RE-THINKING HOW WE DEVELOP LEADERS: A PROCESS APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Kathryn A. Welch, Ph.D
Vista Technologies, Inc.
Arlington, VA

James M. Young, Ed.D.,
Naval Aviation Training Systems (NAVAIR)
Arlington, VA

Marcia N. Murawski, Ed.D.
Vista Technologies, Inc.
Arlington, VA

ABSTRACT

US organizations spend millions of dollars each year on leadership training. Much of these expenditures go toward costly "personal growth" seminars. What are these organizations getting for their money? Conger (1993) says that, without paying attention to transfer-of-training, organizations can get "snake oil" for their effort and expense. Personal growth approaches, as well as conceptual, feedback, or skill-based approaches are also deficient, sometimes even when they are used in combination. This is because all these approaches: rely on mythology, have low content sufficiency, result in little transfer of training, aren't reinforced back on the job by the organizational infrastructure and support processes, fail to take a systems perspective, and are often one-shot attempts at achieving long-term change. This paper describes a process model (Welch, 1994) for an integrated, systems-oriented, developmental approach to leadership development. Additionally it proposes a methodology for implementing the approach and a brief discussion of early-stages of implementation in an ongoing case study. Limitations of the approach are discussed, as well as suggested modifications.

BIOGRAPHIES

Kathryn Welch is an instructional system developer for Vista Technologies, Inc. in Arlington, VA. She specializes in organizational behavior, particularly motivation, leadership, group processes, and social cognition in the workplace. With over nine years experience in the field of education and training, she holds master's and doctoral degrees in industrial-organizational psychology from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. She is a member of several professional organizations, including the American Psychological Association and the Academy of Management, and is the author or co-author of papers, presentations, and technical reports on leadership and managerial decision making.

Marcia Murawski is currently Vice President of Vista Technologies, Inc. She has over 18 years of experience in the analysis, design, development, and evaluation of training programs and systems. She manages the design and implementation of a 15-week Engineering Fundamentals course for Department of Energy scientists and engineers. She also works with NAVAIR's Aviation Training Systems Office to provide training for military and civilian personnel involved in the operation and maintenance of all Naval aviation weapons systems and equipment. Marcia works with both organizations to explore training effectiveness issues. Marcia holds a doctoral degree in instructional technology from the University of Virginia.

James Young is currently the Program Manager for the Navy's General Trainers Program. He is also responsible for advanced technologies, managing foreign military sales, overseeing training systems configuration management policies and procedures within NAVAIR, and providing representation for aviation training with senior officials of the military services. Additionally, Jim has management responsibility for the joint aspects of the Naval Aviation Systems Team Initiative to examine NAVAIR's business processes and core mission statements in order to streamline the NAVAIR organization. Jim holds a doctoral degree in education from East Texas State University.

RE-THINKING HOW WE DEVELOP LEADERS: A PROCESS APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

How comprehensive is your approach to leadership development? Is your approach up-to-date, while avoiding fads? U. S. organizations spend millions each year on leadership and management training, much of these expenditures going toward costly seminars. What are these organizations getting for their money? Without re-thinking the relevance of some of these approaches, organizations can get "snake oil" for their effort and expense (Conger, 1993). This paper describes the controversy over leadership development training, examines a proposed approach, and describes early stages in a pilot study application. In the following discussion, we shall use Conger's (1992; 1993) classification of leadership training approaches: personal growth, conceptual, feedback, and skills.

Leadership is defined here as an adaptive process of convincing others to set aside "for a period of time their individual concerns to pursue a common goal that is important to the responsibilities and welfare of the group" (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Leadership is a complex interactive process. Leadership development systems must focus on "maximizing prospective leaders' abilities to constructively and creatively work within their surroundings; adapt themselves to their surroundings, as necessary; and change their surroundings in some way" (Welch, 1994). Leadership-as-a-process isn't necessarily autocratic, or accompanied by "Pomp and Circumstance" or "Hail to the Chief." Indeed many argue persuasively that leadership is "incremental" --that is, leadership is the influence, inspiration and coalescing that occurs over and above the use of legitimate power or coercion. Leadership isn't necessarily formal, though it can be. Nor is it always easy to pin down a definition of leadership. As one workshop participant put it, "I can't define it, but I know it when I see it." Leadership occurs within a context and therefore its development must be addressed within its ongoing context. Because it is developmental, leadership is not likely to respond to one-shot training efforts.

Leadership seminars can cost from a few hundred dollars per participant to ten thousand dollars or more. This does not include lost time back at the office. Nor does it include disruptions and problems caused by some of the "sensitivity" and confrontational approaches, which, when mismanaged, can lead to lingering psychological consequences for participants and their organizations. These seminars seem to range from meaningful, albeit not job-relevant, experiences to traumatic episodes when some participants are treated confrontationally. Moreover, former participants groomed in risk-taking-at-any-cost may reap organizational havoc and suffer serious personal career losses. (We shall have more to say on the issue of risk later in this paper.) Some participants feel their privacy invaded with questions poking and prodding their psyches for public disclosure. Some participants don't welcome feedback from other participants who are often unskilled or even incompetent in their use of feedback. In addition, some participants question the lack of freedom of choice when an organization either explicitly or implicitly expects attendance. One manager we know refused to go to an EST-like management retreat because of psychological problems his brother developed during and after EST training. Despite his legitimate concerns, his refusal to go was not well-accepted by higher management. Is it ethical or practical to send the unwilling to such training?

Leadership development seminars are often seen as rewards for "players" or rights of passage. Sometimes the trained return to the workplace "walking just a little taller." The question is, does this happen because of the seminar or because implicit in the selection to training is a nod from the organization which reinforces greater confidence. Selection to training can become self-fulfilling prophesy, well-documented in both classroom (Rosenthal, 1966) and organizational training settings (Eden, 1984, 1988; Eden & Ravid, 1992). Properly used, positive expectations may be as powerful, or more so, than formal leadership training. At the very least expectations may serve as a very important ingredient of leadership development. However, more research is needed to identify how to achieve maximal effects by imbedding the use of expectancies into leadership development systems.

Despite these and other criticisms to follow, participants often report intangible benefits from their participation in leadership development

workshops. Yet rarely do these benefits translate into lasting change in the workplace (Conger, 1992).

LIMITATIONS OF PREVAILING APPROACHES

There are numerous limitations of prevailing approaches. We shall discuss only a few of these limitations. Approaches 1) are often based on flawed assumptions, 2) are often based on leadership mythology, 3) often have insufficient curricula, and 4) do not transfer to the job setting.

Flawed Assumptions

Flawed assumptions pervade current approaches to leadership development and training. We discuss primarily personal growth approaches because they are the focus of much current training effort. Personal growth approaches attempt to get the individual in touch with his or her values, inner strengths, and talents. Conger (1992, 1993) takes issue with the basic tenets of the personal growth approach: the presumed correlation with personal passion and organizational success; the presumed desirability of risk taking, regardless of context, degree of risk, and severity of possible consequences; and the presumed leadership prerequisite, a balanced life.

Similar concerns about reliance on flawed assumptions are associated with other approaches to leadership. Conceptual approaches assume incorrectly that, if only participants can understand leadership, they demonstrate it back at work. Although conceptual understanding is important, it is not enough. Concepts must be translated into situation-specific behaviors which either coalesce team activity and synergize it or transform it.

Feedback approaches and skill approaches are related in the sense that feedback approaches often provide feedback on skill possession or lack of it. Feedback approaches use interpretation of personality and skill assessment instruments. The latter often takes the form of 360 degree feedback (that is, feedback from self, subordinates, and superiors). Considerable evidence supports the multiple-raters approach, yet little evidence supports the wisdom of inundating participants with more feedback than they can reasonably deal with. And, there's insufficient evidence that peers-in-training are well-equipped to offer feedback at such seminars.

Moreover, not all measures of leadership used for feedback in seminars are valid. Validity refers to the legitimacy of the attributions made to individuals about test scores. For example, some organizations give feedback concerning Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) scores. By some estimates, over a million people take the Myers-Briggs each year--primarily in the context of team or leadership training. This is despite the fact that a National Academy of Sciences review panel reviewed the literature concerning MBTI use in such contexts and rejected it on the basis of unreliability and other psychometric problems (Druckman & Bjork, 1992). Additionally, scores on the "test" were not found to be consistently related to group task performance. Worse, there's no compelling support for the view that any typology (including Jungian type theory) explains personality or behavior in groups. The point here is that feedback approaches can be limited by theoretically and psychometrically flawed measures. They can be constrained by reliance on unqualified peer feedback. They can also be severely limited by feedback overload from consultant-administered "360 degree feedback." Of course, there are efforts to use properly validated measures. The Center for Creative Leadership's Skills-Scope and Yukl's (1988) Managerial Practices Survey are examples of ongoing validation efforts.

The skills approach is rooted in the famous Ohio State University studies, which over a twenty-year period attempted to identify behaviors associated with leadership. Thousands of behaviors were identified and reduced to approximately ten factors, including the well-known initiating structure and consideration. More recently, Yukl (1988, 1989) and others have identified factors which umbrella important managerial and/or leadership behaviors. However, this approach, while more behaviorally specific than the trait approach, still fails to link behaviors to specific situations. In short, there is no definitive list of appropriate behaviors that fits all situations.

Are Often Based on Leadership Mythology

A major criticism of many leadership development efforts is that they are often rooted in myths. The following examples of leadership myths are

adapted and expanded from Forsyth (1990) and Welch (1994).

Myth 1: Leadership is possession of traits we're born with. There are two points of contention concerning this myth: 1) leaders aren't born that way, and 2) leadership isn't just "traits." Although the leaders-are-born view is widely held among trainees, most leadership training programs are not reflective of this perspective. Leaders learn to lead. To the extent that "traits" or consistencies in behavior play a role in leadership, they are developed through experience and not by virtue of genetics or "birthright." However, widespread use (primarily, but not exclusively, by non-psychologists) of "type" measures is suggestive of out-dated carry-overs of this leaders-are-born view.

Moreover, it's not particularly helpful (though it works slightly better than chance) to identify where prospective leaders are in relation to various "traits" thought to correlate with leadership. That's because, when it comes to possession of these traits, there's no guarantee of success (Yukl, 1989). For example, research has shown that leaders are more likely than non-leaders to exhibit dominance, friendliness, flexibility, etc. But it's possible to be too flexible, too dominant, or too friendly within work contexts. Risk-taking and optimism, both also proposed as distinguishing leaders from non-leaders, can be inappropriate or destructive in some circumstances. Dominance must be combined with maturity and a sense of moderation to not approach aversive control. These are just a few examples of limits necessary for traits.

Another problem with the trait perspective is that sometimes leadership is, at least partially, "in the eye of the beholder," (Dobbins, Welch, Evensen, & Sgro, 1987; Lord, Foti, & Phillips, 1882; Phillips, 1984; Phillips & Lord, 1981; Rush, Thomas, & Lord, 1977), as the discussion of the following myth illustrates.

Myth 2: "People can always objectively assess leadership in others." In fact, people develop implicit theories or mental representations of the ideal leader. Such representations or prototypes contain all the qualities people consider essential to leadership. These subjective prototypes can drive how they perceive, interact with, and evaluate each other. For example, if I favor a leader who's tough and autocratic, I'm going to look for that in potential leaders. So, if I hear a particular leader is effective, I'll tend to assume she or he possess those assumed qualities. Not everyone will agree with me. Perceptions often vary from person to person. I might even report that a leader possesses those qualities in an evaluation of that leader.

Indeed, people tend to use similar prototypes when rating fictitious and actual leaders (Rush et al., 1977), to develop global rather than specific impressions of leaders (Phillips & Lord, 1981), and to perceive the same leader differently, depending on the individual perceiver.

Myth 3: "There's nothing organizations can do to promote leadership emergence." People either emerge or they don't." In fact, what organizations do every day has much to do with individual emergence and mentoring processes critical to leadership development.

Myth 4: "Leadership is a 'list' of do's and don'ts." Although various taxonomies of leadership have been developed, (e.g., Yukl, 1989), there's no definitive list. Moreover, what's appropriate is context dependent (Fiedler & Chemers, 1982; Hemphill, 1949) and follower-dependent (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Green, 1975; Hollander & Offermann, 1990; Lowin & Craig, 1968; Wayne & Ferris, 1990).

Myth 5: "Leadership is 'top-down' rather than 'dual path' (top-down and bottom-up)" (Welch, Mallak, & Kurstedt, 1991). How often do trainees and others cite the advice by Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Schein (1985) who admonish would-be leaders to "align" others to your vision? These are not words of leadership interacting with followership. Rather, these words incorrectly imply that leadership is simply a matter of top-down direction.

Myth 6: "Leadership is power." Although power may be involved in the influence process, leadership and power aren't the same thing. Moreover, unbridled use of power is coercion, not leadership at all.

Myth 7: "People should fear their leaders." Contrary to views of journalist Elizabeth Drew and other chroniclers of the American presidency, the presence of fear among followers isn't necessarily a sign of leadership (Deming, 1986). It is a sign of coercion and intimidation.

Myth 8: Leadership and management are the same thing. Leadership is not management (Kotter, 1990; Zaleznik, 1977). Zaleznik argues that leadership is fundamentally different from management. Four distinctions by Kotter include: 1) leaders establish direction through vision whereas managers plan and budget, 2) leaders coalesce people toward a vision, whereas managers organize and staff, 3) leaders motivate and inspire, whereas managers control and solve problems, 4) leaders produce change, whereas managers produce predictability and order.

Insufficient Coverage of Content

Reliance on myth in curricular design will fatally flaw a training program by guaranteeing its irrelevance. Furthermore, leadership development systems often reflect insufficient attention to adequacy or completeness of course content. Programs containing conceptual material often reflect only one aspect of relevant leadership processes or fail to imbed material in relevant contexts. Sometimes content foci can give the wrong impression to trainees. For example, instead of developing ways of fostering creativity, flexibility, and cooperation appropriate for trainees' job contexts (a challenging prospect), many retreats emphasize risk. But risk taking for its own sake is no virtue. And creativity, flexibility, and cooperation must necessarily be cultivated across time and under multiple contexts.

In addition to these content issues, there are also process-related concerns with most approaches to leadership. Most training curricula simply fail to acknowledge the process nature of leadership, emphasizing instead traits and skills.

To summarize this section, curricula must incorporate attention to the processes by which trainees learn, the processes by which people lead, and the content of leadership research. For example, it's not enough to present enjoyable exercises for participants to play. Such exercise must be grounded in sound and replicated research and impart important concepts to participants. This means training systems designers must know the body of knowledge and not rely on superficial paging through sourcebooks.

No Transfer-of-Training

Insufficient transfer-of-training is a common problem. What, precisely, does scaling a cliff or jumping from a plane have to do with the context of most jobs? With the possible exception of paratrooper training, these activities don't translate into meaningful job-related improvements. Nor is crossing a river suspended by safety harnesses analogous to the kind of risk one might need to take in moving a business to a growth mode. In the artificially "risky" situation, no one will really get hurt (Conger, 1992). In the real world of risk taking, people get hurt--stockholders or taxpayers lose their investments and employees lose their jobs.

No Organizational Reinforcement of Training Behaviors and Processes

Organizational support of prospective leaders' efforts is crucial to effective transfer-of-training. Failure to recognize and remove barriers to newly developed behaviors can also sabotage training efforts. For example, if prospective leaders try to demonstrate increased assertiveness but are rebuked for being "too pushy," or if would-be leaders are challenged to be open and honest but suffer from "shoot the messenger," then training will not transfer. These two examples of failure to properly reinforce desired behaviors are common problems facing participants in leadership development programs.

No Organizational Support of Training

There are other ways organizations can fail to support training. Supervisors can reveal either subtly or not-so-subtly that prospective trainees shouldn't take the training too seriously. Similarly, supervisors can reveal contempt for the material or approach to training. Therefore, it's important that training be a good fit for organizational members and not just a "pet" training program of a select few in the organization. Managers should vocalize support for leadership development and training. Supervisors should encourage participants rather than bemoan lost time.

DESCRIPTION OF A PROCESS TO BUILD IN MULTI-FACETED LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Following is a description of a process model for long-term development of leaders designed by

Welch (1994). The proposed process involves attention to complex leadership processes and some stand-alone training. However, that training is imbedded as closely as possible within contexts, at minimum analogous to and at best similar to the contexts in which trainees ordinarily find themselves at work. The process is also an ongoing developmental approach, tailored to setting, organizational, and individual requirements.

Teach Leadership Basics

By all means, include initial instruction in leadership concepts, making sure the course content reflects up-to-date research and scholarship and minimizes fad. However, don't stop there. Build in discussion and trainee interaction at each step of the conceptual introduction. For example, get individual definitions of leadership before you get started. This identifies pre-conceived notions of leadership. Then build a common definition with participants. Where controversy exists, use debate and other processes to foster enthusiasm. For example, you can have participants debate the pros and cons of the various myths (mentioned earlier), assuring that those arguing the "wrong" side of the debate are in good company. Many people believe the "wrong" side is correct, despite compelling research to the contrary. Assure them that many others believe these myths too. Once initial conceptual understanding develops, the process is also collaborative--it relies upon mutual give and take between organizational sponsors, trainees, and training systems specialists

Collaboratively Assess Need

Ongoing action research is the prototype for documenting continuous improvement. It should go without saying that ongoing, collaborative assessment is necessary to support leadership development efforts. But such assessment takes time. It can't be achieved either with a shotgun approach to assessment or a "quick and dirty" impressions-based observation summary. Consultant training systems experts must partner with the host organization to assure that later prescriptions meet stakeholder requirements. Whenever possible, seek input from customers concerning the questions they need answers to.

Develop Shared Mental Models Of Leadership

Part of the conceptual understanding imparted to trainees must be the importance of perception. As indicated earlier, research has shown that people use well-developed prototypes of leadership to interpret leader behaviors. Sometimes these prototypes can bias perception, evaluation and interaction with leaders. Try to build shared models of leadership by using consensus strategies. Taking time to build a shared model allows participants to explain what's important to them. This saves time in the long run.

However, aware of the importance of perceptions, some leadership development trainers have taken a frightening approach--they give acting lessons. This is not to downplay the importance of presentational and interpersonal skills. It is to suggest that trainers would be wise to deal with substantive issues and avoid teaching participants to become masters of illusion.

Translate Qualities Within The Shared Model Into Observable Behaviors

Important as a next step to model building is translating "characteristics" into observable behaviors. Steer trainees away from abstractions (e.g., the leader must be accountable) and specify exactly how a leader will display accountability. Always lead trainees to the specific. If it can't be operationalized, avoid it. Be wary of vague attributions about people's "character."

Partner With In-House Systems; Collaboratively Assess and Re-design In-House Practices

Don't "reinvent the wheel." Partner with in-house systems to benefit from the best in-house practices. Gather data on what works and what doesn't for your organization. Then, collaboratively assess and re-design leadership development processes, as needed.

Facilitate Leadership Emergence

Leadership emergence is a complex interaction of person and situation variables. For example, individuals who are high self-monitors are more likely to be sensitive to how they are perceived. (Self-monitoring is the ability to know how one's coming across.) Moreover, self monitors who are

flexible are especially likely to emerge as leaders. Individuals who are dominant are also likely to be perceived as emergent leaders. Situation characteristics contributing to leadership emergence include reinforcement of leader-like behaviors, the group's purpose, relation to outside groups, etc. Some individuals' emergence tendencies are affected by group size, task type, group composition, the group's relation to other groups, incentives, presence of a crisis, etc.

Interestingly, some aspects of leadership emergence are amenable to developmental efforts. For example, self-monitoring can be learned. Being able to monitor one's self is the first step in self-correcting and adapting one's responses to the situation. Self-evaluation and correction are important ingredients of self-efficacy (Ashford & Tsui, 1991; Bandura, 1979; 1986). One caution here is that self-monitoring ability is a double-edged sword. It can be used to constructive purposes or it can be used to manipulate and deceive. Care must be taken to foster the former, while discouraging the latter.

An additional ingredient of the leadership emergence process is the cultivation of self-determination. Deci, Connell, and Ryan (1989) have developed a process consultation approach to fostering self-determination. This process involves observation and feedback of both target trainees and their supervisors. Observers identify self-determination behaviors exhibited by the trainees and observe supportive and inhibiting behaviors on the part of their supervisors.

Another approach to leadership emergence is the "self-leader" portion of self- and superleadership model of Manz and Sims (1989) and Sims and Lorenzi (1992). Yet another approach to fostering leadership emergence in the self-leadership arena are aspects of Covey's "Seven Habits" (Covey, 1989) training. Here Covey emphasizes mission-focused self- and time management. Spending more time on important, but not necessarily urgent, activities is the hallmark of this unit in Covey's training arsenal. Ideally, incorporating aspects of all three would make a more complete approach. However, cost may force some training designers to omit one or more of these approaches. There are ways to deal with this. For example, the Covey organization will train-the-trainer and "certify" in-house trainers.

Promote "Superleadership"

Promote "Superleadership" (Manz & Sims, 1989). "Superleadership" is simply helping others to lead themselves. This involves both informal modeling and formal and informal mentoring.

Model the Way (Posner & Kouzes, 1991). Bandura (1979; 1986) has long emphasized the importance of modeling to learning. Thousands of organizations use some form of behavior modeling (Parry & Reich, 1984; Wexley & Baldwin, 1986). Although no panacea for all work-related problems, modeling can he helpful when specific behaviors can be operationalized and demonstrated (Birkenbach, Kamfer, & Morshuizen, 1985; Burke & Day, 1986; Latham & Saari, 1979; Meyer & Raich, 1983). In the leadership development arena, Posner and Kouzes, 1991; Manz and Sims (1989), Sims and Lorenzi (1992) (among others) have underscored the criticality of role modeling. Vicarious organizational reinforcement of the model's behavior can have an effect on the learner.

Mentoring. Capitalizing on the concept of modeling, mentoring is an ongoing form of modeling in which an individual is emulated over time and different situations. Mentoring may be formal, as in the case of formal programs established by organizations that pair mentor and mentee for a period of time. Or, the process may be informal, as in the case of an individual privately designating an individual as the person he or she will emulate. Both kinds of mentoring are important. It's important to note that mentees probably learn more from mentors they've chosen themselves than from assigned mentors. However, both formal and informal mentoring are important components of leadership development systems.

Analyze And Improve Support Mechanisms

Support systems, particularly motivational support systems, are a vital contributor to leadership development. Issues requiring assessment here include, but are not limited to:

- Perceived control (Does the organization or group foster the view that would-be leaders have at least some control of their environments?)

- Expectancies (Are positive expectations directed to enhance performance?)
- Use of future vision and goal-directed behavior
- Perceptions of reinforcement .

Examination of these issues may lead to collaborative corrective action. It's important to help trainees and their organizations build solutions to these problems.

Prevent Derailment

Preventing derailment is one way to provide adequate stewardship of the organization's human resources. Some prospective leaders fail (Bentz, 1985; Hogan et al., 1994) because of "dark side characteristics," which frequently don't show up in the course of trait-based testing. However, Hogan et al. (1994) point out that assessment centers and interviews don't adequately predict derailment either. A coaching system can be designed to overcome some problem cases. Process consultants can also work with potential derailers. Another option is referral to an employee assistance program.

Collaboratively Re-Design, As Needed

Fine-tuning based on apparent deficiencies is a must. However, a more comprehensive assessment can also go a long way toward assuring you've identified trouble spots for re-design. Such an assessment will also reveal additional modules necessary to complete your leadership development system. For example, team building may be in order where conflict and social problems underlie lack of progress. Decision-making workshops, including consensus building ones, may be indicated when faulty decision-making processes are present.

REDUCTION TO PRACTICE IN A GOVERNMENT PROGRAM OFFICE: AN ONGOING APPLICATION AND ASSESSMENT

Progress on the Process to Date

Components of the overall approach include: Preliminaries, building shared mental models of leadership, contextual assessment, partnering with existing in-house programs and processes (including already existing process improvement and re-engineering efforts), facilitating leadership emergence, improving support mechanisms, increasing self-leadership and other-leadership (leading others to lead themselves), and improving mentoring processes. These sub-processes or components will be phased in over time. We report now on Sessions I and II in an ongoing leadership development effort.

Preliminaries: Session I . During an off-site retreat concerning process re-engineering, a self-contained module of the leadership process was introduced to a unit within the Naval Aviation General Trainers Integrated Program Team (IPT). Session I introduced leadership concepts, distinctions among concepts, and related research. Leadership was described as a process involving both leaders and followers. Three exercises focused on 1) IPT definitions of leadership, 2) confronting myths of leadership through debate, and 3) generating individual lists of characteristics considered central to leadership.

In the first exercise, an initial step was taken to design a common or shared notion of leadership among participants. This first step took the form of individuals giving definitions and identifying qualities important to them. A first attempt was also made to consolidate all the individual leadership definitions. Working as four-person groups, participants began to merge their individual definitions into consolidated ones.

In the second exercise, participants debated prevailing myths about leadership (described earlier). Half of each four-person group debated the pro side of two myths and the other half debated the con side of the same two myths. Representatives of each group reported what their group believed were the most salient points on both sides of each issue. Through facilitated discussion with participants, the facilitator examined each myth, briefly summarizing accumulated research concerning it.

In the third exercise, the instructional strategy was to have individuals generate initial lists of characteristics in Session I. Later, Session II participants would build on the individual lists. Session I participants were asked to consider the qualities they consider essential to leadership. Individual lists were constructed and turned in at the end of Session I. Between Sessions I and II, the facilitator analyzed the resulting lists of

characteristics. Most commonly cited were responsible and flexible (tied with 13 participants listing each). Next and tied in rank-ordering were integrity/moral/ethical (12) and the related qualities: honest/trustworthy/credible/believable (12). "Charismatic" completed the "top five" with 9 votes.

Preliminaries: Session II . Approximately five weeks later, the IPT met again in the course of process re-engineering. A two-hour leadership module was incorporated into this unit. A brief re-cap of that second Session II workshop included a reference to a movie (*Twelve Angry Men*), in which the jury leader defied usual stereotypes of leadership, yet his thoughtful, persuasive style changed the votes from 11-1 guilty to 12-0 innocent.

After a brief re-cap of important points from Session I, participants saw the results of their individual characterizations of leadership. From these results, participants further identified traits they agreed to foster among one another and their subordinates. Participants were reminded that building a consensus about what they will look for and reinforce requires more than a majority or plurality vote. Important qualities may not have received the most votes. The majority list might not achieve the agreement or buy-in necessary to assure effort to further the model. Therefore, during consensus procedures, participants were encouraged to avoid voting, to assure that there was general agreement by those present, and to assure that the overall model was something participants could work toward. Acting as one large group, IPT members examined each quality from the Session I list, discussed whether to retain each in the group's model, and considered whether there were any qualities omitted from the Session I list. Qualities on the Session II list included: responsible, knowledgeable, initiative/self-starter, supportive, honest/credible, good communicator, decisive, flexible, confidence/self-assured, open-minded, focused, total team commitment, good listener, motivating, and has a vision. Note that upon any later decision by the group, this list may be amended. All qualities were considered important. However, five were selected for initial focus: decisive, responsible, knowledgeable, initiative/self-starter, and motivating.

The facilitator emphasized the point made in the introduction of this paper--that often there are optimal levels of a desired trait (e.g., flexiblilty, decisiveness, affiliating-oriented, desirous or power, dominant, optimistic). In other words, there are occasions when the relationship between effective performance and possession of a specific trait might more closely resemble an inverted "U" than a straight line. Sometimes, it's necessary to balance one trait against another (e.g., dominance must be balanced with maturity to avoid unwarranted and dysfunctional power-plays, openness must be balanced with caring to make feedback constructive). And sometimes people can compensate for the absence of a trait. For example, many actors and other public figures can overcome introversion to appear extroverted. Using an example from the short list (decisive), the facilitator emphasized it isn't sufficient to look for a more-is-better approach to decisiveness. Sometimes appearing to be decisive may mask snap judgment. Sometimes, participative leaders are viewed as indecisive, regardless of the appropriateness of participation to a particular decision. Participants accordingly refined the notion of decisiveness so that it balances timeliness with quality, inclusion of sufficient information, and buy-in. They don't just want decisive individuals, regardless of quality and cost. They want people to make good timely decisions based upon the best information reasonably gathered by those stakeholders important to the decision making.

Future workshops will further discuss the difficulty of obtaining the "right level" of particular traits for particular situations. More importantly, abstract traits will be linked to observable behaviors. Participants "homework" is to think about some important issues before next time. Specifically, they were asked to consider the above short lists of traits. What constraints, if any, do they want to place on possession of these traits? What specific behaviors illustrate that a person possesses those traits? Keeping desired behaviors in mind, what factors in their work environments foster leadership development? What factors hinder such development? What strategies would help overcome such hindrances? Answers to these questions will be the primary focus of the next session.

"Wishbone," or causal diagrams will be introduced next time. Caveats concerning the use of such diagrams (i.e., that placing an event on a diagram line doesn't prove causality) will be included. As a

pre-cursor to a future unit, the facilitator also introduced the idea of moving away from "the blame game" and focusing on how to help one another succeed. For example, rather than looking to blame people for not being responsible or accountable, the emphasis should shift to how "can I personally be more responsible and what can I do to assist others on my team to do the same." Unnecessary fault-finding may inhibit 1) the development of desirable leadership qualities, 2) continuous improvement efforts, and 3) innovative solutions to organizational problems. Next time, we'll revisit this (blame) issue within the context of attribution theory (the theory of how we attribute cause or explain events). We'll talk, in particular, of how attributions are at play in the leadership process. The session II workshop and a portion of upcoming Session III pave the way for the introduction of a future module on self-leadership. Examples of upcoming activities include:

- Briefly entertain participant modifications to the model.
- Practice operationalizing desired behaviors in behavioral terms.
- Use series of exercises to illustrate the hazards of trait inferences.
- Introduce attributional aspect of thinking and relevance to leadership.
- Conduct attributional exercise.
- Begin examining supporting contingencies and conditions (context management).
- Context management planning
- Collaborative assessment of leadership training needs.
- Introduce self-leadership module.
- Examine the role of attributions in self-leadership.
- Practice using expectations to enhance self-and other performance: How to use positive expectations to improve the leadership process.

Recommendations For Further Modifications

Although it is believed that imbedding leadership development efforts over time may be more effective than other approaches, it may be that too much time elapsed between the first and second preliminaries (conceptual) segments. As was noted five weeks elapsed. This difficulty can be offset by having an intermediate session such as a working lunch between the two occasions. Another possible modification is to increase the activities during the second workshop by adding skits and role-plays to reinforce why certain traits are more desirable in moderate amounts. This would lengthen the second session, but would have the advantage of reinforcing points, while providing a more entertaining experience. Other modification needs will become apparent as we progress through the end of Year 1.

Of course research on theoretical issues will suggest applications for incorporation into development systems. There is no substitute for well-grounded leadership development systems. In short, training systems designers owe it to their sponsors and their trainees to provide no less than sound, meaningful training imbedded within customers' day-to-day contexts. Training systems planners should pilot test program modules in the laboratory, pilot test the entire system, re-design as necessary, and re-test. Then, the entire development system should be tested on multiple groups. Only by doing so will training utility be maximized.

In sum, this paper discussed problems with current trends in leadership development and presented a process for overcoming these shortcomings. Early stages of a case study application, as well as recommendations for improvements, were presented. Overall, the proposed approach not only derives from a more solid foundation, but also is more complete and more assured of long-term success.

REFERENCES

Ashford, S. J. & Tsui, A. S. (1991). Self-regulation for managerial effectiveness: The role of active feedback seeking. *Academy of Management Journal, 34,* 251-280.

Bandura, A. (1979). The self-system in reciprocal determination. *American Psychologist. 33,* 344-358.

Bandura, A. (1986). *The social psychology of thought and action.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row.

Bentz, V. J. (1985, August). A view from the top: A thirty year perspective of research devoted to discovery, description, and prediction of executive behavior. Paper presented to the 93rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles.

Birkenbach, X. C., Kamfer, L., & Morshuizen, J. D. (1985). The development and the evaluation of behavior-modeling training programme for supervisors. *South African Journal of Psychology, 15,* 11-9.

Burke, M. J. & Day, R. R. (1986). A cumulative study of the effectiveness of managerial training. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 2322-246.

Conger, Jay (1992). *Learning to Lead* . San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J. (1993). Personal growth training: Snake Oil or Pathway to Leadership? *Organizational Dynamics, 19-30.*

Covey, S. (1989). *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People.* New York: Simon & Schuster

Dansereau, F., Jr., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations -- a longitudinal investigation of the role-making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13,* 46-78.

Deci, E. J., Connell, J. P., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 580-590.

Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the Crisis* , Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dienesch, R. M. & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review, 11,* 618-634.

Dobbins, G. H., Welch, K. A., Evensen, L. B., & Sgro, J. A. (1987). The biasing effects of leadership prototypes on ratings of leader behavior. *International Journal of Management, 4,* 292-300.

Druckman,D. & Bjork, R. A. (Eds.) (1992). *In the mind's eye: Enhancing human performance.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Eden, D. (1984). Self-fulfilling prophesy as a management tool: Harnessing Pygmalion. *Academy of Management Review, 9,* 64-73.

Eden, D. (1988). Pygmalion, goal setting, and expectancy: Compatible ways to boost productivity. *Academy of Management Review, 13,* 639-652.

Eden, D. & Ravid, E. (1982). Pygmalion vs. self-expectancy: Effects of instructor and self-expectancy in trainee performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 30,* 351-364.

Fiedler, F. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiedler, F. & Chemers, M. M. (1982). *Improving leadership effectiveness: The leader match concept.* New York: Wiley.

Forsyth, D. (1990). *Group dynamics* (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Greene, C. N. (1975). The reciprocal nature of influence between leader and subordinate. *Journal of Applied Psychology., 60,* 187-193.

Hemphill, J. K. (1949). *Situational factors in leadership.* Columbus, OH: Ohio Bureau of Educational Research.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist, 49,* 493-504.

Hollander, E. P. & Offermann, L. R. (1990). Power and leadership in organizations. *American Psychologist, 45,* 179-189.

Kotter, J. (1990). *A force for change*. New York: Free Press.

Latham, G. P. & Saari, L. M. (1979). Application of social learning theory to training supervisors through behavior modeling. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64,* 239-246.

Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J. & Phillips, J. S. (1982). A theory of leadership categorization. On J. G. Hunt, U. Sekaran, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.) (pp. 104-121), *Leadership: Beyond establishment views*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press.

Lowin, A. & Craig, J. R. (1968). The influence level of performance on managerial style: An experimental object lesson in the ambiguity of correlational data. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3,* 440-458.

Manz, C. C. & Sims, H. P. (1991). Superleadership: Beyond the myth of heroic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, (Spring, 1991), 18-35.*

Meyer, H. H. & Raich, M. S. (1983). An objective evaluation of a behavioral modeling program. *Personnel Psychology, 36,* 755-762.

Parry, S. B. & Reich, L. R. (1984). An uneasy look at behavior modeling. *Training and Development Journal, 38,* 57-62.

Phillips, J. S. (1984). The accuracy of leadership ratings: A cognitive categorization perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 33,* 125-138.

Phillips, J. S. & Lord, R. G. (1981). Causal attributions and the perceptions of leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 28,* 143-163.

Posner, B. Z. & Kouzes, J. M. (1991). Leadership Practices: An alternative to the psychological perspective. In K. Clark & M. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of Leadership,* West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Rosenthal, R. (1966). *Experimenter effects in behavioral research.* NY: Meredith.

Rush, M. C., Thomas, J. C., & Lord, R. G. (1977). Implicit leadership theory: A potential threat to the internal validity of leader behavior questionnaires. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 20,* 93-110.

Schein, E. (1985) *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sims, H. P., & Lorenzi, P. (1992). *The new leadership paradigm.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Welch, K.A. (1994). Overcoming leadership development myths to create better leadership development systems. In *Myths in the workplace: The misuses and abuses of psychology in organizations.* Unpublished manuscript.

Welch, K. A., Mallak, L., & Kurstedt, H.A., Jr. (1991). Culture change and the leader-follower subsystem. Paper presented to the Portland International Conference on Management of Engineering and Technology, Portland, OR

Welch, K. A., Polk, J., & Walsh, C. M. (1994). *Building consensus and improving decision making: A handbook for managers.* Technical Report, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Wexley, K. N. & Baldwin, T. T. (1986). Management development. *Journal of Management, 12,* 277-294.

Wayne, S. J. & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 487-499.

Yukl, G. A. (1988). Development and validation of the managerial practices questionnaire. Technical Report, State University of New York at Albany.

Yukl, G. (1989). *Leadership in organizations,* Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Yukl, G. Wall, S., & Lepsinger, R. (1990) An integrating taxonomy of managerial behavior. In K. Clark & M. Clark (Eds.). *Measures of Leadership,* West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Zaccaro, S. J., Foti, R. J., & Kenny, D. A. (1991). Self-monitoring and trait-based

variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 308-315.

Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different *?* *Harvard Business Review, 55*, 67-78.