CHANGING DYNAMICS OF ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

MONTGOMERY VAN WART

This chapter examines the status of public leadership as a field of scholarship, with a focus on its context in the mainstream literature. In particular, this chapter seeks both to provide an overview of recent trends in leadership research and to provide a sense of where public sector leadership theory has been of late.[1] The chapter first defines the boundaries and context of public leadership. It then presents the "postmodern" paradigm that is likely to supplement rather than supplant the "modern" paradigm in the field of organizational leadership. Coverage is then given to eight specific areas in which either the mainstream or public leadership fields have made advances. The chapter concludes with a review of the opportunities and challenges for a public leadership research agenda.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP STUDIES

Although the modern study of leadership is about a hundred years old, interest in leaders and leadership dates back to the beginning of history. There are at least three major reasons that have stimulated enormous interest in the topic. First, leaders have a critical effect on us in the present and future. They can determine on a grand scale the success or failure of a society, country, and community. Leaders of public organizations, especially governments, can bring in resources, set a positive tone, encourage a can-do attitude, or, alternatively, run the organization like a fiefdom, stamp out creativity, make poor judgment calls, or be slow to react to external events (Kaiser, Hogan, and Craig 2008; Trottier, Van Wart, and Wang 2008). At a more tangible level for those not in the senior positions, a bad supervisor can send workers scurrying for new jobs while a good team leader makes a difficult assignment seem easy because of good organization and encouragement. Second, nearly everyone has a leadership role in which he or she wants to do well, no matter whether it is the chief operating officer of a major institution or the lead person in a cross-functional team. Third, there is an intense fascination surrounding those in leadership positions. Human nature is such that there is equal interest in the leader who is a consistent success and the one who is flawed or even a failure. Yet even with what we know about its ancient roots, its effect on citizens and employees, an individual's personal stake in doing it well, and the compulsive fascination it holds, the study of leadership is challenging.

One great guru of organizational leadership, Warren Bennis, noted that "the subject is vast, amorphous, slippery, and, above all, desperately important" (Bennis 2007). It might seem that a special focus on one major context, public administration, would make the task of providing an

assessment of the field easier since less scholarship could make it more manageable. However, the challenges in the field of public administration quickly come to the fore. As Chet Newland stated years ago, public administration tends to be a field of strangers in search of a discipline. "American public administration is awesomely multidisciplinary and more—complicatedly multicultural—drawing on the expertise and insights, even the hopes and imaginations, of all sorts of people. But public administration's more than multidisciplinary character is often frenzied, lacking a fair modicum of shared culture and enterprise" (Newland 1994). When discussions of leadership with a public sector thrust occur, it is often as if mainstream topics hit a multifaceted prism and are refracted in distinctly different, and not uniform, directions.

In the first major assessment of administrative leadership research in the last twenty years,[2] Larry Terry noted that in "all this talk about more effective leadership, the topic of *bureaucratic leadership* is conspicuously absent" (Terry 1995, 2; emphasis in original). He noted numerous reasons for this lacuna, elaborated a "conservator" model advocating a balance of stewardship and deliberative action, and urged far greater attention to this important topic. Eight years later, Van Wart's assessment was that the field of administrative leadership was beginning to evolve, albeit slowly and with as many gaps as there were strengths. After an extensive review of the literature, he noted three trends. First, he found that the normative foundations of administrative leadership were being thoroughly discussed because of the debates surrounding reinvention, the new public management, and various public sector reforms such as contracting out that have been slowly but surely changing the face of public administration in the United States and around the world. Second, the importance of administrative leadership, as opposed to management practice, still seemed either to be largely lacking from a research perspective, or supplied with a nonempirical set of assertions—often atheoretical. Finally, the amount and quality of "normal science" research in administrative leadership was scant and weak. In addition, he pointed to two gaps. The need for work in integrated models or frameworks of leadership that can be used to organize the disparate field as well as for teaching purposes was highlighted. Also noted was a need for more consistent clarity in identifying the leadership population vis-à-vis its position in the political-administrative system. Overall, he felt that the "weaknesses were more pronounced than the strengths" (Van Wart 2003, 224).

A third perspective is reflected in a symposium in which Van Slyke and Alexander reviewed the literature on public service leadership. Their assessment includes all types of leadership. One important conclusion that they reach is that "public sector leadership research parallels developments on the private sector side but lags temporally in empirical tests, application, and modifications of leadership concepts and frameworks as they relate to public organizations. Understanding the interactions between the microlevel attributes of the individual leader (traits, characteristics, and competencies) and the macrolevel attributes of the organization (structure, culture, environment, products, people, and partnerships) is critical for discovering and developing appropriate models of public sector leadership" (Van Slyke and Alexander 2006, 366).

Thus, their major focus is to refine the mainstream literature in the public sector context—identifying where it is the same or nearly so, but clarifying where and why it is different. They identify large-scale projects as being particularly useful because of the scope of the leadership environment and the substantial variations across the public sector universe. Although they identify this as a major gap, they present it as an excellent opportunity as well.

A final assessment by Morse, Buss, and Kinghorn echoes Terry's call for more emphasis on administrative leadership in a rapidly evolving world in which the increasing challenges for leaders make it "not a friendly one" (2007, 10). Their emphasis, as shaped by the edited volume, is to better articulate the normative debate on the best style of administrative leadership (strongly

entrepreneurial and market driven on one extreme and more restrained and civic guided on the other), to better understand how to achieve successful change in public sector settings, to provide useful models of collaboration, and to investigate theories in relation to specific administrative contexts.

DEFINING THE BOUNDARIES AND THE EVOLVING CONTEXT OF PUBLIC LEADERSHIP

In defining the broad boundaries of public leadership, Morse, Buss, and Kinghorn (2007) note that there are at least three types of public sectors. There is political leadership, which involves legislators, elected executives in the policy process such as presidents, governors, and mayors, and the various stakeholders in the political process. There is organizational leadership, also known as bureaucratic or administrative leadership, primarily aimed at those leading and managing employees, programs, and organizations for the public good. Third, there is collaborative leadership, which focuses on leading in a shared-power world where citizens must have broad access and engagement, where more organizations must be included in policies and solutions, and where accountability is more broadly distributed (see chapter 17, "Collaborative Public Agencies in the Network Era," in this volume). Each of these types is important, and each will be referenced. The primary focus of this chapter, however, is about administrative leadership affecting more than 23 million employees in the United States alone.[3] As Morse, Buss, and Kinghorn (2007) note, it is difficult to disentangle the types because of the enormous overlap; at the same time, it is important to provide a narrower focus of this sweeping topic for heuristic purposes.

While there are many fundamental "eternal verities" related to leadership that seem to defy culture, time, and even biology (Arvey et al. 2007), much of what is interesting about leadership is affected by context. Therefore, when environmental shifts occur, social values evolve, organizational structures adjust, preferred leader styles alter, and competency needs are affected (Bass 2008). Research needs to identify, to the degree possible, the more long-term stable elements of leadership and those that are more topically affected. What are the recent shifts in the organizational environment? Focusing on the American context, the demographics have shifted to a more multicultural and educated society. Communication is much more computer and technology mediated. Organizations are more team based, networked, globally connected, and flatter, and purport to be more empowered and participative. The public at-large as citizens, consumers, and organizational members is much more cynical and distrusting. Global and national wealth distribution trends have been more unequal for thirty years so that the average CEO now gets 262 times what the average worker gets (Mishel, Bernstein, and Sheirholz 2009). Global competition has increased enormously over the last half century.

Abramson, Breul, and Kamensky (2006) point out that in a world in which public sector expectations and mandates, technology, structures, resources, workforce demographics, and norms are evolving, the challenges of management must also evolve. They identify six major trends that have direct or indirect effects on management: (1) changing the formal rules of government in order to allow more flexibility and customization of services, (2) the expanded use of performance measurement, (3) the increased emphasis on competition, choice, and incentives, (4) the expectation of performance on demand, (5) the requirement for greater citizen engagement, and (6) the greater use of networks and partnerships. Ultimately, all these trends make leadership challenging (Van Wart and Berman 1999) and make the business of providing scholarly and applied materials that much more critical (see Cortada et al. 2008 for a list of worldwide drivers affecting government).

These trends and others have had a real impact on leadership. For example, the massive reductions in middle management in the 1980s in the private sector and in the 1990s in the public sector may have been instigated by economic pressures but were made possible by improvements in communication and data processing. This encouraged more use of teams, networks, and the concomitant empowerment strategies, all of which had an enormous effect on the necessity of leaders at all levels to broaden the range of their styles and to shift their emphasis from directive styles toward more participatory and delegated modes. Because these latter styles are no less difficult to implement successfully, it might be argued that they are more difficult to implement; managers-as-leaders have had their work cut out for them in trying to make this transition.

The recent leadership literature adds to or changes ongoing approaches developed over the last century or more. The literature started with a "great-man" approach in the nineteenth century. A "traits" approach dominated the first half of the twentieth century but was very one-dimensional and failed to adequately address the various contexts of leadership. Useful, if simplistic, situational and contingency models, such as the managerial grid (Blake and Mouton 1964) and situational leadership (Hersey and Blanchard 1969), were put forward in the 1960s. In the 1970s somewhat more sophisticated models such as path goal theory (House and Mitchell 1974) and normative decision theory (Vroom and Yetton 1973) were advanced. The field expanded greatly in the 1980s and 1990s with the surge in interest in transformational and charismatic leadership. Executive and external perspectives became foci of the literature. Normative discussions about the personal morality of leaders and the appropriate role of public leaders of various types have been ongoing in the academic literature since the 1940s. No brief synopsis can do justice to a vast and complex field. (See Bass 2008 for a more inclusive review of mainstream literature and Van Wart 2008 for public sector leadership literature.)

THE RISE OF THE POSTMODERN PERSPECTIVE IN LEADERSHIP STUDIES

Several characteristics have dominated the overall approach to leadership studies. First, until recently, leadership research followed "modern" trends, with an emphasis on empiricism, rationalism, positivism, and reductionism. Empiricism holds that all knowledge comes from the senses and that the metaphysical is not an interest of science. Rationalism asserts that the mind organizes knowledge of the external world by observation and contemplation. Positivism (built on empiricism and rationalism) supports an approach that holds that science is testable, cumulative, and neutral and that things are ultimately measurable. Reductionism is an approach that attempts to reduce complexity to the fewest elements or variables and to explain science at the most fundamental level (e.g., reducing classical genetics to molecular biology).

Second, and flowing from the first, the study of leadership (overall) has tended to be objectivist, leader-centric, and status quo oriented. The objectivist trend was manifested by the effort to break leadership down into its constituent parts (traits, skills, behaviors, attitudes, etc.) and analyze the empirical relationship among them, with the hope that increasingly abstract general rules could be interpolated from microlevel studies. Research tended to be leader-centric because the leader in the leadership process has tended to be the major object of study. How does the leader relate to the followers? How does the leader maintain order and productivity? How does the leader use her or his values or change the organization's values? Finally, leadership studies have tended to assume that leadership forms are inherent and that individuals and organizations need to discover and master those forms (sometimes called realism).

Incipient challenges to some of the tenets of modernist research began as early as the late

1970s in the work of people such as Burns (1978), with the introduction of social values, and Greenleaf (1977), with the introduction of individual values and a denial of instrumentalism. Since 2000, leadership studies have been increasingly affected by calls for and approaches reflecting postmodern research trends. The newer journals *Integral Leadership* (2000) and *Leadership* (2005) reverse the modernist emphasis by calling for more eclectic, relational, and holistic approaches. While the tenets underlying modern research are not abandoned, they are likely to be overtaken by a radically different perspective by many leading researchers in the longer term.

Postmodern thought asserts that science is not neutral, science is not necessarily cumulative, sensory knowledge is only one form of knowledge, and nonsensory knowledge can be studied. It also asserts that the structure of knowledge is a form of power and thus accepting that structure is to reify the status quo. An alternative way of knowing and perceiving is constructionism (aka constructivism), which challenges the supremacy of empiricism, rationalism, positivism, and reductionism. It holds that all knowledge is constructed, truth is relative to our purposes (i.e., based on intersubjectivity), the notion of "progress" is largely a myth, and far from being neutral observers of "facts," scientists are active participants in creating reality or distorting it for their own (generally unintentional) ends.

Postmodernism also points out that differences are often as important as or more important than similarities. Postmodernists assert that the myth of neutrality allows personal assumptions to go unchallenged; it is better to state one's values and incorporate them in the research endeavor explicitly than purport to be unbiased. The scientific theory underlying postmodernism is general systems theory to the degree that it emphasizes the importance of the whole as much as or more than the parts, the prospect for external perturbations, and the unexpected effects of seemingly tiny incidents (e.g., tipping points and butterfly effects). Examples of research reflecting strong elements of postmodernism in leadership are identified in the following sections. They relate to such topics as discourse (aka discursive) theory, complexity and relational theory, integral leadership studies, and network and collaboration theory. Public sector examples are integrated in the discussion that follows.

Discourse Theory

Discourse theory has its roots in Foucault (1970, 1972), who examined the reification of social structures through language and customary usage. For example, calling guerrilla military activists in another country either "freedom fighters" or "terrorists" entirely changes the terms of debate. In leadership studies in particular, an interest in discourse theory "began with a more general dissatisfaction with the results and lack of coherence in trait and style based psychological research" (Kelly 2008, 764). Those with a discourse-theory perspective tend to question traditional definitions of leadership (Barker 2001), question and challenge traditional leadership studies as excessively involved in the psychology of leaders (Fairhurst 2007), emphasize the importance of studying followers in context (Alvesson and Sveningsson 2003; Collinson 2006; Gronn 2002), and ask for longer ethnographic studies (Kelly 2008). Chen (2008, 547) notes that the more traditional positivist research tradition of leadership psychology and more constructionist discursive leadership "appear to have little in common." Nonetheless, she "finds ample room for coexistence . . . when one takes into consideration the enormous complexity of the subject matter, coupled with the multiplicity of perspectives for study" (Chen 2008, 549).

Gender theory in leadership is loosely aligned with discourse theory. Gender theory has used a variety of critiques to understand the glass ceiling, but discourse theory is particularly powerful at

describing and studying the subtle structures of power that do not necessarily block women from power in the contemporary world, but tend to create amorphous cultural challenges for women to reach the highest levels (e.g., Eagly and Carli 2007 use the labyrinth metaphor).

Complexity Theory

Complexity science suggests a different paradigm for leadership—one that frames leadership as a complex interactive dynamic from which adaptive outcomes emerge (e.g., learning, innovation, and adaptability). Complexity theory is a type of general systems theory that appreciates the massive complexity and interconnectedness of all phenomena, and particularly human social processes such as leadership. Because of this complexity, it points out that the most successful organizations are often ones that have evolving structures that bubble up from below and percolate in from the environment—often called complex adaptive systems (Osborn and Hunt 2007). Complexity theory is very good for studying the multidirectional relational nature of leadership (Uhl-Bien 2006), and the emergence of new organizational and leadership forms (Lichtenstein and Plowman 2009). This approach has reached the popular literature in many subtle and not so subtle ways. For example, in defining leadership, Goffee and Jones (2009) say—to lay audiences—that it is relational, nonhierarchical, and contextual, a far cry from many earlier definitions focusing on leaders' influence, power to change for better or worse, leader traits, and so on.

Integral Leadership

Integral leadership tends to focus on leadership as a community process, democratizing and decentralizing leadership as much as possible. This is the focus of the *Integral Leadership Review.* One example is McCrimmon (2007, 1), who asserts that "leadership needs to be reframed for a digital, postmodern age. The world is losing its stable and hierarchical character. Life is now more dynamic, chaotic; final authorities have vanished." Edwards (2009) is another example of this emphasis, as demonstrated in the title of his essay "Seeing Integral Leadership Through Three Important Lenses: Developmental, Ecological, and Governance," which incorporates the focus on followers, the environment, and community. Integral leadership themes are common in the popular literature because of the concern for corporate social responsibility among leaders and private organizations, as well as the public administration literature because of its focus on serving the community and doing good.

These themes have been expressed in the literature regarding public sector organizations, but in many cases the theoretical or ideological specification has been substantially more muted and related trends are intermingled more freely. An excellent example of discourse (and gender bias) theory is by Ford (2006, 77) who "examines contemporary discourses of leadership and their complex interrelations with gender and identity in the UK public sector. . . . [and] questions dominant hegemonic and stereotypical notions of subjectivity that assume a simple, unitary identity and perpetuate androcentric depictions of organizational life." Crosby and Kiedrowski (2008) provide four levels of integral leadership spanning the individual, group, organization, and society. Schweigert (2007, 325) provides a concrete example in a community setting in which "leadership is rooted in the authority of the followers" and further asserts that "leadership development must focus less on the qualities of individual leaders and more on the social settings, processes, and needs that require and facilitate authoritative action." Critique of the limits of hierarchy and measurement has suggested more integrated and values-oriented public sector leadership models (Loveday 2008).

Network Theory and Collaborative Leadership

The interconnectedness of problems, the regionalization and globalization of solutions, and the decrease in government resources have emphasized the need to move increasingly from government to governance and from hierarchy to networks (Maak and Pless 2006). This requires that leaders have a new worldview, different competencies, and additional tools. Several sets of literature have evolved that overlap with organizational leadership, which is a primary focus of this chapter. One important example relates to a special issue on collaborative management in *Public Administration Review* in 2006. The symposium editors provide two helpful definitions: "Collaborative public management is a concept that describes the process of facilitating and operating in multi-organizational arrangements to solve problems that cannot be solved or easily solved by single organizations. Collaborative means to co-labor, to cooperate to achieve common goals, working across boundaries in multisector relationships. Cooperation is based on the value of reciprocity" (O'Leary, Gerard, and Bingham 2006, 7).

They further note that "participatory governance is the active involvement of citizens in government decision making. Governance means to steer the process that influences decisions and actions within the private, public, and civic sectors." Don Kettl (2006, 10) explains why the contemporary imperative to collaborate is more important than historic boundaries. He notes, "Working effectively at these boundaries requires new strategies of collaboration and new skills for public managers. Failure to develop these strategies—or an instinct to approach boundaries primarily as political symbolism—worsens the performance of the administrative system." Thompson and Perry (2006) dissect collaboration into five variable dimensions that leaders have to understand and master for maximum effectiveness: governance, administration, organizational autonomy, mutuality, and norms of trust and reciprocity. Researchers also point out when collaboration is less than ideal (McGuire 2006) and discuss the limits of collaboration (Bevir 2006).

MAJOR ACTIVITY IN LEADERSHIP STUDIES

Leadership studies have progressed not only because of the additional postmodern perspective, but also because of a maturation of some to the traditional foci. Attention is now given to specific areas in more detail in which there has been significant activity: distributed leadership, transformational leadership, ethics, methods, crisis management, case studies, trait and competency models, and integrated theories.

Distributed Leadership

The attention to followers has not been a major theme in the study of the leadership process in the past. A number of important exceptions existed. For example, Hollander's idiosyncratic credit theory (1958) noted that leaders build up and lose psychological support that they use in their initiatives. However, the traits of leaders, their daily practices (transactions), and the ability to inspire change have tended to be center stage. Contemporary trends have increasingly placed followers in their various guises in an equal light, and have given them far more research attention. Pearce and Conger's (2003) important work, *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership,* crystallized the new rethinking about nonleader-centric forms of leadership by incorporating elements of vertical leadership with horizontal leadership (i.e., self-managed teams, leadership of self, and various types of empowering leadership). Horizontal leadership is often called distributed leadership; *Leadership Quarterly* devoted a special issue to it in 2006, as well

as one that included followers in 2001. Examples in the follower-distributed vein are numerous; a few noteworthy ones are Kellerman's book on followership (2008), Drath et al.'s call for an "increasingly peer-like and collaborative" framework (2008), and Van Vugt, Hogan, and Kaiser's (2008, 182) historical-evolutionary analysis for why leadership research "tends to ignore the central role of followers." Calls for more emphasis on followers and collective action in public sector settings have become more common around the globe (Dunoon 2002; Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe 2005; Lawler 2008; Lemay 2009).

Teams started to become important in the 1980s, but research lagged until the 1990s, as did team leadership functions in particular (Burke et al. 2006). The different types of teams (senior management, functional, cross-functional, self-managed, etc.) with their different emphases on regular production, communication, and innovation, as well as vertical versus horizontal (distributed) modalities, have made research in this area complex. Today, with the increased importance of distributed leadership, leadership in teams has become an important topic (Day, Gronn, and Salas 2006). Transformational leadership effects have been formally studied for face-to-face and virtual teams (Purvanova and Bono 2009; Schaubroeck, Lam, and Cha 2007). Significant work has been done on different types of teams such as senior management teams (Wageman et al. 2008), comparing the importance of vertical and shared leadership elements (Pearce, Conger, and Locke 2008), representative teams and organizational democracy (Clarke 2006), and the effects of formal leadership roles on individual performance (Day, Sin, and Chen 2004), among other topics.

Transformational Leadership

Although some studies still usefully point out the utility of transactional approaches (e.g., Vecchio, Justin, and Pearce 2008), the debate over the effectiveness of transformational leadership over transactional leadership (e.g., Schriesheim et al. 2006) has subsided with a more reasonable acknowledgment that both styles are needed in different situations to different degrees (O'Shea et al. 2009). One of the key elements, change, has received a significant amount of research on the public sector side. For example, Fernandez and Pitts (2007) investigated the array of factors enhancing or diminishing change in an educational setting, Wright and Pandey (2009) found more transformational leadership at the municipal level than has been assumed by scholars, Dull (2008) examined the prime importance of credibility for public leaders, and Washington and Hacker (2005) studied the critical need for public managers to fully understand policy changes for better implementation.

Although charismatic leadership is typically considered a subtype of transformational leadership, it continues to receive a great deal of interest. Sosik (2005) found that approximately 11 percent of the positive performance variance was due to the presence of charisma in the case of five organizations, while Rowold and Heinitz in their study (2007) found that charismatic leadership had a significant impact only on subjective perceptions of performance, not on profit. Work by de Hoogh et al. (2005) discriminated the subtle but significant differences in the operation of charisma in the private versus public sectors, finding that leader responsibility makes a difference in charismatic appeal. Javidian and Waldman (2003) also found that charismatic leadership was a potent force in the public sector. Innumerable studies and books have examined negative charisma, among them Cha and Edmondson (2006), which looked at the long-term disenchantment effect, and Tourish and Vatcha (2005), which looked at charisma leading to corruption at Enron. Related to negative charisma is an increase in research on the nature of other types of negative leadership by various names (Rosenthal and Pittinsky 2006; Schilling (2009).

Among the other aspects of transformational leadership that have received considerable attention

include the effects of vision (e.g., Strange and Mumford 2005), the role of positive emotions and mood contagion (e.g., Bono and Ilies 2006), and the effect of those positive emotions on service relationships (Liao and Chuang 2007). Strategic leadership is closely aligned with transformational leadership, but it focuses more on how ideas are selected, how decisions are made, and the subsequent implementation (e.g., Boal and Hooijberg 2001; Pajunen 2006). Discussions of strategic leadership at the administrative level have been more muted in the public sector because of issues related to democratic accountability, but it has not been entirely overlooked (Fairholm 2009).

Ethics and Leadership

The mainstream leadership literature has finally started to come of age in looking at ethics in more than an ad hoc framework. Three different perspectives have emerged (Trevino, Weaver, and Reynolds 2006) that are distinctive enough to describe, but the ideal-type models sketched here inevitably have a good deal of overlap as articulated by various theorists. The ethical leadership model (e.g., Brown and Trevino 2006) focuses on moral management at a more transactional level and ethical standards at the organizational level (Waldman and Siegel 2008). What do leaders do to support ethical and moral behavior, and what do they need to do in order to make sure that organizations themselves are ethical?

A second model is the servant leadership model (e.g., Greenleaf 1977; Liden et al. 2008), which focuses more on supporting followers via participation, empowerment, and development. How can leaders make sure that the organization is about the employees and end users? A more recent version of servant leadership is spiritual leadership, which emphasizes membership and calling (Fry, Vitucci, and Cedillo 2005) to balance transformational needs that focus primarily on the organization (Parolini, Patterson and Winston 2009).

A third model is authentic leadership, which tends to focus on self-awareness, honesty, and transparency (Avolio and Gardner 2005; Yammarino et al. 2008). How can leaders have integrity in a multifaceted world? All these themes have been extensively discussed in the public sector literature for some time in journals such as *Public Integrity* and indirectly in both the ethics and management literatures (Menzel 2007). A current example of a relatively new theme in the public sector is "affective" leadership, which stresses the need to take into consideration the emotional labor so common in the public sector (Newman, Guy, and Mastracci 2009).

Trust has continued to be an important topic in the mainstream (no matter the research paradigm) and in the public sector. Trust is invariably highlighted by popular writers such as Covey (2009), and the mainstream literature has shown the power of positive organizational behaviors as emerging from select traits such as hope, optimism, resiliency, and other variables (Luthans 2007), and has provided careful analyses of the subelements of trust (Burke et al. 2007). Extensive research has been done about trust in government. This includes Newell, Reeher, and Ronayne's edited volume (2008) on building trust through values-based leadership, self-awareness, coaching, using teams effectively, providing high performance (good value), collaborating, and using good networking skills. Empirical research has shown that although citizen participation and involvement can positively affect trust, agency or government performance is the stronger factor ultimately (Vigoda-Gadot and Mizrahi 2008; Wang and Van Wart 2007).

Methods

Because of the complexity of approaches, factors, and interactions, the strength of research methods is a major concern relative to the perceived credibility of the field from a scholarly perspective.

Although popular and quasi-academic products are not expected to provide the same level of rigor, the scholarly literature should provide clearly enunciated constructs, carefully conceived hypotheses, and well-crafted empirical arguments (Yammarino and Dansereau 2008). In a 2005 meta-analysis, Yammarino et al. explored the conceptual accuracy of seventeen different approaches to leadership: Ohio State, contingency, participative, charismatic, transformational, leader-member exchange, information processing/implicit, substitutes, romance, self-leadership, multiple linkage, multilevel/leaderplex, individualized, path goal, vertical dyad linkage, situational, and influence tactics. Their concern was that the four major levels of analysis, "individuals or persons (independent human beings), dyads (two person groups and interpersonal relationships), groups (work groups and teams), and organizations (collectives larger than groups and groups of groups)," are commonly but inappropriately blended or conflated, thereby confounding good theoretical modeling practices (Yammarino et al. 2005, 880). They found that "while the literature is vast and growing, relatively few studies in any of the areas of leadership research have addressed levels-of-analysis, and inference drawing. Nevertheless, the findings reported are encouraging, as levels issues are still relatively new to the leadership field and some progress has clearly been made in the last decade" (879). Simultaneously, the postmodern approaches have emphasized qualitative techniques such as biography (Shamir, Dayan-Horesh, and Adler 2005) and narrative inquiry (O'Spina and Dodge 2005).

Leadership in Crisis Management

All organizations can and do have crises from time to time, but their frequency and severity are much affected by the quality of leadership (Tichy and Bennis 2007; Boin and 't Hart 2003). Good leaders have contingency plans (mitigation) to prevent many crises altogether, prepare for a variety of plausible events, respond quickly and effectively when crises occur, and are able to move the affected community and responding organizations back to normalcy after the event in a reasonable timeframe.

Emergency response agencies have a special challenge in dealing with catastrophic events that are very large or unusual, or simply catch agencies off guard (Farazmand 2001). The Katrina/Rita crisis has both entered the national psyche and received tremendous scholarly attention. An entire special issue of *Public Administration Review* in 2007 looked at the roots of administrative failure in the wake of Katrina. The failures of leadership in this event got wide coverage in all the major public administration journals. For example, Kapucu and Van Wart (2006, 2008) compared the administrative successes of the "horde of hurricanes" that inundated Florida in 2004 to the leadership failures experienced in New Orleans with Katrina.

Biographical Case Studies

It was not many years ago that case studies of administrators were scarce and nearly always atheoretical. The biographies of outstanding leaders not only commemorate the qualities of professionalism and perseverance, but serve as valuable teaching tools as well. This deficit has been remedied by numerous biographical case studies, as well as books devoted to significant administrative leaders. In the journal *Public Integrity,* cases include those of George C. Marshall, known for the Marshall Plan (Pops 2006), Dag Hammarskjold, the strong-willed leader of the United Nations from 1953 to 1961 (Lyon 2006–7), and Sam Medina, an everyday moral exemplar (Rugeley and Van Wart 2006). "Administrative profiles" have also been highlighted in *Public Administration Review.* They include the case of Charles Rossotti of the Internal

Revenue Service (Rainey and Thompson 2006), Elmer Staats, who headed the Government Accountability Office (Callahan 2006), and Sean O'Keefe at NASA (Lambright 2008). The IBM Center for the Business of Government provided a volume including short profiles in leadership, specifically seeking out administrative leaders who were not cabinet secretaries (Morales 2007). Of course, many biographies about political and business leaders are published in the popular press, but one that stands out as focusing on an administrative leader is that of Colin Powell (Harari 2002).

Trait and Competency Models

Trait and competency research is alive and well in the organizational world, despite ongoing debates (Hollenbeck, McCall, and Silzer 2006). These debates pit applied and pure researchers against each other. Critics argue that competency models are based on unrealistic assumptions: a single set of characteristics that adequately describes effective leaders, independence of context and trait interaction, and senior management bias for simplistic presentations. Essentially, they argue, competency models are a "descendant of the long-discredited 'great man' theory." Zaccaro (2007), while acknowledging the potential of a trait-competency approach, notes that the value will also be limited unless researchers combine traits and attributes in conceptually meaningful ways that predict leadership. Contemporary critics argue that competency models are excessively individually oriented and leader-centric from discursive and constructionist perspectives (Bolden and Gosling 2006; Carroll, Levy, and Richmond 2008). Proponents argue that competency models have utility because they summarize the experience and insight of seasoned leaders, specify a range of useful behavior, provide a powerful tool for self-development, and outline a framework useful for leadership effectiveness. Yukl, Gordon, and Tabor (2002) use a hierarchical taxonomy with task, relations, and change behavior metacategories that utilizes confirmatory factor analysis to provide empirical support to competency approaches.

Although there are more than eighty-eight thousand units of government in the United States when states, counties, municipalities of various types, school districts, and special districts are counted, the civilian federal government is in a class of its own because of its size, constituting about 11 percent of the employees in American government (U.S. OMB 2009). Because of its resources and prestige, it has unique opportunities to lead when it chooses to do so. One area where it has been generally strong is in leadership research.

One reason for the quality of federal data is because it has been very strong at setting up the systems to critique itself through the Government Accountability Office, Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB), and inspectors general of the various agencies. The reports of these agencies and offices are, in general, exceptionally well researched and cogently written (see, for example, U.S. Government Accountability Office 2006; Merit System Protection Board 2007). The quality of data provided means that academic research has much to work with, and not only are analyses of the degree of success forthcoming, but so, too, is the analysis of its leadership (e.g., Menzel 2006; Light 2008). The Office of Personnel Management has long tried to provide leadership in applied leadership models (U.S. OPM 1999, 2006), which has encouraged the use of rigorous competency models by academics as well (Van Wart 2003, 2005). Using their own data set, Thach and Thompson (2007) provided a detailed competency comparison of private and public (and nonprofit) organizations. While there was a great deal of similarity, significant differences emerged where business emphasized time management, self-knowledge, and marketing in contrast to the public and nonprofit sectors, which emphasized conflict management and being inspirational.[4]

Integrated Models and Approaches to Leadership

The urge for integrative theories in the popular literature is relatively constant and has led to prescriptive, normative, universalistic, and relatively simplistic models. Though they may be inspiring and provide numerous useful tips, they are not in general rigorous, especially from a contextual perspective.

The most rigorous and elegant integrative model from the scientific community is generally considered to be Bass's "full range" leadership model (1985, 1996), which merges both transactional and transformational approaches. It has found wide support and has been reported to include up to 70 percent of the variance of leadership factors in some studies. As powerful as this may be at a macrolevel, it is still highly universalistic (noncontextual) and simplistic (it accounts for only the broadest behaviors). Thus, there has been a call by the more traditional empiricists for more descriptively precise theories, as well as a call by the newer postmodern theorists for more complex and relational theories.

Avolio (2007) suggests that integrative theories must contain five elements: cognitive elements of leaders and followers, individual and group behaviors, the historical context, the proximal or internal context, and the distal or environmental context. This is a tall order because so many simultaneous spheres are involved, each with numerous factors that make it nearly impossible to represent in more than a descriptive framework. Some examples of such models from the mainstream are Yukl's flexible leadership theory model (2008), Hunt's extended multiple organizational level model (1996), Boal and Hoojiberg's integrated strategic leadership model (2001), Pearce and Conger's shared leadership model (2003, 2008), and Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey's complexity adaptive systems theory (2007).

One of the significant challenges in organizing leadership research as well as teaching it to practitioners is the enormous situational variety related to different sectors, organizing structures, levels of analysis, and focus of analysis. Even if one narrows the focus to organizational leadership, is one addressing the private or public sector, with their different emphases on profit maximization and competition versus the public good and governance; examining a hierarchical or a team-based organization; distinguishing among the competencies for a frontline supervisor or an agency head; or focusing on managing for results versus the effects of gender, power, or ethics on leadership? While normal science and deep understanding are built upon individual cases, ultimately classes of cases are aligned into categories and types and midlevel theories, which are further aggregated into macrolevel theories. Although mainstream leadership research has been strong at the empirical and middle levels, leadership research has had difficulty agreeing to frameworks to incorporate the disparate theories referenced earlier (i.e., transactional, transformational, distributed, servant).

Integral leadership (aka integrative leadership) focuses on cross-boundary problem solving that elevates the community (Crosby and Bryson 2005; Crosby and Kiedrowski 2008) in the tradition established by Burns (1978). In line with Burns's distinction, it emphasizes "transforming" leadership (raising the consciousness of followers to solve problems through enlightenment as much as self-interest) rather than merely transformational (i.e., change-oriented) leadership, which tends to be more executive and top-down oriented.

Van Wart (2004) frames leadership from an individual and organizational perspective, using a "leadership action cycle" to integrate transactional, transformational, and distributed approaches with particular reference to public sector settings. His model includes five major leader domains—assessments, characteristics, styles, behaviors, and evaluation/development—ultimately incorporating seventy factors. Van Wart's framework is designed to be a useful tool for relating research studies to an overarching context and as a teaching matrix of concrete leadership and management mechanics.

Matthew Fairholm (2004) frames leadership more broadly from a public values perspective. He emphasizes "five leadership perspectives (ranging from leadership as equivalent to scientific management, to leadership being a whole-soul or spiritual endeavor) held by public managers and discusses their implications for public administration." In doing so, he provides a classical apology for administrative leadership. Fernandez (2005) looks at the critical factors leading to superintendent success (educational performance) using an integrative framework and a large data set of Texas school districts. He found that more than half of the variance in organizational performance could be explained by six variables: community support, task difficulty, experience, promotion of change, choice of style, and internal management. While community support had a direct, positive relationship with performance, in other cases variables had nonlinear effects, such as task difficulty, which moderated the choice of style and internal management emphasis, and promotion of change, which had a short-term negative effect because of disruption. Fernandez and Pitts (2007) followed up with a study of leadership change.

RESEARCH GAPS, WEAKNESSES, AND CONCERNS

A number of the major gaps identified by recent reviews have been at least partially addressed. In terms of importance, leadership studies in the public sector have blossomed from being marginalized, when Terry (1995) did his review, to being a recognized area of research interest. In addition to public leadership scholarship, enough materials have been generated with a public sector focus that classes in the area are no longer entirely derivative of materials from business, psychology, and education scholars (Denhardt and Denhardt 2006; Van Wart 2008; Fairholm and Fairholm 2009).

Public leadership theory has followed into more formal aspects of postmodern theory (e.g., complexity and chaos theory) but has integrated collaborative, collective, and network issues with gusto. For example, the affective leadership research of Newman, Guy, and Mastracci (2009) is clearly postmodern in approach. As organizations have flattened in the corporate and agency worlds, distributed theories looking at self-leadership, team leadership, and shared leadership have matured, but more can be done in the administrative leadership arena. Transformational leadership studies have become more careful in their use of constructs and have narrowed their specifications to be more useful and to help build nonuniversalistic theory. Much work needs to be done in this regard. The mainstream has finally caught up with the public sector ethics literature in terms of articulation of conceptual framework. Traditional positivist methods have improved in the field as a whole in terms of levels of analysis and careful model building, but both the mainstream and administrative leadership fields are still rife with impressionistic models utilizing convenience data sets. Some areas in which there has been special interest and need have developed more robustly. Crisis management in the aftermath of 9/11 is one case. The development of teaching materials, case studies, and more sophisticated trait and competency models is another example where materials have blossomed that were formerly scant or out of date with current leadership emphases. Finally, the field as a whole has settled into a better understanding of integrated theory building, from the simplistic trait models of the first half of the twentieth century, the simplistic two-factor matrices of the 1960s through the 1980s, and the interesting but exaggerated debates about leadership versus management and transactional methods versus transformational methods from the late 1970s through the 1990s. Today, with the addition of more theoretically grounded distributed leadership literature, and the enriching nature of postmodern approaches warning us of the excesses of positivism (and its attendant methodologies) and the reification of power, there are finally a variety of comprehensive approaches with a better appreciation of the virtues (and limits) of those approaches.

Nonetheless, there are still a few concerns that are apparent from reviewing the field as well as reviewing manuscripts for publication. One concern is that the strong convictions of many scholars interested in the field tend to lead to implicit if not explicit statements of certitude that they have "the answer" to the leadership question. Such assertions are useful for popular books sold in airports, with their breezy lists of favorite tips and personalized models. This leads to an unhelpful assertion or inference that one type of leadership study is more important than another. An example of this occurred in the mainstream during the 1980s when transformational leadership roared onto the scene and there was a dismissal of management as routine and plentiful, if not downright trivial and potentially insidious. Second, there is still a substantial problem with studies being able to site the context of their "problem" in the bigger picture, which consequently reduces their generalizability and usefulness as normal science. Nevertheless, the recent advances in both the mainstream, in terms of better balance, and the public leadership literature, in terms of self-consciousness and depth, have been impressive.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The importance of public sector leadership is profound but, historically, has lagged behind the mainstream. However, public sector leadership is slowly becoming its own specialized area of study. Political, organization, and collaborative leadership are distinctive subareas within public sector leadership. An important development in all fields of leadership study is postmodernism. In leadership studies, postmodernism is a broad critique of the literature as being too status quo oriented with an emphasis on leadership from the top down, positivism, empiricism, and static power structures. This perspective aligns with studies emphasizing gender issues, contextual and ethnographic research strategies, complexity and chaos theories, and integral or community approaches, among others. Focusing on organizational leadership, the aspects that have developed most in recent years include distributed or horizontal leadership, biographical case studies, crisis management leadership, analysis of federal leadership and applied competency models useful for government, network and collaborative leadership, and integrated frameworks or holistic perspectives of leadership. The field of public sector leadership is generally more nuanced in terms of specifying types of leadership, the factors involved, and the use of different perspectives. As important, it has achieved a critical mass and can be considered a recognizable and maturing field of interest.

NOTES

1. The review focuses on the last ten years of research but emphasizes the last five years when possible.
2. See Van Wart (2005) for a review of prior literature.
3. OMB historical tables, 2009, reflecting the data from 2007 (U.S. OMB 2009).
4. It should be noted that the first item is similar to other competency priority listings: honesty and integrity. The other matched top competencies are somewhat more highly ranked than on similar lists in the past, but these data reflect holistic assessments discussed above: collaboration (team player) and developing others. Adaptability was fourth for the private sector and fifth for the public and nonprofit sector.

REFERENCES

Abramson, M.A., J.D. Breul, and J.M. Kamensky. 2006. *Six Trends Transforming Government.* Washington, DC: IBM Center for Business of Government.
Alimo-Metcalfe, B., and J. Alban-Metcalfe. 2005. Leadership: Time for a new direction? *Leadership* 1 (1): 51–71.

Alvesson, M., and S. Sveningsson. 2003. Managers doing leadership: The extra ordinarization of the mundane. *Human Relations* 56 (12): 1435–1459.

Arvey, R.D., Z. Zhang, B.J. Avolio, and R.F. Krueger. 2007. Developmental and genetic determinants of leadership role occupancy among women. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92 (3): 693–706.

Avolio, B.J. 2007. Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychologist* 62 (1) 25–33.

Avolio, B.J., and W.L. Gardner. 2005. Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly* 16:315–338.

Barker, R.A. 2001. The nature of leadership. *Human Relations* 54 (4): 469–494.

Bass, B.M. 1985. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations.* New York: Free Press.

———. 1996. *A New Paradigm of Leadership: An Inquiry into Transformational Leadership.* Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

———. 2008. *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications.* New York: Free Press.

Bennis, W. 2007. The challenges of leadership in the modern world. *American Psychologist* 62 (1): 2–5.

Bevir, M. 2006. Democratic governance: Systems and radical perspective. *Public Administration Review* 66 (3): 426–436.

Blake, R.R., and Mouton, J.S. 1964. *The Managerial Grid.* Houston, TX: Gulf.

Boal, K.B., and R. Hooijberg. 2001. Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *Leadership Quarterly* 11:515–549.

Bolden, R., and J. Gosling. 2006. Leadership competencies: Time to change the tune? *Leadership* 2 (2): 147–163.

Boin, A., and P. 't Hart. 2003. Public leadership in times of crisis: Mission impossible? *Public Administration Review* 63 (5): 544–553.

Bono, J.E., and R. Ilies. 2006. Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *Leadership Quarterly* 17:317–334.

Brown, M.E., and L.K. Trevino. 2006. Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *Leadership Quarterly* 17:595–616.

Burke, C.S., D.E. Sims, E.H. Lazzara, and E. Salas. 2007. Trust in leadership: A multi-level review and integration. *Leadership Quarterly* 18:606–632.

Burke, C.S., K.C. Stagel, C. Klein, G.F. Goodwin, E. Salas, and S.M. Halpin. 2006. What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly* 17:288–307.

Burns, J.M. 1978. *Leadership.* New York: HarperCollins.

Callahan, K. 2006. Elmer Boyd Staats and the pursuit of good government. *Public Administration Review* 66 (2): 159–167.

Carroll, B., L. Levy, and D. Richmond. 2008. Leadership as practice: Challenging the competency paradigm. *Leadership* 4 (4): 363–379.

Cha, S.E., and A.C. Edmondson. 2006. When values backfire: Leadership, attribution, and disenchantment in a values-driven organization. *Leadership Quarterly* 17:57–78.

Chen, L. 2008. Leaders or leadership: Alternative approaches to leadership studies. *Management Communication Quarterly* 21 (4): 547–555.

Clarke, M. 2006. A study of the role of "representative" leadership in stimulating organization democracy. *Leadership* 2 (4): 427–450.

Collinson, D. 2006. Rethinking followership: A poststructuralist analysis of follower identities. *Leadership Quarterly* 17:179–89.

Cortada, J.W., S. Dijkstra, G.M. Mooney, and T. Ramsey. 2008. *Government and the Perpetual Collaboration Mandate: Six Worldwide Drivers Demand Customized Strategies.* Somers, NY: IBM Institute for Business Value.

Covey, S.M.R. 2009. Building trust: How the best leaders do it. *Leadership Excellence* 21 (1): 15.

Crosby, B.C., and J.M. Bryson. 2005. *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crosby, B.C., and J. Kiedrowski. 2008. Integrative leadership: Observations from a University of Minnesota seminar series. *Integral Leadership Review* 8 (3): 1–14. www.integralleadershipreview.com/archives/2008–06/2008–06-article-crosby.html (accessed July 2010).

Day, D.V., P. Gronn, and E. Salas. 2006. Leadership in team-based organizations: On the threshold of a new era. *Leadership Quarterly* 17:211–216.

Day, D.V., H. Sin, and T.T. Chen. 2004. Assessing the burdens of leadership: Effects of formal leadership roles on individual performance over time. *Personnel Psychology* 57 (3): 573–605.

De Hoogh, A.H.B., D.N. Den Hartog, P.L. Koopman, H. Thierry, P.T. Van den Berg, J.G. Van der Weide, and C.P.M. Wilderom. 2005. Leader motives, charismatic leadership, and subordinate's work attitude in the profit and voluntary sector. *Leadership Quarterly* 16:17–38.

Denhardt, R.B., and J.V. Denhardt. 2006. *The Dance of Leadership: The Art of Leading Business, Government, and Society.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Drath, W.H., C.D. McCauley, C.J. Palus, W. Van Velsor, P.M.G. O'Connor, and J.B. McGuire. 2008. Direction, alignment, commitment: Toward a more integrative ontology of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly* 19: 635–653.

Dull, M. 2008. Results-model reform leadership: Questions of credible commitment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19 (2): 255–284.

Dunoon, D. 2002. Rethinking leadership for the public sector. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 61 (3): 3–18.

Edwards, M. 2009. Seeing integral leadership through three important lenses: Developmental, ecological and governance. *Integral Leadership Review* 9 (1): 1–13.

Eagly, H., and L.L. Carli. 2007. *Through the Labyrinth: The Truth about How Women Become Leaders.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Fairholm, M.R. 2004. Perspectives on the practice of leadership. *Public Administration Review* 64 (5): 577–590.

———. 2009. Leadership and organizational strategy. *Innovation Journal* 14 (1): article 3 (online). http://www.innovation.cc/scholarly-style/fairholm3.pdf (accessed July 2010).

Fairholm, M.R., and G.W. Fairholm. 2009. *Understanding Leadership Perspectives.* New York: Springer.

Fairhurst, G.T. 2007. *Discursive Leadership: In Conversation with Leadership Psychology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Farazmand, A. 2001. Crisis and emergency management. In *Handbook of Crisis and Emergency Management,* ed. A. Farazmand, pp. 1–10. New York: Marcel Dekker.

Fernandez. S. 2005. Developing and testing an integrative framework of public sector leadership: Evidence from the public education arena. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15 (2): 197–217.

Fernandez, S., and D.W. Pitts. 2007. Under what conditions do public managers favor and pursue organizational change? *American Review of Public Administration* 37 (3): 324–341.

Foucault, M. 1970. *The Order of Things.* New York: Pantheon.

———. 1972. *Archaeology of Knowledge.* New York: Pantheon.

Ford, J. 2006. Discourses of leadership: Gender, identity and contradiction in a UK public sector organization. *Leadership* 2 (1): 77–99.

Fry, L.W., S. Vitucci, and M. Cedillo. 2005. Spiritual leadership and army transformation: Theory, measurement, and establishing a baseline. *Leadership Quarterly* 16:835–862.

Goffee, R., and G. Jones. 2009. Authentic leadership. *Leadership Excellence* 26 (7): 17.

Greenleaf, R.K. 1977. *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness.* New York: Paulist Press.

Gronn, P. 2002. Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly* 13:481–490.

Hersey, P., and K.H. Blanchard. 1969. Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal* 23 (1): 26–34.

Harari, O. 2002. *The Leadership Secrets of Colin Powell.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hollander, E.P. 1958. Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review* 65:117–127.

Hollenbeck, G.P., M.W. McCall, and R.F. Silzer. 2006. Leadership competency models. *Leadership Quarterly* 17 (4): 398–413.

House, R.J., and T.R. Mitchell. 1974. Path-goal theory of leadership. *Contemporary Business* 3 (Fall): 81–98.

Hunt, J.G. 1996. *Leadership: A New Synthesis.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Javidian, M., and D.A. Waldman. 2003. Exploring charismatic leadership in the public sector: Measurement and consequences. *Public Administration Review* 63 (2): 229–242.

Kaiser, R.B., R. Hogan, and S.B. Craig. 2008. Leadership and the fate of organizations. *American Psychologist* 63 (2): 96–110.

Kapucu, N., and M. Van Wart. 2006. The evolving role of the public sector in managing catastrophic disasters: Lessons learned. *Administration and Society* 38 (3): 1–30.

———. 2008. Making matters worse: Anatomy of leadership failures in catastrophic events. *Administration and Society* 40 (7): 711–740.

Kellerman, B. 2008. *Followership: How Followers Are Creating Change and Changing Leaders.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Kelly, S. 2008. Leadership: A categorical mistake? *Human Relations* 61 (6): 763–782.

Kettl, D. 2006. Managing boundaries in American administration: The collaboration imperative. *Public Administration Review* 66 (supplement): 10–19.

Lambright, W.H. 2008. Leadership and change at NASA: Sean O'Keefe as administrator. *Public Administration Review* 68 (2): 230–240.

Lawler, J. 2008. Individualization and public sector leadership. *Public Administration* 86 (1): 21–34.

Lemay, L. 2009. The practice of collective and strategic leadership in the public sector. *Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal* 14 (1): 1–19.

Liao, H., and A. Chuang. 2007. Transforming service employees and climate: A multilevel, multisource examination of transformational leadership in building long-term service relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92 (4): 1006–1019.

Lichtenstein, B.B., and D.A. Plowman. 2009. The leadership of emergence: A complex systems leadership theory of emergence at successive organizational levels. *Leadership Quarterly* 20:617–630.

Liden, R.C., S.J. Wayne, H. Zhao, and D. Henderson. 2008. Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly* 19:161–177.

Light, P.C. 2008. A government ill executed: The depletion of the federal service. *Public Administration Review* 68 (3): 413–419.

Loveday, B. 2008. Performance management and the decline of leadership within public services in the United Kingdom. *Policing* 2 (1): 120–130.

Luthans, F. 2007. Emerging positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Management* 33 (3): 321–349.

Lyon, A.J. 2006–7. Moral motives and policy actions: The case of Dag Hammarskjold at the United Nations. *Public Integrity* 9 (1): 70–95.

Maak, T., and N.M. Pless, eds. 2006. *Responsible Leadership: A Relational Approach.* London: Routledge.

McCrimmon, M. 2007. Reframing leadership for a modern age. *Integral Leadership Review* 7 (2): 1–6.

McGuire, M. 2006. Collaborative public management: Assessing what we know and how we know it. *Public Administration Review* 66 (supplement): 33–43.

Menzel, D.C. 2006. The Katrina aftermath: A failure of federalism or leadership? *Public Administration Review* 66 (6): 808–812.

———. 2007. *Ethics Management for Public Administrators: Building Organizations of Integrity.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Merit System Protection Board. 2007. *Merit Principles Survey: 2007.* www.mspb.gov/netsearch/viewdocs.aspx?docnumber=288965&version=289309&application=ACROBAT (see parts B–D in particular) (accessed July 2010).

Mishel, L., J. Bernstein, and H. Sheirholz. 2009. *The State of Working America: 2008–2009.* Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Morales, A. 2007. *Management Matters: The Business of Government.* Washington, DC: IBM Global Business Services.

Morse, R.S., T.F. Buss, and C.M. Kinghorn, eds. 2007. *Transforming Public Leadership for the 21st Century.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Newell, T., G. Reeher, and P. Ronayne, eds. 2008. *The Trusted Leader: Building the Relationships That Make Government Work.* Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Newland, C.A. 1994. A field of strangers in search of a discipline: Separatism of public management research from public administration. *Public Administration Review* 54 (5): 486–495.

Newman, M.A., M.E. Guy, and S.H. Mastracci. 2009. Affective leadership and emotional labor. *Public Administration Review* 69 (1): 6–20.

O'Leary, R., C. Gerard, and L.B. Bingham. 2006. Introduction to the symposium on collaborative public management. *Public Administration Review* 66 (supplement): 6–9.

O'Shea, P.G., R.J. Foti, N.M.A. Hauenstein, and P. Bycio. 2009. Are the best leaders both transformational and transactional? A pattern analysis. *Leadership* 5 (2): 237–259.

O'Spina, S., and J. Dodge. 2005. It's about time: Catching method up to meaning—The usefulness of narrative inquiry in public administration research. *Public Administration Review* 65 (2): 143–157.

Osborn, R.N., and J.G. Hunt. 2007. Leadership and the choice of order: Complexity and hierarchical perspectives near the edge of chaos. *Leadership Quarterly* 18:319–340.

Pajunen, K. 2006. The more things change, the more they remain the same? Evaluating strategic leadership in organizational transformations. *Leadership* 2 (3): 341–366.

Parolini, J., K. Patterson, and B. Winston. 2009. Distinguishing between transformational and servant leadership. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal* 30 (3): 274–291.

Pearce, C.L., and J.A. Conger. 2003. *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearce, C.L., J.A. Conger, and E. Locke. 2008. Shared leadership theory. *Leadership Quarterly* 19: 622–628.

Pops, G. 2006. The ethical leadership of George C. Marshall. *Public Integrity* 8 (2): 165–185.

Purvanova, R.K., and J.E. Bono. 2009. Transformational leadership in context: Face-to-face and virtual teams. *Leadership Quarterly* 20:343–357.

Rainey, H.G., and J. Thompson. 2006. Leadership and the transformation of a major institution: Charles Rossotti and the Internal Revenue Service. *Public Administration Review* 66 (4): 596–604.

Rosenthal, S.A., and T.L. Pittinsky. 2006. Narcissistic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly* 17:617–633.

Rowold, J., and K. Heinitz. 2007. Transformational and charismatic leadership: Assessing the convergent, divergent and criterion validity of the MLK and the CKS. *Leadership Quarterly* 18:121–133.

Rugeley, C., and M. Van Wart. 2006. Everyday moral exemplars. *Public Integrity* 8 (4): 381–394.

Schaubroeck, J., S.S.K. Lam, and S.E. Cha. 2007. Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92 (4): 1020–1030.

Schilling. J. 2009. From ineffectiveness to destruction: A qualitative study on the meaning of negative leadership. *Leadership* 5 (1): 102–128.

Schriesheim, C.A., S.L. Castro, X. Zhou, and L.A. DeChurch. 2006. An investigation of path-goal and transformational leadership theory predictions at the individual level of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly* 17:21–38.

Schweigert, F.J. 2007. Learning to lead: Strengthening the practice of community leadership. *Leadership* 3 (3): 325–342.

Shamir, B., H. Dayan-Horesh, and D. Adler. 2005. Leading by biography: Towards a life-story approach to the study of leadership. *Leadership* 1 (1): 13–29.

Sosik, J.J. 2005. The role of personal values in the charismatic leadership of corporate managers: A model and preliminary field study. *Leadership Quarterly* 16:221–244.

Strange, J.M., and M.D. Mumford. 2005. The origins of vision: Effects of reflection, models, and analysis. *Leadership Quarterly* 16:121–148.

Terry, L. 1995. *Leadership of Public Bureaucracies: The Administrator as Conservator.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thach, E., and K.J. Thompson. 2007. Trading places: Examining leadership competencies between for-profit vs. public and non-profit leaders. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 28 (4): 356–375.

Thompson, A.M., and J.L. Perry. 2006. Collaboration processes: Inside the black box. *Public Administration Review* 66 (supplement): 20–32.

Tourish, D., and N. Vatcha. 2005. Charismatic leadership and corporate cultism at Enron: The elimination of dissent, the promotion of conformity and organizational collapse. *Leadership* 1 (4): 455–480.

Tichy, N.M., and W.G. Bennis. 2007. *Judgment: How Winning Leaders Make Great Calls.* New York: Penguin.

Trevino, L.K., G.R. Weaver, and S.J. Reynolds. 2006. Behavioral ethics in organizations: A review. *Journal of Management* 32:951–990.

Trottier, T., M. Van Wart, and X. Wang. 2008. Examining the nature and significance of leadership in government organizations. *Public Administration Review* 68 (2): 319–333.

Uhl-Bien, M. 2006. Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *Leadership Quarterly* 17:654–676.

Uhl-Bien, M., R. Marion, and B. McKelvey. 2007. Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *Leadership Quarterly* 18:298–318.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. 2006. *Catastrophic Disasters: Enhanced Leadership, Capabilities, and Accountability Controls Will Improve the Effectiveness of the Nation's Preparedness, Response, and Recovery System.* GAO-06–618. Washington, DC: USGAO.

U.S. Office of Management and Budget (U.S. OMB). 2009. Historical tables (17.5). www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2009/pdf/hist.pdf (accessed July 2010).

U.S. Office of Personnel Management (U.S. OPM). 1999. *High Performance Leaders—A Competency Model.* Drafted by L.D. Eyde. D.J. Gregory, T.W. Muldrow, and P.K. Mergen. Report PRDC-99–02. Washington, DC: Employment Service—Personnel and Development Center.

———. 2006. Executive core qualifications. Washington, DC: U.S. OPM. www.chcoc.gov/Transmittals/Attachments/trans751.pdf.

Van Slyke, D.M., and R.W. Alexander. 2006. Public service leadership: Opportunities for clarity and coherence. *American Review of Public Administration* 36 (4): 362–374.

Van Vugt, M., R. Hogan, and R.B. Kaiser. 2008. Leadership, followership, and evolution. *American Psychologist* 63 (3): 182–196.

Van Wart, M. 2003. Public sector leadership theory: An assessment. *Public Administration Review* 6 (2): 214–228.

———. 2004. A comprehensive model of organizational leadership: The leadership action cycle. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior* 7 (2): 173–208.

———. 2005. *Dynamics of Leadership in Public Service: Theory and Practice.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

———. 2008. *Leadership in Public Organizations: An Introduction.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Van Wart, M., and E. Berman. 1999. Contemporary public sector productivity values: Narrower scope, tougher standards, and new rules of the game. *Public Productivity and Management Review* 22 (3): 326–347.

Vecchio, R.P., J.E. Justin, and C.L. Pearce. 2008. The utility of transactional and transformational leadership for predicting performance and satisfaction with a path-goal theory framework. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 81 (1): 71–82.

Vigoda-Gadot, E., and S. Mizrahi. 2008. Public sector management and the democratic ethos: A 5-year study of key relationships in Israel. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18 (1): 79–108.

Vroom, V.H., and P.W. Yetton. 1973. *Leadership and Decision-making.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Wageman, R., D.N. Nunes, J.A. Burruss, and J.R. Hackman. 2008. *Senior Leadership Teams: What It Takes to Make Them Great.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Waldman, D.A., and D. Siegel. 2008. Defining social responsibility. *Leadership Quarterly* 19:117–131.

Wang, X., and M. Van Wart. 2007. When public participation in administration leads to trust: An empirical assessment of managers' perceptions. *Public Administration Review* 67 (2): 265–278.

Washington, M., and M. Hacker. 2005. Why change fails: Knowledge counts. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal* 26 (5): 400–411.

Wright, B.E., and S.K. Pandey. 2009. Transformational leadership in the public sector: Does structure matter? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory:* 20 (1): 75–89.

Yammarino, F.J., and F. Dansereau. 2008. Multi-level nature of and multi-level approaches to leadership. *Leadership Quarterly* 19:135–141.

Yammarino, F.J., S.D. Dionne, J.U. Chun, and F. Dansereau. 2005. Leadership and levels of analysis: A state-of-the-science review. *Leadership Quarterly* 16:879–919.

Yammarino, F.J., S.D. Dionne, C.A. Schriesheim, and F. Dansereau. 2008. Authentic leadership and positive organizational behavior: a meso, multi-level perspective. *Leadership Quarterly* 19:693–707.

Yukl, G. 2008. How leaders influence organizational effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly* 19:708–722.

Yukl, G., A. Gordon, and T. Taber. 2002. A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 9 (1): 15–32.

Zaccaro, S.J. 2007. Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist* 62 (1): 6–16.