business, yet a number of business scholars over the years have felt no discomfort over writing about business ethics without doing research into ethics. If you look at what is considered the best work in business ethics, you will not find research that is only business or only philosophical ethics. A good example of the ideal mix is Ed Freeman and Dan Gilbert's *Corporate Strategy and the Search for Ethics* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1988).

26. Extensive work has been done on leadership in political science, but this research is not well integrated into the business/psychology literature. One might argue that because the discussion of leadership is so much a part of political science, it is not noticeable as a separate field, except perhaps for presidential studies. It is, however, interesting to note that Barbara Kellerman's anthology on political leadership is interdisciplinary. See, Barbara Kellerman, ed., *Political Leadership: A Source Book* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1986). It draws from political science, philosophy, economics, history, and sociology. Yet if one looks at the references in Bass and Stogdill, the lion's share of them are from management and psychology and very few from political science or other fields. Extensive work has also been done on leadership in military

academies. For example see, Howard Prince and associates, eds., *Leadership in Organizations*, 3rd edition (West Point, NY: United States Military Academy, 1988).

27. Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 20.

28. A recent example of a leadership textbook is Richard Hughes, Robert Ginnett, and Gordon J. Curphy, *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience* (New York: Irwin, 1993).

29. James G. Hunt has published eight collections of symposia papers on leadership. Note the language in the titles of these books, "Current Developments," "Leadership Frontiers," "The Cutting Edge," "Beyond Establishment Views," and "Emerging Vistas." One senses that Hunt is trying to capture something that keeps falling through scholars' fingers like sand. These are the 8 collections: E. A. Fleishman and J. G. Hunt, eds., *Current Developments in the Study of Leadership* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press, 1973); J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson, eds., *Contingency Approaches to Leadership* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press, 1974); J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson, eds., *Leadership Frontiers* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press, 1975); J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson, eds., *Leadership: The Cutting Edge* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press, 1977); J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson, eds., *Crosscurrents in Leadership* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1979); J. G. Hunt, U. Sekaran, and C. A. Schriesheim, eds., *Leadership: Beyond Establishment Views* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1982); J. G. Hunt, D. M. Hosking, C. A. Schriesheim, and R. Stewart, eds., *Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on Managerial Behavior and Leadership* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1984); James G. Hunt, B. Rajaram Baliga, H. Peter Dachler, and Chester A. Schriesheim, eds., *Emerging Leadership Vistas* (Lexington MA: Lexington Books, 1988).

30. Kuhn, 20.

31. Rost, 6-7.

32. In J. G. Hunt's symposia (opus cited) and in other articles on leadership, scholars constantly lament that they have done so much studying and know so little about leadership. Yet the same scholars who lament this fact do little to change the way that they do research.

33. Rost, 6.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid., 99.

36. The theory of meaning that I have in mind is from Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, tr. G. E. M. Anscomb, 3rd edition (New York: Macmillan 1968), 18-20, 241.

37. Rost, 47 from: B. V. Moore, "The May Conference on Leadership," *Personnel Journal*, vol. 6 (1927): 124.

38. Ibid., 47 from: E. S. Bogardus, *Leaders and Leadership* (New York: Appelton-Century, 1934), 5.

39. Ibid., 48 from: E. B. Reuter, *Handbook of Sociology* (New York: Dryden Press, 1941), 133.

40. Page 50. The bracket part is Rost's summary of the definition from: C. A. Gibb, "Leadership," in G. Lindzey, ed., *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 2 (Cambridge, MA: Addison Wesley, 1954): 877-920.

41. Page 53. From: M. Seeman, *Social Status and Leadership* (Columbus: Ohio State University Bureau of Educational Research, 1960), p. 127.

42. Page 59, R. N. Osborn and J. G. Hunt, "An Adaptive Reactive Theory of Leadership," in J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson, eds., *Leadership Frontiers* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1975), 28.

43. Page 72. From S. C. Sarkesian, "A Personal Perspective," in J. H. Buck and L. J. Korb, eds., *Military Leadership* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981), 243.

44. Page 102.

45. Burns criticizes leadership studies for bifurcating literature on leadership and followership. He says that the leadership literature is elitist, projecting heroic leaders against the drab mass of powerless followers. The followership literature, according to Burns, tends to be populist in its approach, linking the masses with small overlapping circles of politicians, military officers and business people. See Burns (1979), 3.

46. One's choice of a definition can be aesthetic and/or moral and/or political (if you control the definitions, you control the research agenda).

47. Rost, 161.

48. Leaders carry their own normative baggage in their definitions. For example:

"A leader is a man who has the ability to get other people to do what they don't want to do, and like it" (Harry Truman).

"Clean examples have a curious method of multiplying themselves" (Gandhi).

"Whatever goal man has reached is due to his originality plus his brutality" (Adolf Hitler).

"If we do not win, we will blame neither heaven nor earth, only ourselves" (Mao). These examples are from G. D. Paige's book, *The Scientific Study of Political Leadership*, 66. They are taken from Barbara Kellerman's *Leadership: Multidisciplinary Perspectives* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984), 71-72.

49. This is from Ron Heifetz's book *Leadership Without Easy Answers* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap/Harvard University Press, 1998), 17-18.

50. See, Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus, *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge* (New York: Harper Collins, 1985), 45.

51. The leader/manager distinction is a troublesome one in the leadership literature. One problem is that *leadership* is a hot word these days, and the current trend is to put leadership in the title of books on traditional management subjects. If we look at the formal positions of leaders and managers in organizations, the leader's job requires a broader perspective on the operation and on the moral significance of policies and actions of the organization (this is part of the "vision thing"). The manager's perspective is narrower than a leader's. A manager's job is to ensure that people complete a project or set of tasks. In ethical terms, this element of leadership boils down to thinking about actions in terms of how they impact on the organization as a whole and in the long run. In the ethics seminars that I have run for corporate managers, I have noticed that the managers who tend to take a big picture view of particular ethical problems are most often the ones who have been identified as having the greatest leadership potential. So Bennis and Nanus do seem to be right. However, it is not that managers are unethical, but rather that they have a narrower moral perspective that is in part dictated by the way in which they respond to the constraints and pressures of their position. Managers are also subject to Kant's old adage that "ought implies can."

52. Here Aristotle's discussion of excellence (*areté*) would be useful. Aristotle says that excellent actions must be good in themselves and good and noble. See the argument in Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book I, sections 6-8 (1096a12-1098b8). Later in Book II, sections 13-16 (31104b), Aristotle argues that a virtuous person has appropriate emotions along with dispositions to act the right way. Virtue then is being made happy by the right sort of thing.

53. See E. A. Fleishman, "The Description of Supervisory Behavior," *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 37 (1953): 1–6.

54. Results from the earlier and later Michigan studies are discussed in R. Likert's books, *New Patterns of Management* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961) and *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967).

55. See P. Hersey and K. H. Blanchard, *The Management of Organizational Behavior*, 5th edition (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1993).

56. It would be worthwhile to look at some of the studies and ask how the subjects with high/high orientations solve ethical problems. Do they tend to find themselves trapped in between deontic and consequentialist approaches to the problem? Are people who score high on the task scale consequentialists when it comes to approaching ethical problems? etc.

57. See Gary Yukl, *Leadership in Organizations*, 2nd edition (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1989), 96.

58. Old metaethical problems such as David Hume's problem of "drawing an ought from an is," G. E. Moore's naturalistic fallacy and more recent discussions of ethical realism take on a certain urgency in applied ethics. I find that the more work that I do in applied ethics the more I lean toward the position that moral discourse is cognitive in that it expresses propositions that have truth value. However, I am still uncomfortable with drawing moral prescriptions from "scientific" studies of leadership. I have not really worked out a coherent position on these points of moral epistemology. For a good discussion of these issues see, Geoffrey Sayre-McCord, ed., *Essays on Moral Realism* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1988). I find David Wiggins' and Geoffrey Sayre-McCord's articles on ethical realism to be particularly compelling.

59. This is the argument that the sciences provide explanation and the humanities understanding. See Chapter 1 of G. H. von Wright, *Explanation and Understanding* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971).

60. In most journal articles, authors, including this one, offer stipulative definitions. These definitions make clear how concepts are being used in the chapter. They are not meant to be universal definitions.

61. We need a better picture of what a leader ought to be in order to educate and develop leaders in schools and organizations.

62. Burns uses the terms *transforming* and *transformational* in his book. However, he prefers to refer to his theory as *transforming* leadership.

63. I think that Burns is sometimes overly sanguine about the universal truth of these theories of human development.

64. James MacGregor Burns (1978), 42–43.

65. Rost (1991), xii.

66. I am very grateful to Professor Burns for the discussions that we have had on the ethics of leadership. Burns' reflections on his work as a biographer have led me to this conclusion.

67. For example, see Burns' discussion of Roosevelt's treatment of Joe Kennedy, 32–33.

68. One of the problems with using the values approach to ethics is that it requires a very complicated taxonomy of values. The word *value* is also problematic because it encompasses so many different kinds of things. The values approach requires arguments for some sort of hierarchy of values that would serve to resolve conflicts of values. To make values something that people do rather than just have, Milton Rokeach offers a very awkward discussion of the ought character of values. "A person phenomenologically experiences

"oughtness" to be objectively required by society in somewhat the same way that he perceives an incomplete circle as objectively requiring closure." See Milton Rokeach, *The Nature of Human Values* (New York: The Free Press, 1973), 9.

69. Burns (1978), 426.

70. *Ibid.*, 3.

71. *Ibid.*, 426.

72. The third test has an Aristotelian twist to it. The relationship of leaders and followers and the ends of that relationship must rest on *eudaimonia* or happiness that is understood as human flourishing or as Aristotle says "living well and faring well with being happy." Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book I (1095a19) from Jonathan Barnes, ed., *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, vol. II (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 1730.

73. Burns (1979), 424.

74. Bernard Bass, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations* (New York: Free Press, 1985). Bernard Bass and Paul Steidlmeier, "Ethics, Character, and Authentic Transformational Leader Behavior," *The Leadership Quarterly* 10, 2 (1999): 181-217.

75. Judith Rosner, "Ways Women Lead," in *Harvard Business Review*, (Nov./Dec. 1990), 99-125.

76. Jay Conger, *The Charismatic Leader: Behind the Mystique of Exceptional Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989), xiv.

77. Bass (1985), 31.

78. For example, see Robert J. House, William D. Spangler, and James Woycke's study "Personality and Charisma in the U.S. Presidency," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 3 (Sept. 1991), 364-396. Their study looks at charisma in terms of the bond between leaders and followers and in terms of actual behavior of the presidents (p. 366). The question that lurks in the background of this research is: Is their relationship, in Burns' terms, morally uplifting? Is the behavior ethical? and, Is the process that takes place in the relationship between these charismatic presidents and their followers humanly enriching?

79. For a very provocative account of charismatic leadership from an anthropological point of view, see Charles Lindholm, *Charisma* (Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, 1990). Lindholm presents several case studies, including ones on Charles Manson and Jim Jones.

80. Greenleaf takes his theory from Hesse. See Robert K. Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership* (New York: Paulist Press, 1977). Hermann Hesse, *The Journey to the East* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1956).

81. The Robert K. Greenleaf Center in Indianapolis works with companies to implement this idea of leadership in organizations. The Robert K. Greenleaf Center, 1100 W. 42nd St., Suite 321, Indianapolis, IN 46208.

82. Greenleaf (1977), 13-14.