LEADERSHIP: PERSPECTIVES IN THEORY AND RESEARCH*
ARThUR G. JAGO†

Prominent trends in leadership research are reviewed. Theoretical perspectives are organized in a four-fold typology based on the dominating assumptions of the research effort: (1) the focus on a universally appropriate set of leadership traits, (2) the focus on a universally appropriate behavioral style, (3) the focus on situationally contingent leadership traits, and (4) the focus on situationally contingent behavioral styles. Potential organizational prescriptions following from each perspective are identified (e.g., selection, placement, training). It is argued that existing research has mapped only a portion of the domain of leadership phenomena due to a concentration on relatively few leadership constructs and because of the popularity of a limited set of empirical methodologies. Recent developments, promising new directions, and novel methods in leadership research are described.

(LEADERSHIP; ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR)

1. Introduction

Unlike “harder” sciences (e.g., physics, chemistry, biology) where well accepted “laws” may govern phenomena, the soft science of behavior in organizations remains an imprecise, inexact exploration into the causes and consequences of complex human interactions. Equivocal explanations of organizational events abound; each competing explanation, of course, often having unique implications for the practicing (or aspiring) manager trying desperately to apply social science knowledge toward solving the problems encountered in his or her organizational role.

Leadership research is no exception to this rule. Although thousands of empirical investigations of leaders have been conducted in the last 75 years, no clear and unequivocal understanding exists as to what distinguishes leaders from nonleaders and, perhaps more importantly, what distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders. Multiple interpretations of leadership phenomena exist, each providing some insight into the role of leader but each remaining an incomplete and wholly inadequate explanation of complex relationships. Although behavioral scientists have granted few topical areas greater research attention, the results of these efforts remain a bewildering melange for even the most serious student of organizations.

Sadly, the survey of leadership research to follow fails to resolve certain nagging contradictions produced in these years of research, and falls far short of filling some conspicuous holes in our accumulated knowledge. Nonetheless, this review does represent an attempt: (1) to organize and discuss a broad range of theories influencing leadership research over the years, (2) to identify important similarities and differences among these theories, and (3) to outline the major organizational implications stemming from each theoretical perspective. Clearly, no attempt is made to provide a comprehensive review of all the empirical evidence pertaining to each position. Indeed, such an in-depth critique of such evidence is beyond the scope of the present article and is available elsewhere [35], [54], [108].

2. Concepts and Definitions

Stogdill astutely notes that “there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept” [108, p. 7]. At the risk of being criticized for merely adding to this list, the following definition is offered in the hope of incorporating important aspects of several of its predecessors:

Leadership is both a process and a property. The process of leadership is the use of none coercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities of the members of an organized group toward the accomplishment of group objectives. As a property, leadership is the set of qualities or characteristics attributed to those who are perceived to successfully employ such influence.
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It is important to recognize what this definition includes and what it excludes. Leadership is not only some quality or characteristic that one possesses or is perceived to possess, it can be something that one does. It therefore can describe an act as well as a person. Leadership does not involve the use of force, coercion or domination and is not necessarily implied by the use of such titles as manager, supervisor, or superior. In this respect, the definition provides a conceptual distinction between leadership processes and motivational processes, the latter being the more appropriate domain for any discussion of the administration of discretionary rewards and punishments made possible by some formal authority structure. Leadership is therefore distinct from "supervision" or what might be termed "headship" [35], [58].

Leadership is expressed or displayed through interaction between people and necessarily implies its complement, "followership." For one to influence, another must permit himself to be influenced. Moreover, leader and follower(s) must be at least loosely organized around some common or agreed upon purpose or mission, the achievement of which is perceived to depend in part on the leader-follower relationship. A person who causes panic by shouting "Fire!" in a crowded theatre may indeed be influencing many lives. However, by our definition the individual would not be exhibiting leadership. On the other hand, a second person who may calm the same crowd and direct the achievement of an orderly evacuation would be exhibiting leadership.

Perhaps the most important feature of the above definition is that it does not restrict the role of leader to one formally designated member of a group or, for that matter, to any single group member. Leadership is an evolving, dynamic process. At times, leaders become followers and followers become leaders [50]. Moreover multiple leader roles may coexist in groups, each such role serving a different leadership purpose or function [3]. Although most of the research on leadership to be reviewed has been confined only to the study of managers and their structurally defined subordinates in work settings, our definition is far less restrictive than these studies would seem to imply.

With this definition of leadership in mind, it now becomes possible to sort, classify and categorize alternative theories of leadership. For this purpose two distinctions must be made:

**Universal vs. Contingent Theories**

Certain perspectives make the implicit assumption that what constitutes successful or effective leadership does not depend on the characteristics of the situation in which the leader operates. Leadership is proposed to be a general as opposed to specific phenomenon, that is, what constitutes effective leadership for the corporation president is essentially the same as that for the shopfloor foreman, clergyman, or Cub Scout den mother. Moreover, leadership is invariant within, as well as between, roles. Different circumstances encountered by the leader are not necessarily seen as requiring different forms of leadership. Because they propose that there exists a "one-best-way" to lead, such perspectives attempt to offer universal prescriptions for leadership.

On the other hand, alternative approaches propose that effective leadership depends on specific features of the leader's situation (e.g., characteristics of the task, characteristics of followers). These approaches propose certain situational variables that, when assessed, provide a situational diagnosis on which leadership prescriptions are based. These theories therefore provide contingent prescriptions for leadership; that is, prescriptions contingent on certain situational factors.

**Traits vs. Behaviors**

Secondly, perspectives differ in the way the leadership construct is conceptualized. It is possible to view leadership primarily in terms of relatively stable and enduring characteristics of people. Leadership can be viewed as a trait (or set of traits) distributed in some way among the population. In this sense, leadership is viewed as a measurable and quantifiable property possessed in different amounts by different people. Alternatively, it is possible to focus on observable leader behaviors rather than on inherent traits. From such a perspective, leadership exists primarily in the actions of the leader. Leadership is expressed in terms of overt behavior patterns rather than in terms of some intrinsic property or characteristic.

**TABLE 1**

A Typology of Leadership Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Leadership Construct</th>
<th>Theoretical Approach</th>
<th>Universal</th>
<th>Contingent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader Traits</td>
<td>Type I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Behaviors</td>
<td>Type II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1 combines these concepts to form a matrix of four ways in which to view leadership. From a Type I perspective, for example, leadership is viewed as a trait or characteristic likely to be possessed by the effective leader found in any group or organizational context. From a Type IV perspective, on the other hand, leadership is viewed primarily as a behavior or act, its effectiveness determined in part by situational features. Each of the four perspectives is entirely compatible with our definition of leadership and represents a potentially promising way of looking at leadership. As the following sections outline, moreover, each has stimulated substantial empirical and theoretical development.

3. Type I Perspectives: The Search for Universal Leadership Traits

From the turn of the century through the 1940's leadership research was dominated by attempts to show that leaders possessed some intrinsic quality or characteristic that differentiated them from followers. The search was directed toward identifying that property possessed by the likes of Napoleon, Hitler, Lincoln, Gandhi, Kennedy (and their lesser known counterparts in educational, military and industrial settings) that would ultimately prove to be the essence of successful and effective leadership. Research concentrated on the measurement and quantification of leadership traits and the relationship between such traits and criteria of leader effectiveness.

Leadership was not viewed as an independent property that was totally distinct and separate from the other 17,000 trait names used in our language to identify differences among people [1]. On the contrary, leadership was viewed as an abstract property the existence of which was explainable in terms of other more basic or fundamental traits distinguishing individuals. In this sense leadership was treated as a second-level trait construct composed of, or highly related to, more fundamental first-level trait constructs that included physical and constitutional factors, skills and abilities, personality characteristics and social characteristics. Empirical research was directed toward identifying these first-level traits, the cumulative outcome of which was a large number of personal characteristics apparently associated with and contributing to leadership.

Table 2 lists the prominent first-level traits which the research evidence suggests are related to leadership [4], [34], [62], [82], [108]. Presumably the more qualities or attributes contained in the list a person possesses, the more he or she is likely to be an effective leader.

The organizational implications stemming from a Type I perspective are potentially far-reaching. If leadership is indeed governed by the traits contained in Table 2, the selection of people most likely to be successful in positions of leadership—including political officials, industrial managers, PTA presidents—could be made in a relatively straightforward and mechanical manner. Replacing subjective methods and educated guesswork, a “leadership test” could be constructed to assess and weigh the various traits known to be associated with leadership. Administration of such a test to all candidates for a particular position would

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical and Constitutional Factors</th>
<th>Personality Characteristics</th>
<th>Social Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity, energy</td>
<td>Achievement drive, ambition</td>
<td>Cooperativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance, grooming</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Adjustment, normality</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>Popularity, prestige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alertness</td>
<td>Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antiauthoritarianism</td>
<td>Socioeconomic position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Tact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional balance, control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independence, nonconformity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insightfulness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill and Ability</td>
<td>Originality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative ability</td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Sense of humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical competence</td>
<td>Tolerance of stress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provide a quantitative estimate of their relative leadership potential and a basis for selecting the most promising individual.

Unfortunately, several features of Type I research prevent the development of such a test in spite of readily available techniques (e.g., I.Q. tests, personality inventories) that measure those first-order traits thought to be related to leadership. First, the relationships uncovered in Type I research are typically weak, albeit statistically significant. There are, for example, far too many exceptions to the general rule that effective leaders possess superior intelligence for this relationship to exhibit much practical utility.\(^1\) Superior intelligence far from guarantees leadership; average or below average intelligence in no way precludes leadership. Although intelligence and other traits are indeed known to be related to leadership, measures of such traits have been found to have extremely limited predictive value.

Second, the direction and strength of certain relationships apparently depend on certain situational contingencies. Gibb [35], Stogdill [108], and others note the existence of certain inconsistencies and contradictions among the results of Type I research that can only be explained if one rejects the notion of a universal leadership trait (or set of traits) and accepts the fact that those who are successful leaders in some situations may not necessarily be successful leaders in all situations. The relative importance of different leadership traits may depend upon the organizational setting, historical precedent, the nature of the specific goals or objectives of the group, task characteristics, and the traits and characteristics of followers. Among prison inmates, for example, Schrag [95] reports that informal leaders tended to be homosexual, neurotic and psychopathic—traits certainly not ascribed to all leaders or even to leaders in all prison settings [42].

Finally, there are potential problems with the most popular method for testing the existence of a leadership trait. The ideal Type I paradigm would involve a longitudinal comparison of effective and ineffective leaders engaged in similar if not identical leadership roles. However, unavoidable problems in the definition and measurement of “effectiveness” have forced many researchers to instead compare the traits of leaders to the traits of followers. The implicit assumption is that the person formally designated a leader (e.g., manager, supervisor or foreman) has, on the average, greater leadership than does the average person not so designated. This does, however, cause two potential problems in the interpretation of results. First, measurable distinctions between leaders and followers may say more about an inappropriate selection process employed to choose managers than about the nature of leadership itself. If, for example, intelligence is one factor considered in the decision to promote an employee to a managerial position, differences in levels of intelligence between managers and subordinates would be expected even if intelligence bears no relationship to the ability to lead. The apparent relationship between intelligence and leadership could merely be an artifact of an inappropriate and invalid promotion process. Second, a simple comparison of leaders and followers does not necessarily imply that the leadership “trait” preceded selection to the leadership role. Occupying a position of leadership may, for example, have the effect of increasing one’s self-confidence, an effect which might be expected regardless of who assumes the position. If this were the case, the relationship between leadership and self-confidence would be spurious, each variable being affected in a similar manner by a third variable (i.e., promotion to the position).

These and other problems led many researchers to abandon the search for a universal trait of leadership. Nonetheless, Calder [7] has recently advanced a theory that has rekindled interest in leadership traits. When compared to the typical Type I perspective, however, this theory takes a dramatically different approach in specifying the acquisition and functional value of such traits.

An Attribution Theory of Leadership

Calder suggests that leadership is indeed a disposition or trait but that it only need exist in the perceptions of others, particularly followers. According to Calder, leadership itself is not a viable scientific construct or variable. However, the process by which people infer that real or imagined leadership qualities exist in others is indeed important and is capable of scientific analysis. People label others as possessing or as not possessing leadership qualities and the manner in which those labels become attached is the foundation of an attribution theory of leadership. Notice that from this perspective, the leader (or potential leader) is not the focal person of scientific analysis. Instead, observers of the leader become focal as we attempt to understand the psychological processes that lead to certain perceptions, labels and attributions.

The attribution of leadership begins either with the actual observation of a person’s behavior and its consequences, with second-hand accounts of the person’s behavior or with “inferred observations” (i.e., simple observations which may imply the existence of otherwise unobserved behavior). These observations are then accepted or rejected as evidence of leadership on the basis of four rules or criteria: (1) Is the behavior distinctive? (2) Is the behavior typical of how leaders are expected to act? (3) Is the behavior either consistent across time and place or extreme?, and (4) Can other dispositional (or trait) causes of the observed behavior be rejected? Central to the process of answering these questions and to any ultimate attribution of leadership is the observer’s “implicit leadership theory” that specifies certain perceived differences between

\(^1\) In their literature reviews, Stogdill [108] reports a mean correlation coefficient of 0.28 and Mann [82] reports a median correlation coefficient of 0.25.
leaders and followers. Such implicit theories may have little validity and indeed may be quite contrary to some of the theories discussed in this review. Nonetheless these implicit theories provide the standard against which the behavior is evaluated for evidence that it indeed represents leadership.

Attribution theory has generated substantial research interest in recent years, although most empirical studies have been concerned with specific dispositional attributions other than leadership [64]. In a notable exception, however, Mitchell, Larson and Green [90] reveal that an outside observer of an interacting group will make inferred observations about the leader's behavior depending upon the perceived success or failure of the group in accomplishing its task. Although this study falls short of fully documenting an inferred leadership trait, the evidence suggests that a successful group can promote the inference that the leader must indeed be doing something right—that is, something distinctive and typical of how leaders should behave.

Also noteworthy, House [53] has advanced a theory of charismatic leadership consistent with—although not formally derived from—an attribution theory perspective. Charisma can be viewed as a special form or type of leadership—leadership inferred from the observation of behavior that has what might be called "charismatic effects" (i.e., effects which represent evidence of charisma as opposed to other leadership qualities or traits). Similar to the more general treatment of the attribution of leadership advanced by Calder, House places much less emphasis on defining and specifying the fundamental properties and traits of charisma than he does on specifying: (1) the nature of charismatic effects, (2) the conditions under which these charismatic effects will occur, and (3) the conditions under which one will be labeled as having charismatic qualities.

4. Type II Perspectives: Leadership Styles

After the early disappointments of Type I perspectives, research in the late 1940s began examining leadership in terms of the behavioral interaction between leader and follower. Leadership was viewed as an observable process or activity rather than an inherent, often unobservable, personal characteristic or trait.

For this Type II perspective, effective leaders were presumably distinguished from ineffective leaders not by how they behaved on an intelligence or personality test but rather by how they behaved when interacting with followers or potential followers. Type II research concentrated on two related issues. The first issue concerned the dimensionality of leader behavior. What meaningful categories or factors can be used to describe differences in leader behavior? What summary dimensions can be used to identify patterns—or "styles"—of leader behavior? The second issue concerned the relative effectiveness of different leader behaviors. What categories or factors seem to distinguish effective from ineffective leaders? What is the optimal leadership style?

Consideration and Initiating Structure

To address the dimensionality issue, a questionnaire was developed that initially contained 150 items designed to assess subordinates' perceptions of their leaders' actual behavior. Administered in both military [45] and industrial settings [26], responses to the questionnaires were factor analyzed to empirically determine the underlying factor structure or dimensionality of leader behavior. Two distinct factors emerged, their independence initially confirmed by later investigations in other settings [32], [43].

The first factor, labeled consideration (C), involves the degree of two-way communication and consultation, mutual trust, respect, and warmth a leader exhibits toward his followers. A leader would receive a high score on consideration if his subordinates would agree with descriptions such as "He makes those feel at ease when talking to them," "He is friendly and approachable," "He looks out for the personal welfare of group members," "He puts suggestions into operation." On the other hand a leader would receive a low score on consideration if his subordinates disagreed with these descriptions.

The second factor, labeled initiating structure (IS), involves the degree to which the leader defines and organizes relationships among group members and establishes well-defined channels of communication and methods of accomplishing the group's task. A leader would receive a high score on initiating structure if his subordinates would agree with descriptions such as "He assigns people to particular tasks," "He schedules the work to be done," "He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations," "He emphasizes deadlines." On the other hand, a leader would receive a low score on initiating structure if his subordinates disagreed with these descriptions.

It is important to emphasize that consideration and initiating structure are not opposite ends of a single leader behavior continuum, but are instead separate and conceptually independent dimensions. Therefore,

---

2On the basis of these studies the questionnaire was reduced to 40 items and named the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire or LBDQ [43]. Alternate forms of this instrument include the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire or LOQ [29], the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire or SBDQ [30], and the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire—Form XII or LBDQ—XII [107]. These different instruments, however, have produced different results leading to some confusion in the consideration/initiating structure literature [96].
in addition to the possibilities of being high in C and low in IS or of being low in C and high in IS, it is entirely possible to score high on both dimensions or low on both dimensions (or, of course, any combination in-between). The conceptualization of leader behavior in this two-dimensional fashion has generated far more research than a competing one-dimensional framework that referred to “employee-centered” versus “production-centered” supervision [66], [67].

The next step involved the identification of the optimal leadership style i.e., the most effective combination of consideration and initiating structure behaviors that a leader can display toward his followers. In a number of military, educational and industrial settings, leaders’ reliance on C and IS were measured and correlated with criteria such as (1) subordinate satisfaction, (2) subordinate performance, (3) subordinate, peer, or superior evaluations of leader performance. In a number of these studies [30], [33], [44], [48], [56], the analyses suggested the most effective leader was one who exhibited both high consideration (C) and high initiating structure (IS). The successful leader was one who developed good rapport and two-way communication with subordinates and who, at the same time, took an active role in planning and directing group activities.

These results also had potentially far-reaching prescriptive implications. Whereas Type I research attempted to identify those factors what would be useful in selecting leaders, Type II research attempted to identify those factors that would be useful in training leaders. Unlike relatively stable traits and characteristics, behavior patterns can be presumably changed through instruction and practice. Conceptualizing leadership in terms of the behavior patterns of the leader suggests that effective leadership is an acquired skill and can therefore be taught.

There is indeed some evidence that attitudinal and behavioral changes do result from leadership training involving self-assessment, lectures, groups discussions, case studies, films, role-playing and “sensitivity-training” [8], [108]. At the same time, however, there is remarkably little evidence to suggest that such changes have the intended effect of increasing group or organization effectiveness. Managers can indeed be trained to behave in ways characteristic of high consideration and high initiating structure but the expected pay-offs from such training are not necessarily realized [8].

Additional research concerning the consequences of different behavior patterns provides a potential explanation for the disappointing results of these training efforts. A number of studies indicate that under certain circumstances a behavior pattern emphasizing both consideration and initiating structure may not always be ideal [73], [75]. The effectiveness of C and IS may depend on: (1) follower needs and dependencies, (2) follower ability, (3) the degree of task structure, (4) the degree of intrinsic satisfaction associated with the task, (5) task pressure, (6) job level, (7) follower expectations, and (8) leader upward influence [55], [74]. Moreover, the effectiveness of C and IS apparently depends on one’s choice of criteria. Studies of production supervisors indicate that higher initiating structure is related to higher proficiency ratings (by upper management) but also to higher rates of grievances and turnover. On the other hand, higher consideration is related to lower proficiency ratings but also to lower rates of grievances and turnover [31], [32]. These results suggest the futility of attempting to identify a universally appropriate leadership style based on the consideration and initiating structure dimensions. Initially overlooked situational contingencies exist, rendering training in C and IS to be less applicable than first thought.

Nonetheless, one-best-way training designs having foundations in the early C and IS research persist. For example, Blake and Mouton’s [5] Managerial Grid program trains managers to exhibit both high “concern for production” and high “concern for people.” Despite the lack of unequivocal evidence supporting the training’s effectiveness [66], the program is widely adopted. Its simplicity contributes to its intuitive appeal, despite what others have labeled the “great hi-hi leader behavior myth” [76].

**Autocracy-Democracy**

At about the same time that substantial research interest was devoted to consideration and initiating structure, other researchers taking a Type II perspective were employing an autocracy-democracy dimension in their attempts to identify an optimal leadership style. At one end of the continuum, autocratic leadership is characterized by highly centralized decision-making and completely concentrated power. At the other end of the continuum, democratic leadership is characterized by highly participative decision-making and power-equilization. Although “styles” between these extremes are often proposed [47], [109], it is worth noting that most empirical research from this Type II perspective has treated these endpoints as if they represented an autocracy versus democracy dichotomy.

It is also worth noting that the notion of democratic leadership overlaps somewhat with the “consideration” dimension in the C and IS literature. Some items purported to measure consideration have a distinctly democratic flavor: (1) “He consults the group before acting,” (2) “He treats all group members as his equals,” and (3) “He gets group approval on important matters before going ahead” [29], [43]. Despite this overlap, the dimensions are far from identical. Consideration includes a host of behaviors not necessarily implied by a democratic leadership style (e.g., “he does personal favors for group members”).

Hypotheses concerning the relative effectiveness of autocratic and democratic leadership styles rely heavily on certain presumed benefits of participative decision-making and power-sharing. Morse and Reimer
[91] suggest that democratic leadership provides followers with the opportunity to express and fulfill individual needs in the course of accomplishing group goals. The opportunity for regulating and controlling their own activities enhances psychological identification with the group and its task and provides a means for satisfying ego-esteem and self-actualization needs through the work of the group rather than at its expense. Morale and group productivity may therefore both benefit from a democratic supervisory style.

In addition, democratic leadership is thought to directly enhance the effectiveness of managerial decisions [81], [113]. Participative decision-making provides a vehicle for follower information, expertise and creativity to be brought to bear on problems for which the leader's own information and knowledge may be insufficient. Moreover, power-sharing can create a climate where constructive conflict is encouraged, thereby insuring that important perspectives on a problem or decision are not overlooked. Aside from these benefits to the quality of decision, follower involvement may ease the implementation of a decision. First, the need to communicate the decision is reduced. By being actively involved in the process, followers are likely to understand the decision and their roles in implementing its provisions. Second, potential resistance to the decision is greatly reduced. Presumably, participation in the decision making process fosters ego involvement in the decision itself leading to a greater sense of commitment to the course of action chosen than if the same decision had been arrived at by more autocratic means.

If these benefits of democratic leadership do exist, the organizational implications once again involve training. To improve leadership effectiveness, one would provide the leader with instruction and practice in the behavioral pattern shown to be most effective—in this case, participative decision-making and power-sharing.

As in the case of C and IS however, no overwhelming evidence exists to support the initial predictions of proponents of democratic leadership. In the most comprehensive discussion to date of the relevant research evidence, Locke and Schweiger [78] review 46 studies testing the effects of participative decision-making on work group productivity and 43 studies testing the effects of participative decision-making on work group satisfaction. Employing productivity as the criterion, only 10 (22%) of the studies revealed democratic leadership to be superior to autocratic leadership. Of the remainder, 26 (56%) of the studies revealed no significant or no unequivocal differences and 10 (22%) actually suggested democratic leadership to be inferior. The results are only somewhat more supportive for the criterion of work group satisfaction. Twenty-six (60%) of the studies support the superiority of democratic leadership; 13 (30%) reveal no significant or no unequivocal evidence; 4 (9%) studies suggest democratic leadership to be inferior to autocratic leadership.

Reflecting on this evidence, Locke and Schweiger (and others [25]) conclude that the effects of democratic leadership may depend upon a number of contextual or situational variables including: (1) the extent of leader and follower knowledge and expertise, (2) follower motivation, (3) task attributes (e.g., complexity), (4) the degree of conflict over goals or means to attain goals, (5) leader attributes, (6) time pressures, (7) group and organization size, and (8) environmental stability.

The similarity between these conclusions and those reached in reviewing the research of Type I and other Type II perspectives is not coincidental. Each of these theoretical approaches has assumed the existence of a one-best-way to lead, that is, a universally appropriate set of traits or behaviors that distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders. The empirical evidence clearly reveals the lack of a basis for such a sweeping assumption.

**Leader Behavior: Cause or Effect?**

An implicit—if not explicit—assumption in Type II research is that leadership behavior causes or determines group and organizational outcomes; among these outcomes, follower satisfaction and performance. A correlation between “consideration” and “performance,” for example, is taken as evidence that higher levels of follower performance are caused by higher levels of consideration. An intervention designed to increase the frequency with which a manager displays considerate behavior would therefore be expected to produce a concomitant increase in follower satisfaction.

The expectation, however, may not be fulfilled. Using sophisticated methodological techniques designed to detect the direction of causation, several studies have challenged the conventional wisdom that leader behavior causes follower satisfaction and performance by revealing that the opposite can and does occur. In an elaborate simulation of an office setting, Lowin and Craig [79] report that supervisory personnel respond to more competent employees by displaying more considerate behavior, less initiating structure and less close supervision. As the apparent competence of the subordinate varied, so did the leadership style. Farris and Lim [16] report that leaders who believed that their subordinates were high performers displayed greater supportiveness and greater goal emphasis and were perceived to be more sensitive and nonpunitive than leaders who believed that their subordinates were low performers. Herold [49] and Greene [38], [40] report additional evidence suggesting that higher follower performance can cause increases in leader supportiveness and consideration and cause decreases in leader punitive and initiating structure. Crowe, Bochner and Clark [10] report that leaders become more democratic when followers exercise initiative, offer ideas and set goals and become more autocratic when followers are passive, request instructions and are unquestioning.
Other studies have gone beyond the leader-follower relationship and have examined the broader social environment for possible antecedents of leader behavior. Space prevents a detailed discussion of these investigations. However, the collective conclusion of these efforts is that work groups [28], [32], [60], functional departments [13], [47], hierarchical levels [6], [27], [47], [61], and entire organizations [116] develop unique “climates” or “cultures” favoring certain leadership practices. Through selection or socialization processes, managers entering such settings either already possess or quickly acquire the accepted leadership style. By their behavior they “fit in” thereby sustaining the norm and reinforcing the culture. Thus the broader context within which a leader operates may be as important an antecedent of leader behavior as his or her own predisposition.

5. Type III Perspectives: Fiedler’s Contingency Model

Disappointments with the Type I and Type II perspectives led scholars to conclude that “leadership depends on the situation.” Of course, this obvious truism could offer little insight or practical value unless certain precise situational contingencies could be specified and validated. The exact conditions under which different leadership traits or leadership behaviors would be effective required identification. Research of Types III and IV attempts to provide such theoretical and empirical elaboration by offering more complex leadership models that presumably come closer to representing the complexities of actual leadership effectiveness.

Type III research is concerned with specifying the conditions under which certain leader traits (rather than behaviors) are effective. However, Type III research has hardly exhausted the list of potential traits (Table 2) that may interact with situational variables to determine leader effectiveness. In fact, for over twenty years Type III research has been dominated by a single leadership model involving a single leadership trait. In developing a “Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness,” Fiedler and his associates [19], [20], [22] argue that group productivity is dependent upon the match between: (1) a personality trait labeled task versus relationship motivation, and (2) the “favorableness” of the leadership situation.

Task versus relationship motivation is measured by Fiedler’s Least Preferred Co-worker scale [22]. In completing the instrument, you are asked to think of the person whom you can work least well and to describe this person by placing one check mark on each of 16 eight-point bipolar adjective pairs similar to the following:

Unpleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Pleasant

Each item is scored from one to eight, with eight being the most favorable description. Your Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) score is simply the sum of the 16 item scores.

Interpreting your LPC score hinges on the assumption that your descriptions of your co-worker says more about you than about the person you have described. In essence, it is assumed that everyone’s least preferred co-worker is about equally “unpleasant” and that differences in descriptions of these co-workers actually reflect differences in an underlying personality trait among the people doing the describing. Although several competing interpretations of LPC scores exist [19], [22], [89], Fiedler has recently argued that there is little doubt that “high LPC leaders (i.e., leaders who describe their least preferred co-worker in relatively favorable terms) are basically more concerned with interpersonal relations, while low LPC leaders (i.e., leaders who describe their least preferred co-worker in relatively unfavorable terms) are more concerned with task-relevant problems” [21, p. 48].

The distinction between relationship-oriented and task-oriented leadership is somewhat similar to the distinction made in Type II research between considerate leader behavior and initiating structure leader behavior. In fact, Fiedler has used the terms “considerate leadership” and “structuring leadership” to refer to high LPC and low LPC leaders respectively [17], [18]. They are, however, far from identical concepts. First, relationship-motivated and task-motivated leadership are proposed to be opposite ends of a single continuum rather than distinct and independent dimensions. Second, relationship-motivated and task-motivated leadership are thought to represent relatively stable predispositions or personality traits rather than more transitory behavioral styles capable of change.3

Fiedler defines situation favorableness in terms of three critical dimensions listed here in their apparent order of importance:

(1) **Leader-Member Relations**—the degree to which group members trust and like the leader and are willing to follow his guidance.

(2) **Task Structure**—involves four elements: (a) the degree to which the requirements of the job are clearly stated (i.e., goal clarity), (b) the number of different ways in which the job can be performed (i.e., goal-path

3Similar parallels exist with the autocracy-democracy dimension proposed in Type II research. Fiedler [18] describes high LPC leaders as being “non-directive” and “permissive” while low LPC leaders are “directive” and “autocratic.”
multiplicity), (c) the degree to which the job provides knowledge of results (i.e., verifiability), and (d) the degree to which there exists an optimal solution or outcome for the task (i.e., specificity).

(3) Position Power—the degree to which there exists vested authority in the leadership position giving the leader the right to direct, evaluate, reward and punish group members.

Fiedler dichotomizes each critical dimension (good vs. poor leader member relations; structured vs. unstructured tasks; strong vs. weak position power) thereby producing eight combinations of situational characteristics. The most “favorable” of these combinations is the situation characterized by good leader member relations, a structured task and strong position power. The least “favorable” of these combinations is the situation characterized by poor leader member relations, an unstructured task and weak position power.

The most effective leadership trait (task-motivated vs. relationship-motivated) in various situations was arrived at inductively by correlating LPC scores with work group productivity scores for leaders in each of the eight combinations of situational characteristics [19]. These results, summarized in Table 3, reveal that task-oriented leaders tend to perform best in very favorable or in very unfavorable situations and that relationship-oriented leaders tend to perform best in moderately favorable situations. Inasmuch as these relationships were arrived at inductively employing a measure (LPC), the meaning of which is debatable, there are no unequivocal explanations for why the relationships exist as they do. Even without such explanations, however, the data are convincing enough for Fiedler to conclude that “it is simply not meaningful to speak of an effective leader or of an ineffective leader; we can only speak of a leader who tends to be effective in one situation and ineffective in another [19, p. 261].

If the effectiveness of a leader is indeed determined by the match between his LPC score and the favorableness of the situation, there are fewer implications for selection (as in Type I research) or for training (as in Type II research) than there are for the placement of managers in organizations. One need not hire (or otherwise select) only high or only low LPC people for positions requiring leadership. Nor should one try to train leaders to be more task-motivated or relationship-motivated. (Indeed, Fiedler is highly skeptical of the usefulness of such efforts since LPC is presumed to be governed by a stable personality trait that resists meaningful change.) Instead one should take care in placing leaders in situations likely to fit their leadership style: high LPC leaders in moderately favorable situations, low LPC leaders in either favorable or unfavorable situations.

In the event that such optimal placement is impossible, an alternative is to “engineer the job to fit the manager” [18]. On the assumption that it is easier to change the situation than to change the leadership style of the leader, this “engineering” consists of increasing or decreasing the situational favorableness of the situation to fit the leader’s LPC. A self-paced leadership education program called Leader Match [23], involves from four to twelve hours of self-assessment, situational diagnosis and instruction in the principles of the contingency model. In the case of a mismatch between a leader’s LPC score and the favorableness of his leadership situation, suggestions are given for: (1) changing leader member relations (e.g., “spend more—or less—informal time with your subordinates” [p. 154]); (2) modifying task structure (e.g., “break the job down into smaller subtasks which can be more highly structured” [p. 155]), and (3) modifying position power (e.g., “show your subordinates who’s boss by exercising fully the powers which the organization provides” [p. 157]; “call on members of your group to participate in planning and decision-making functions” [p. 157]). Evidence bearing on the usefulness of such training is not unequivocal. However, studies of the effectiveness of the Leader Match program reveal significant increases in the performance ratings of trained personnel when compared to control groups receiving no training [11], [24], [77].

The contingency model has generated considerable controversy among leadership scholars [2], [71], [72], [85], [94], [96], [97], [100], [101], [106], [111]. Although space prevents a thorough discussion of all the conceptual and methodological issues central to this debate, it is worth noting that arguments have been offered challenging: (1) the reliability and validity of LPC scores, (2) the measurement and evaluation of situational favorableness, and (3) the very existence of the proposed interaction between LPC and situational favorableness in determining effectiveness. By implication, these concerns also question the usefulness of the Leader Match program based on the model. Despite these criticisms, Fiedler recently noted that his contingency model is “one of the most researched and best-validated leadership theories at this time” [23, p. 3]. Even its detractors would agree, however, that the development of the contingency model challenged the naive assumption that there exists a one-best-way to lead and that the model provided a valuable first step toward conceptualizing leadership in terms of its situational dependencies.

6. Type IV Perspectives: Behavioral Contingencies

Like Fiedler’s model, Type IV perspectives also make the assumption that effective leadership depends on the situation. Unlike Fiedler’s model, however, effective leadership is defined in terms of behaviors rather than traits.

Whereas Fiedler’s model represents an attempt to resolve certain inconsistencies and contradictions in Type I research, Type IV research attempts to resolve similar inconsistencies and contradictions stemming from Type II research. In fact, two of the three positions to be described in this section (path-goal theory
### TABLE 3

*Fiedler’s Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Situation</th>
<th>Leader-Member Relations</th>
<th>Decreasing Situational Favorableness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Power</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship-Oriented (High LPC)</td>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>Mismatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented (Low LPC)</td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Leaders perform best when there exists a match between person and situation.
and the Vroon/Yetton model) are attempts to specify the situational contingencies that help to resolve some of the problems found in the consideration and initiating structure literature and in the autocracy-democracy literature. The third position, an operant conditioning model of leadership, has its roots in learning theory and is only indirectly related to previous leadership research.

**Path-Goal Theory**

Extending an initial formulation by Evans [15], House and his associates propose a path-goal theory of leadership [52], [55], [57]. From this perspective leadership is viewed in terms of both the motivating impact and the need satisfaction impact that the leader can have on followers; that is, effective leadership is thought to involve behaviors that increase follower performance and/or satisfaction by means of enhancing those psychological states that result in increased motivation or increased need satisfaction. It is labeled a path-goal approach in that leader behavior is expressed in terms of the leader's influence in clarifying the paths or routes followers travel toward work and personal goal attainment.

The theory consists of two propositions:

1. **Leader initiating structure** will contribute to the satisfaction of followers engaged in ambiguous (i.e., unstructured) tasks and contribute to the dissatisfaction of followers engaged in clear (i.e., structured) tasks.
2. **Leader consideration** will have its most positive effect on the satisfaction of followers engaged in clear (i.e., structured) tasks.

These hypotheses suggest that when task demands are unclear, or when formal procedures, regulations and policies are ambiguous, structuring behavior complements the task by providing the required guidance and instruction likely to clarify expectations and the paths to goal accomplishment. On the other hand, when task demands are self-evident, as in the case of highly routinized or formalized work roles, followers may resent a leader's attempt to initiate further structure. Such behavior may do little to further clarify path-goal relationships and may be viewed as excessively directive and unnecessarily restrictive. Instead, the effective leader in a structured situation engages in personally supportive behavior which provides a source of extrinsic rewards for followers. Such extrinsic rewards reduce the frustration and stress that presumably accompany a highly structured task having little challenge and few sources of intrinsic satisfaction.

Research pertaining to these hypotheses, however, has produced mixed results. Schriesheim and Von Glinow [98] cite six studies supporting the first hypothesis and the same number of studies failing to support

---

4 Those familiar with theories of motivation will recognize that the term path-goal is derived from expectancy theory [112]. Expectancy theory predicts that an individual's motivation to perform a given act is a function of: (1) his beliefs that the act will lead to outcomes (i.e., expectancies), (2) his beliefs that these outcomes can be instrumental to the attainment of other outcomes (i.e., instrumentalities) and (3) the subjective value or utility he assigns to each outcome (i.e., valences). Expectancy theory provides a conceptual base for the path-goal theory of leadership, the latter being an attempt to specify where the leader can intervene in the motivational process to secure effort, performance and follower satisfaction.

5 In a revision of the theory, House and Dessler [55] employ the labels instrumental and supportive leadership rather than the conceptually similar initiating structure and consideration labels. House and Mitchell [57] also consider the potential effects of participative leadership and achievement-oriented leadership as additional leader behavior constructs. Griffin [41] adds maintenance leadership, a minimum-interference leader behavior strategy.
the hypothesis. They cite five studies supporting the second hypothesis and four studies failing to support the hypothesis.\(^6\) Explanations offered to account for such inconsistencies often center on the difficulties of measuring the relevant variables contained in the theory and on differences in the procedures and questionnaires employed in different studies [96], [98], [99]. Of course it is also possible that the theory is incorrect or that available tests of the theory have considered too few situational variables (i.e., only task structure) that may moderate the leader behavior-follower response relationship. With regard to this last point, it should be noted that promising research is now being conducted to examine the possible moderating effects of follower characteristics (e.g., [14]), of task dimensions other than task structure [52], [63], and of complex combinations of task and follower characteristics [41].

Like the other Type IV approaches to leadership to be discussed, path-goal theory represents a relatively recent contribution to the leadership literature and is currently a subject of extensive empirical scrutiny by leadership scholars. Should their efforts support path-goal predictions the organizational implications will be similar to those growing out of Type II research. Leadership training (as opposed to selection or placement) would be prescribed. However training would not only be focused on the acquisition of new behavioral styles. Skills in diagnosing the leadership situation and rules for matching the appropriate behavior to the situation would be emphasized. Leaders would not only be trained to exhibit initiating structure and consideration but would also be taught the specific conditions or circumstances under which each is likely to contribute to follower motivation and satisfaction. In essence, leaders would be taught how to adapt their behavior to the demands of the situation.

An Operant Conditioning Prescriptive

Having roots in Skinnerian [104] learning theory, the operant conditioning perspective on leadership examines the effect that rewards and punishments can have in reinforcing particular behavior patterns of followers. Leadership is viewed in terms of the process by which a leader or manager motivates and “shapes” the behavior of followers or subordinates by controlling the consequences associated with various behaviors. The perspective is a contingency theory of behavioral leadership (a type IV perspective) in that a leader’s greatest impact on followers is hypothesized to exist through the rewards and punishments he or she makes contingent on their performance levels.\(^7\)

Studies of MBA students [102], financial managers [93], hospital employees [103], retail store managers [92], employees of a manufacturer of capital equipment [69], [70], and employees of insurance, R&D and chemical companies [39], reveal consistent results for the effects of positive rewards (e.g., praise) but certain inconsistencies in the effects of punitive rewards (e.g., reprimand). Making positive rewards contingent on high levels of performance is indeed associated with higher overall levels of follower performance [39], [92], [102], [103], and higher levels of subordinate satisfaction [39], [69], [70], [93], [103]. Making punitive rewards contingent on low levels of performance, however, has been shown in some studies to be related to lower overall levels of performance [92], [102] and satisfaction [39], [70] and, in other studies, to higher overall levels of performance [39] and satisfaction [93], [103].

Although the evidence regarding punitive behavior is inconclusive, results do clearly suggest that making positive rewards contingent on performance will motivate followers and provide for their need satisfaction. Although few documented examples exist, training in the administration of such rewards will presumably increase the leader’s ability to control or shape follower behavior thus increasing the predictability and desirability of follower responses to situations [46], [80]. A number of studies, for example, reveal the potential benefits of making pay contingent on performance (e.g., [65]). Presumably applications involving other, more informal rewards available to the leader (e.g., praise, encouragement, increased responsibility) would similarly increase follower motivation.

It is noteworthy that the principal predictions of an operant conditioning approach to leadership can be interpreted in terms of the path-goal theory previously discussed [54].\(^8\) From a path-goal perspective, the leader who employs contingent rewards is clarifying paths to desired goals by making the “satisfaction of subordinates’ needs contingent on effective performance” [25, p. 254]. Both path-goal and operant conditioning approaches are remarkably similar in suggesting that the leader will have a motivating impact upon followers to the extent that the leader makes rewards contingent on successful accomplishment of the task and on the attainment of group goals and objectives.

---

\(^6\)Research conducted after the Schriesheim and Von Glinow review also presents mixed results [110].

\(^7\)To the extent this framework deals with the effects of *formal* rewards and punishments, it is more appropriately discussed as a theory of motivation rather than of leadership. Research efforts to date, however, have not made an explicit distinction between the effects of formal (e.g., pay) and informal (e.g., praise) mechanisms and, for completeness, these efforts are discussed here.

\(^8\)The reverse has also been proposed. Mawhinney and Ford [84] argue that evidence favoring path-goal theory can be interpreted in terms of the principles of operant conditioning.
The Vroom/Yetton Model

When compared to either the path-goal or the operant conditioning theory, the Vroom/Yetton model [118] is more explicit in its predictions but much more narrow in its focus. Although the relationship between a leader and set of followers is recognized as having many dimensions, Vroom and Yetton concentrate only on the behavior of a formally designated leader in the specific decision-making situations he or she encounters. Recognizing the lack of overwhelming evidence favoring either an autocratic or democratic decision making style, they attempt to specify the specific situational contingencies likely to govern the effectiveness of several decision making strategies. Following Maier [81], Vroom and Yetton propose that the effectiveness of a decision is a function of three classes of outcomes, each of which may be expected to be affected by the decision process used. These are:
1. The quality or rationality of the decision.
2. The acceptance or commitment on the part of subordinates to execute the decision effectively.
3. The amount of time required to make the decision.

Table 4 contains the taxonomy of decision processes available to the leader when faced with a problem or decision. Each process is represented by a symbol (e.g., AI, CI, GII) which provides a convenient method of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Vroom/Yetton Decision Making Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>You solve the problem or make the decision yourself using the information available to you at the present time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AII</td>
<td>You obtain any necessary information from subordinates, then decide on a solution to the problem yourself. You may or may not tell subordinates the purpose of your questions or give information about the problem or decision you are working on. The input provided by them is clearly in response to your request for specific information. They do not play a role in the definition of the problem or in generating or evaluation alternative solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>You share the problem with the relevant subordinates individually, getting their ideas and suggestions without bringing them together as a group. Then you make the decision. This decision may or may not reflect your subordinates' influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII</td>
<td>You share the problem with your subordinates in a group meeting. In this meeting you obtain their ideas and suggestions. Then you make the decision which may or may not reflect your subordinates's influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GII</td>
<td>You share the problem with your subordinates as a group. Together you generate and evaluate alternatives and attempt to reach agreement (consensus) on a solution. Your role is much like that of chairperson, coordinating the discussion, keeping it focused on the problem and making sure that the critical issues are discussed. You can provide the group with information or ideas that you have but you do not try to &quot;press&quot; them to adopt &quot;your&quot; solution and are willing to accept and implement any solution which has the support of the entire group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9The version of the model presented here is concerned with what Vroom and Yetton call "group problems," i.e., problems affecting more than a single subordinate of the manager. An extension of the model to "individual problems" (i.e., problem affecting only a single subordinate) is discussed by Vroom and Jago [116].
referring to it. The letters in the code signify the basic properties of the process (A stands for autocratic; C for consultative; G for group). The roman numerals that follow the letter constitute variants on that process. Thus AI represents the first variant on an autocratic process. All the second variant, and so on.

Choice from among these available decision processes is prescribed by the decision tree contained in Figure 1 [118]. Arranged along the top of the tree are eight problem attributes, expressed here in the form of simple Yes-No questions that a leader could ask himself about the decision-making situation he is presently confronting.10 To use the model, one starts at the left-hand side of the tree and works toward the right-hand side, asking oneself the questions pertaining to any box that is encountered. When an endpoint on the tree is reached, a number will be found designating the problem type and one or more decision-making processes (called the “feasible set”) considered appropriate for that problem.

Of course, the decision processes specified for each problem type are not arbitrary. The specification of the feasible set of decision processes for each problem type is governed by a set of seven contingency rules that serve to protect the quality and acceptance of the decision by eliminating alternatives that risk one or the other of these decision outcomes (e.g., “If the quality of the decision is important and the leader does not possess sufficient information or expertise to solve the problem alone, the AI is eliminated from the feasible set.”). The decision tree is merely a convenient structure for applying these rules, and, once the problem type has been determined, the rules have all been applied. It can be seen that there are some problem types for which only one method remains in the feasible set, and others for which two, three, four, or even five methods remain in the feasible set.

Only two empirical investigations have examined the validity of the Vroom/Yetton model. In the first of these studies, Vroom and Jago [117] compared the rated effectiveness of 117 managerial decisions reached through use of a process within the problem’s feasible set with the rated effectiveness of 64 other decisions reached through use of a process outside the problem’s feasible set. The evidence favored the Vroom/Yetton model and each of its underlying tenets. This study, however, did not provide a completely independent measure of decision effectiveness. A second, more ambitious study by Margerison and Glube [83] examined the relationship between an index of overall conformity to the prescriptions of the Vroom/Yetton model and the success of 45 owner-managers of identical retail franchises. Those owners exhibiting greater conformity to the Vroom/Yetton prescriptions had more economically productive franchises and had employees who reported greater job satisfaction than did those owners exhibiting less conformity to these prescriptions.

The training implications of the Vroom/Yetton model are quite clear: if the model is valid, more effective leadership in decision-making situations will result if leaders are taught to use the model to guide the choice of the appropriate levels of subordinate participation. Vroom [114] describes a technology designed to accomplish such learning. Prior to training, each participant completes a problem set containing from 30 to 54 hypothetical decision making situations. The trainee is asked to consider each case and to choose the level of participation he or she would permit if the situation were real and he or she was the leader depicted. Responses are then analyzed by a computer program that produces a three to seven page individualized printout that compares the responses of the trainee both with the behavior prescribed by the normative model and with the average or modal behavior of other trainees. After training in the model and practice in its use, trainees receive their printouts and are given guidance in interpreting their scores. Although quite preliminary, analyses of the training’s effectiveness are encouraging [153], [168].

Managers’ responses to the hypothetical problem set cases are also employed to generate descriptive models of leader behavior that are then compared to the specific Vroom/Yetton normative prescriptions [59], [116], [118]. Although these studies fall short of providing information about actual leader behavior in real situations, the evidence does suggest that a leader’s willingness to employ participative decision making techniques is governed more by the unique characteristics of a decision making situation encountered than by some invariant autocracy-democracy “style.” Leaders are more willing to use participation in situations which require a high quality, technically adequate, solution than in situations which seem rather trivial or have no technical component. Leaders exhibit greater participation on those problems in which they lack relevant information or expertise, particularly if the problem is unstructured as opposed to structured. Leaders exhibit more participation on problems that require subordinate acceptance and commitment than on problems that do not, especially if they lack the power to gain that acceptance from an autocratic decision. Leaders are more participative when followers share organizational goals than when they do not and when potential conflict among followers over preferred solutions is low rather than high.

In many ways these behavioral tendencies are quite similar to the rules underlying the Vroom/Yetton decision tree. In fact, analyses of reported and prescribed behavior reveal that a leader’s level of participation fully conforms to the prescriptions of the normative model (i.e., falls within the prescribed feasible set) in about two-thirds of all instances [116], [118]. Departures from the Vroom/Yetton feasible set are more often due to violations of those rules designed to protect decision acceptance rather than due to violations of rules designed to protect decision quality.

---

10For a detailed definition of these attributes and of criteria to be used in making Yes-No judgments, see Vroom and Yetton [118, pp. 21–31].
A. DOES THE PROBLEM POSSESS A QUALITY REQUIREMENT?

B. DO I HAVE SUFFICIENT INFO TO MAKE A HIGH QUALITY DECISION?

C. IS THE PROBLEM STRUCTURED?

D. IS ACCEPTANCE OF DECISION BY SUBORDINATES IMPORTANT FOR EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION?

E. IF I WERE TO MAKE THE DECISION BY MYSELF, IS IT REASONABLY CERTAIN THAT IT WOULD BE ACCEPTED BY MY SUBORDINATES?

F. DO SUBORDINATES SHARE THE ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS TO BE ATTAINED IN SOLVING THIS PROBLEM?

G. IS CONFLICT AMONG SUBORDINATES OVER PREFERRED SOLUTIONS LIKELY?

---

**FIGURE 1.** Vroom/Yetton Decision Process Flow Chart.
7. Conclusions: Toward New Directions in Leadership Research

The four-fold typology employed in this review is designed to provide a useful vehicle for organizing the dominant trends in prior leadership research. The rows and columns of the matrix (Table 1) represent the underlying assumptions made and orientations taken by different leadership scholars. The intersection of rows and columns produce cells in the matrix representing the different theoretical perspectives possible when these assumptions and orientations are combined. Classification of specific theories of leadership in the different cells provides the opportunity to compare approaches on the basis of their common sets of assumptions (i.e., shared rows or columns) and the opportunity to contrast these same approaches on the basis of any unique sets of assumptions (i.e., unshared rows or columns). Moreover, the typology has been used to identify historical trends in leadership research and to indicate how particular perspectives represent outgrowths of others.

It may seem tempting to single out one perspective on leadership (or, more narrowly, one theory of leadership within a given perspective) as having contributed the greatest knowledge or as having the greatest practical utility. To make such a judgement, however, would inappropriately undervalue the very real contributions made in other approaches. Moreover, it makes little sense to view different leadership theories as necessarily competing theories. Although sometimes implied by the proponents of an approach, no leadership theory can rightfully claim comprehensive treatment of the entire domain of leadership phenomena. Because at least some empirical support is available for each perspective, leadership appears to be a far more complex set of cause-and-effect relationships than suggested by any one of the comparatively simple theoretical models offered to date.

It must also be remembered that the evidence accumulated within the boundaries of each of the four perspectives, while somewhat supportive of propositions and hypotheses, is also to some degree either incomplete, inconclusive, contradictory or controversial. Although it is clear that thousands of scholarly efforts have greatly advanced our understanding of leadership phenomena, it is also clear that much is left to be learned. Certain unanswered questions alone prevent any one perspective from standing out as singularly superior to all others.

Much future research will undoubtedly be directed toward testing and refining existing leadership approaches. Within the framework of a single theory, research will be designed to satisfy critics of previous studies, to resolve certain anomalies and contradictions apparent in existing evidence, or to test yet untested hypotheses and propositions derived from the theory. Due to measurement problems only briefly mentioned in this review, much of this research will concentrate on methodological refinements rather than on substantive issues.

Other research will go beyond existing theories and paradigms thereby broadening the knowledge base. And much of this research will easily lend itself to classification in our four-fold typology. Particularly valuable will be those approaches that extend the dimensions of leader behavior beyond the overly simple one-dimensional or two-dimensional formulations characteristic of much of the existing Type II and Type IV research. Also valuable will be those efforts directed at specifying the precise situational contingencies that govern the effectiveness of various leadership traits. As the only prominent representative of Type III research, Fiedler's "Contingency Model" has far from exhausted the list of traits for which such contingencies might exist.

Still other research, however, may not be so amenable to easy classification in our four-cell matrix. Novel leadership perspectives with unique sets of assumptions and theoretical orientations may provide new ways to examine and interpret leadership phenomena. To accommodate these new perspectives, additional ways of sorting or classifying approaches may become important. If some isolated (although notable) contributions to leadership research become trends, the following conceptual distinctions may prove useful in an eventual expansion of the dimensionality of our four-fold typology:

**Leadership vs. Supervision**

Following Jacobs [58], the definition of leadership proposed in this review suggests a distinction between leadership processes and supervisory processes. Leadership involves the influence of group members through interpersonal processes without resort to the authority or power derived from an employment contract. Supervision, on the other hand, involves the influence of group members through the use of formal rewards and punishments and through the exercise of contractual obligations. This distinction seems particularly important if leadership as a research topic is to evolve into an area conceptually and empirically independent of other areas of scientific inquiry (e.g., motivation, control). At present, the boundaries of different areas often overlap, as illustrated by the heavy influence of motivation theories in both path-goal and operant conditioning leadership theories. This has led not only to substantial confusion regarding what leadership is and is not but also to the extreme view that definitional problems suggest leadership itself should be abandoned as a researchable topic [86]. No opportunity to discount such arguments will be available unless future research is more careful in defining the domain of leadership vis à vis other explanatory constructs.
Dyadic vs. Group Processes

Advancing this distinction between leadership and supervision, recent work by Graen and his associates \cite{12, 36, 37} suggest that a person in a position of formal authority may “lead” some subordinates but merely “supervise” others. Managers differentiate subordinates into in-group members (i.e., the “trusted cadre” who receive leadership) and out-group members (i.e., the “hired hands” who receive supervision). Members of different subgroups respond differently to the managers and these differences can be important determinants of the relative performance and satisfaction of group members.

Graen and his colleagues have a legitimate criticism of the majority of prior leadership research that typically employs what is labeled the “average style” approach. Researchers using such an approach have assumed that behavior patterns on the part of a leader are stylistic in nature and similarly applied to all group members. Reported departures from such styles are treated as “random error” (in a statistical sense) and explained away with cursory references to measurement error, response bias, perceptual differences, etc. In concentrating on the “vertical dyad” (i.e., individual leader-follower relationships), Graen and his colleagues have demonstrated that these departures from some average are far from random and, in fact, are predictive of subsequent phenomena.

Advancing these results, future research should distinguish between leader behavior displayed only in a one-to-one relationship with individual followers and leader behavior displayed in a one-to-many relationship with a group. Graen’s research clearly indicates that there are important differences in the interpersonal dynamics of dyadic vs. group processes yet these differences have only begun to be identified.

Appointed vs. Emergent Leadership

As suggested in the introduction of this review (and reinforced by the discussion of the empirical evidence), the majority of research investigations have examined leadership within the context of a managerial role in a formal organizational setting. In addition to contributing to the confounding of leadership with supervision, this trend has produced little in the way of knowledge about the processes that lead to the development of informal leadership, i.e., the processes by which a group member becomes elevated to a position of status and leadership thereby attaining greater than average influence over peers.

Such processes may be quite important. It seems reasonable to speculate that many situations exist in which an informal leader within a group has much greater influence over fellow group members than does a formal leader appointed to a position of managerial authority over the group. Indeed, successful labor unionization efforts are often attributed to the emergence of a persuasive and powerful leader from the ranks of those led.

A notable exception to the absence of programmatic research on emergent leadership is work by Hollander \cite{50, 51}. This research documents that it is the conforming group member who is likely to attain elevation to a position of informal leadership. It is the contributing individual who has “paid his dues” who often becomes the high status member capable of ultimately redirecting the group and effecting changes in the same group norms toward which prior conformity was exhibited. Clearly additional systematic research concerning other possible determinants of emergent leadership is warranted. At the same time, care should be taken not to confuse the processes of effective appointed leadership and what may be very different processes of effective emergent leadership. At least one study suggests that these two types of leaders behave in very distinct ways \cite{9}.

Objective vs. Subjective Measures

Certainly most leadership studies have relied at least in part on either self-report measures of leadership constructs (e.g., reports of intended behavior in hypothetical situations employed in the Vroom/Yetton research) or on follower-report measures of such constructs (e.g., subordinate ratings of a manager’s level of Consideration and Initiating Structure). Yet recent developments in attribution theory raise some troubling issues in the interpretation of such subjective measures of behavior. To the extent self-description and followers’ descriptions are affected by perceptual biases, implicit theories and “inferred observations” that are invoked as a consequence of the leader’s impact or accomplishments, the evidence may be systematically distorted by attributional processes in a direction that may artificially inflate relationships between presumed leadership constructs and leadership consequences. Many of our “tests” of leadership theories may have actually produced nothing more than a specification of the implicit—and perhaps fallacious—“theories” adopted by our questionnaire respondents (e.g., “he is such an effective leader he must be considerate”).

Greater use of more objective measures of leader behavior, including direct and independent observation, is certainly required if the existence of such distortions is to be fully documented and prior evidence properly interpreted. Yet care must be taken not to rely exclusively on the experimental laboratory to provide the setting for such measures. Although carefully designed experiments provide the opportunity for structured observation minimally affected by observer bias, the short-term nature of the typical experiment and the
artificial setting within the laboratory often limit the external validity (i.e., generalizability) of results. Research methodologies with the realism of the field setting and the control of the laboratory are required.

This is not to imply that subjective assessments of leadership should be abandoned. Such assessments, however, should be recognized as containing potential distortions due to perceptual biases, selective recall, limited observables and inaccurate attributional mechanisms. Building on the theoretical development of Calder, research directed toward understanding the antecedents of these distortions is particularly appropriate.

Toward New Methodologies

These largely uncharted areas provide significant challenges for social scientists interested in understanding the development, dynamics and effectiveness of leadership processes. Literally thousands of studies have contributed substantial knowledge having implications for the selection, placement and training of leaders. However, we seem to know a great deal about only a few elements of leadership. Although existing research paradigms are not to be undervalued, it is clear that new methods and measures are required if leadership is to develop and mature as a subdiscipline within behavioral science. Efforts that depart from the ubiquitous concepts of “consideration,” “initiating structure,” “participation,” and “LPC” (and their respective pencil-and-paper measurement instruments) are necessary if research is to be broadened in some of the suggested directions.

Unfortunately, some critics of leadership research may view such efforts as further evidence of a fragmented literature lacking consistency and a programmatic thrust (cf., [86]). The less parochial view is that such efforts will begin to fill large gaps that exist in legitimate areas within the domain of leadership research. What is required, of course, is both programmatic refinements to existing theory and research and creative expansions into unexplored territory. The former will provide depth while the latter will provide breadth to a literature having substantial social and scholarly significance.11

11 An expanded version of this article was presented at the TIMS XXIV International Meeting, Honolulu, Hawaii, June, 1979. The author appreciates the helpful comments of L. Cummings, J. Ivancevich, D. Schweiger, A. Szilagyi, V. Vroom, and G. Wolf on a draft version of this manuscript.
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