

Resource for

Chapter 2: Conceptual Confusion

*This Book Note accompanies the review of the state of thinking about the concept of 'leadership' in business organisations in Chapter 2, Conceptual Confusion, of **The Leadership Mind**. This review established that the state of conceptualisation about 'leadership' in business organisations was and continues to be a muddle.*

*Our account in the books part of Chapter 2 drew on the review of Rost (1991) which covered books published in the century from 1890 to 1990. We wanted to check the state of play from then until the present. It was not possible within the physical confines of **The Leadership Mind** to give a comprehensive survey of all that has been written on 'leadership' since 1990 to the extent that Rost undertook for his review.*

To help readers to make up their own minds what has been going on about 'leadership' in the period since the end of Rost's survey, we review a selection of books from prominent writers on various approaches to 'leadership' since 1990. We give a sampling of quotations so readers can get a flavour of how 'leadership' is presented in these kinds of writings.

■ CONCEPTUAL CONFUSION ABOUT 'LEADERSHIP' CONTINUES FROM 1990 TO TODAY

Our selective review of books starts from the end of Rost's survey in 1990 at the end of Rost's century.

In 1990, Max De Pree, reflecting his practitioner experience running the Herman Miller furniture company, stated that 'leadership is not an easy subject to explain' while noting that "[c]oncepts of leadership, ideas about leadership, and leadership practices are the subject of much thought, discussion, writing, teaching, and learning".¹

De Pree saw 'leadership' as responsibilities in

his *Leadership Is an Art*. In the chapter titled What is Leadership? he began with:

The first responsibility of a leader is to define reality. The last is to say thank you. In between the two, the leader must become a servant and a debtor. That sums up the progress of an artful leader.²

Seeing 'leadership' in terms of duty is in the spirit of Greenleaf's 'Servant Leadership', coming from the Gospel of Luke to which he refers.³ It conveys how De Pree is thinking considering his extensive experience in running a reputable and successful business. He says:

The art of leadership requires us to think about the leader-as-steward in terms of relationships: of assets and legacy, of momentum and effectiveness, of civility and values.

The list of responsibilities also includes: bequeathing assets and legacy; a clear statement of the values of the organization which lead to the principles and standards that guide the practices of the people; identifying, developing, and nurturing future leadership; a new reference point for what caring, purposeful, committed people can be in the organizational setting; a certain maturity; rationality giving reason and mutual understanding to programs and to relationship and giving visible order; understanding the economic basis of the corporation; space for people in the sense of the freedom enabling our gifts to be exercised giving each other the space to grow, to be ourselves, to exercise our diversity; provide and maintain momentum; developing, expressing, defending civility and values, and ensuring 'effectiveness'. The latter references Drucker's distinction

between 'efficiency', as doing the thing right, and effectiveness', as doing the right thing, and he says leaders can delegate efficiency, but they must deal personally with effectiveness.⁴

James O'Toole said in his foreword to De Pree's book:

Of the dozen or so books published in the last few years that have stressed the role of the leader in achieving corporate excellence, this is the only one that puts forward one forgotten but essential truth about leadership: leaders have ideas. In those other books, leaders are portrayed, variously, as charismatic personalities, showmen, cheerleaders, con artist, visionaries, autocrats, and circus stunt men. They bark orders and run around doing everybody else's work for them. How preposterous that this could work in a company of one thousand (let alone a hundred thousand) employees! Max's idea of leadership is different. He knows from his experience that it is not a leader's strong voice, the snap of his whip, or his trendy TV persona that motivates employees. The art of leadership, as Max says, is 'liberating people to do what is required of them in the most effective and humane way possible'. Thus, the leader is the servant of his followers in that he removes the obstacles that prevent them from doing their jobs. In short, the true leader enables his or her followers to realize their full potential.⁵

De Pree is one of our favourites along with the James March volume to come.

Also in 1990, John W Gardner, one of the prominent writers in the field of 'leadership' studies in general and in business organisations who, in referring to himself, says he has been writing on 'leadership' for 25 years,⁶ notes in *On Leadership* that:

Leadership is the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers.⁷

This idea of 'leadership' runs into some trouble when Gardner later says:

We say that we want effective leadership; but Hitler was effective. Criteria beyond effectiveness are needed.⁸

Thus, something more must be added than the definition he gave.

He continues to make distinctions, saying 'leadership' must not be confused with status, power, or official authority.⁹ As regards the latter, he adds:

Confusion between leadership and official authority has a deadly effect on large organizations. Corporations and government agencies everywhere have executives to imagine that their placement on the organization chart has given them a body of followers. And of course it is not. They have been given subordinates. Whether the subordinates become followers depends on whether the executives act like leaders.¹⁰

He focuses in on 'management' and 'leadership' being different:

Many writers on leadership take considerable pains to distinguish between leaders and managers. In the process leaders generally end up looking like a cross between Napoleon and the Pied Piper, and managers like unimaginative clods. This troubles me.

He says:

The word *manager* usually indicates that the individual so labeled holds a directive post in an organization, presiding over the processes by which the organization functions, allocating resources prudently, and making the best possible use of people

while noting that:

The manager is more tightly linked to an organization than is the leader indeed the leader may have no organization at all.¹¹

Many writers, like Gardner, sense some distinction or need to make a distinction (not the same thing). The line of demarcation drawn is usually vague. It is generally made in terms of subtle characteristics of behaviour or personal attributes as, for example, in Gardner's attempt to separate them by 'tightness of linkage to the organisation'. Most writers, including Kotter as mentioned below, do not make a meaningful separation in terms of their descriptions.

Gardner characterises 'leadership' in terms of 'leaders' and 'leader/managers', that is, people distinguishing themselves on the basis of at least six personal characteristics: they think longer term; they think about the unit they are heading, they grasp its relationship to larger realities; they reach and influence constituents beyond their jurisdictions,

beyond boundaries; they put heavy emphasis on the intangibles of vision, values, and motivation and understand intuitively the nonrational and unconscious elements in leader-constituent interaction; they have the political skill to cope with the conflicting requirements of multiple constituencies; and they think in terms of renewal.¹²

We note here that many writers would use such characteristics to explain the nature and role of 'Management'.

There is a constant flow of influences between business and 'public life' with ideas about 'management' and 'leadership' moving between these realms all the time, not least through the interchange of personnel.¹³

In 1995, as an example, the United Kingdom Committee on Standards in Public Life which formulated 'The Seven Principles of Public Life' (31 May 1995), also known as 'The Nolan Principles', which are to be *applied by anyone* who works as a public office holder.¹⁴ These are: Selflessness, Integrity, Objectivity, Accountability, Openness, Honesty and, the final one, Principle 1.7, is about 'leadership, stating:

Holders of public office should exhibit these principles in their own behaviour. They should actively promote and robustly support the principles and be willing to challenge poor behaviour wherever it occurs.

The obvious question prompted by this statement of 'leadership' is why a more appropriate word, like 'exemplary' or 'exemplar', even the contemporary 'role modelling' and 'giving example', not used since that is clearly what is meant? Why waste the necessary word 'leadership' when there are better alternatives available? Why be so lazy and thoughtless and add to the confusion about 'leadership' in peoples' minds?

There is a genre of books aimed at the business community that may be characterised as 'executive summaries', synopses, or potted summaries of the ideas of various writers purporting to give the busy person all the information they need to know about a topic.

In 1996, the entry on 'Leadership' in *Key Management Ideas: Thinking that Changed the Management World* by Stuart Crainer is a good example in this genre of publication. Written in the encyclopaedia style this gives a snapshot in 14 pages of the thinking about the topic as it was in the air around the time of publication.¹⁵ The example we use to represent

this genre was presented as a 'Management Master Class' in a business series from the 'Financial Times Pitman Publishing'. It gives a light overview of topics without demanding much by way of effort or time. These types of writings about 'leadership' are useful for our purpose because, in providing synopses of current options, they by themselves show in the conflict of options the muddle about the conception of 'leadership' in business.

This example starts with saying:

Leadership is one of the great intangibles of the business world. It is a skill most people would love to possess, but one which *defies close definition*. Ask people which leaders they admire and you are as likely to be told Gandhi as John Kennedy, Jack Welch as Richard Branson. Yet, most agree that leadership is a vital ingredient in business success and that great leaders make for great organizations.¹⁶

Thus, the muddle starts immediately by declaring no point in seeking conceptual clarity. Note that 'leaders' are already identified without a conception of 'leadership'. Unsurprisingly then it continues by quoting a "former chief executive of the Leadership Trust" as saying:

Broadly speaking there are two approaches to leadership. You can theorize about it or you can get on and do it. Theorizing about it is great fun, hugely indulgent and largely useless. Doing it - or doing it better - is demanding, frequently frustrating and of immense value... Those who want to change an organization must be able to change people and in that process there is only one starting point that makes sense. Learning to lead oneself better is the only way to lead others.¹⁷

A better illustration to represent Keynes's aphorism the 'confusion of thought and feeling leads to confusion of speech' than the circularity here could hardly be found in this field. The sentiment about getting on and doing something, rather than talking about it, while admirable presumes we know what the 'it' is. We need only recall Drucker pointing out that 'every practice is based on theory, even if practitioners are not aware of it' to see the nonsense of the first part in this piece as reported here. 'Theory' is thinking. We may well ask, therefore: If you don't know what you are doing, how do you do it, other than by random good luck? The speaker would seem to know what 'leadership' is but, dismissing thinking,

under the pejorative 'theorising', does not tell us what that is. The second half is a *non-sequitur* that presumes what 'leadership' is again without telling us anything as to what it is in this speaker's mind.

The author notes: 'when considering leadership in the *business context* most roots lead to the *military world*'.¹⁸ The potpourri in the case at hand comes under the banner 'The Rise of the New Leader'. It starts with a section headed 'Machiavellian Leadership' and the reader is offered a sample of Machiavelli, such as: "It is unnecessary for a prince to have all the good qualities I have enumerated, but it is very necessary to *appear* to have them', Machiavelli advises, adding the suggestion that it is useful 'to be a great *pretender* and *dissembler*'"¹⁹ ; "Above all", we are told, "Machiavelli is the champion of leadership through cunning and intrigue, the triumph of force over reason":

For many the age of reason has yet to dawn. Managers may not have read *The Prince* but will be able to identify with Machiavelli's observation that 'a Prince ought to have no other aim or thought, nor select anything else for his study, then war and its discipline. In the corporate trenches, Machiavelli remains useful reading.'²⁰

Crainer turns from Machiavelli to 'Military Models', saying "Leadership reemerged on the management agenda in the 1980s after a period of relative neglect. A great many books were produced purporting to offer essential guidance on how to become leader. These tended to follow military inspirations with the business leader portrayed as a general, inspiring the corporate troops to one more effort."²¹ The author says: "The doyen of the military inspired approaches is the UK leadership writer and practitioner, John Adair, who was himself in the army ..." and who "identified a list of the basic functions of leadership: planning, initiating, controlling, supporting, informing, and evaluating" in the belief that "leadership is a skill which can be learned like any other" as "one of the fundamentals of the military approach to leadership - leaders are formed in the crucible of action rather than through chance genetics." We will look at Adair's idea of 'leadership' in terms of one of his own books shortly.

The next section goes on to 'The Evolution of Leadership' with two pages covering the standard range of theories in a series of highlighted, potted

summaries: 'Great Man', 'Trait', 'Power and Influence', 'Behaviorist', 'Situational', 'Contingency', 'Transactional', 'Attribution', and 'Transformational'.

A section called 'The New Leader' comes next. Under this heading we are told:

The increasing emphasis in the 1990s has focused on details as real people managing in a consensus seeking manner. Instead of seeing leadership as being synonymous with dictatorship, this view sees leadership as a more subtle and humane art. It also breaks down the barrier between leadership and management. Traditionally, in theory at least, the two have been separated ... Increasingly, management and leadership are seen as inextricably linked. It is one thing for a leader to propound a grand vision; but it is redundant unless the vision is managed into real achievement. While traditional views of leadership tend eventually to concentrate on vision and charisma, the message now seems to be that charisma is no longer enough to carry leaders through.²²

There are two highlighted boxes on 'Four Types of Management Style, identified by Rensis Likert as 'Exploitative Authoritarian', 'Benevolent Autocracy', 'Consultative', and 'Participative'. The second, 'The Old Models of Leadership', reports the findings of 'Phil Hodgson of the Ashridge Management College', analysing 'a number of business leaders', as concluding that "the old models of leadership are no longer appropriate" and quote Hodgson:

Generally, the managers interviewed had outgrown the notion of the individualistic leader. Instead, they regarded leadership as a question of drawing people and disparate parts of the organization together in a way that made individuals and the organization more effective.

It refers to Adair as concluding that "the new leader must add value as a coach, mentor, and problem solver; allow people to accept credit for success and responsibility for failure; and must continually evaluate and enhance their own leadership role". He is quoted:

[The new leaders] don't follow rigid or orthodox role models, but prefer to nurture their own unique leadership style ...And, they don't do people's jobs for them or put their faith in developing a personality cult.

The bottom line is: "The new recipe for leadership centers on five key areas: learning, energy, simplicity, focus, and innocence." ²³

Another author, Leonard Sayles, who is "representative of a great deal of the new thinking", is quoted as saying "managers who are not leader can only be failures" and Crainer responds:

Interestingly, and unhelpfully for the practicing manager, leadership attracts such aphorisms rather than hard and fast definitions. Indeed, there are a plethora of definitions on what constitutes a leader and the characteristics of leadership. In practice, none have come to be universally, or even widely, accepted. ²⁴

This entry finishes with a section titled 'Warren Bennis: Doing the Right Thing' with one highlighted box on 'Vital Leadership Qualities', taken from a Bennis book in which Bennis concluded that leaders possessed four vital competencies: 'Management of Attention', 'Management of Meaning', 'Management of Trust', and 'Management of Self', and another box, 'Leaders Not Managers', which lists Bennis's 'fundamental differences' between 'leadership' and 'management'. Bennis is quoted:

To survive in the 21st century we're going to need a new generation of leaders, not managers. The distinction is an important one. Leaders conquer the context - the volatile, turbulent, ambiguous surroundings that sometimes see (*sic*) to conspire against us and will surely suffocate us if we let them - while managers surrender to it. ²⁵

Again, while placing 'leadership' in the domain of personal characteristics of the conquering hero as contrasted with the surrendering manager, the line of demarcation is a nebulous one. Other authors are mentioned, including "Harvard's John Kotter [identifying] three 3 central processes in leadership: establishing direction; aligning people; motivating and inspiring" ²⁶, to whom we now turn for another prominent writer on 'leadership' and author of bestselling books.

In 1998, representing a slightly different type of 'executive summary' book with even more 'succinct' synopses, the *MBA Management Models* pick John Adair's 'action-centred leadership', which we will come to later, as their one 'model' of 'leadership'. ²⁷

In 1999, John Kotter lists 'definition' under 'leadership' in the index, something many books on the

subject do not even do. His defines 'leadership' as the:

... development of vision and strategies, the alignment of relevant people behind those strategies, and the empowerment of individuals to make division happen, despite obstacles. ²⁸

He says:

This stands in contrast to *management*, which involves keeping the current system operating through planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling, and problem solving. Leadership works through people and culture. It's soft and hot. Management works through hierarchy and systems. It's harder and cooler. ²⁹

He continues:

This distinction between management and leadership is neither arbitrary nor semantic. It is, instead, enormously important and a source of great confusion. The person who thinks management is leadership will manage change, hence keeping it under control, but he or she will be unable to provide the stuff required to make larger and more difficult leaps. ³⁰

The year 2002 heralded a growth of books on 'leadership' induced by the wave of corporate scandals and the 9/11 attacks in the United States as writers began to respond to what was perceived as the failures of 'leadership', the 'dearth of leadership', and the 'leadership gap'.

In 2002, Noel Tichy, *The Cycle of Leadership: How Great Leaders Teach Their Companies to Win*, one of the best, stated:

The essence of leading is not commanding, but teaching. It is opening people's eyes and minds. It is teaching them new ways to see the world and pointing them to new goals. It is giving them the motivation and discipline to achieve those goals. And it is teaching them to share their own knowledge and teach others. ³¹

Tichy emphasises teaching: "Leaders are people who can think and act intelligently on their own and who can teach others" ³² :

A leader must not only have implicit knowledge, but must be able to make it explicit so that others can understand, interact and build on it. Experienced isn't enough; a point of view isn't enough" ... " Leaders must be able

to share their experience. And in order to do that they must externalize the tacit knowledge within them. They must draw lessons from their experiences, and then convey those lessons in a form so that others can use it.³³

This book followed on his *The Leadership Engine: How Winning Companies Build Leaders at Every Level* of 1997, reissued 2002 where the definition listed in the index, for once in this kind of book, is:

Great Leaders Are Great Teachers

- They accomplished their goals through the people they teach
- They teach others to be leaders, not followers
- Winning Leaders Make Teaching a Personal Priority
- They considered teaching one of their primary roles
- They use every opportunity to learn and to teach

Winners Have a 'Teachable Point of View'

- They have clear ideas and values, based on knowledge and experience
- They articulate those lessons to others.³⁴

Tichy, states that “[t]eaching other leaders certainly isn’t the only requirement of leadership”; they must have: ‘ideas about the purpose of their organization and how to organize its resources’, ‘values that prescribe how it will operate and behave as a member of society’, ‘energy and the ability to energize others’, and ‘edge’, the courage to make hard choices and take tough actions’. He adds that in all the leaders he has observed there’s an additional trait to these essential characteristics of leaders that “helps implement the others and, I believe, is ultimately responsible for the success of their organizations. It is that these leaders engender leadership traits in others. They teach others to be leaders.”³⁵

In 2002, Perseus Publishing (listed as author) produced a compendium, *Business: The Ultimate Resource*, which, at 2,200 pages and with 150 original articles, it promoted as a “landmark in reference publishing”, the “most detailed business resource ever published”, a “one-stop reference covering virtually every aspect of the world of business, and “aimed at everyone who works”, and “the gold standard of business information for the twenty first century”.³⁶ In the following year, 2003, it produced a selection drawn from the previous volume in 420 pages, *Best*

Practice: Ideas and Insights from the World’s Foremost Business Thinkers.³⁷ Ten short articles were selected for its section on ‘leadership’ entitled ‘Leading with Integrity’.

Bennis, for example, whom we come to elsewhere, jumps into talking about ‘leaders’ and ‘leadership’ without saying what he means. He says he is going to add from his own work what he considers to be “four critical aspects of leadership, which came out of a study about leadership and learning”. These are: ‘adaptive capacity’, ‘capacity to engage in shared meaning’, ‘finding out who they themselves are’, and ‘relying on a moral compass, set of principles, belief system, set of convictions’. He says: “Every good leader is going to have to - one way or another - learn these capacities” while noting they are “necessary but not sufficient. For example, if you’re interested in leading a ballet company, you must know something about choreography and about the art world”. He says “he want[s] to argue that these four factors ...are context-and culture-free” but, as is the style of thinking in this field, he actually asserts it rather than making the case.³⁸

Most of the entries will be seen to be in the common vein in this field of taking for granted that talking about ‘leadership’, ‘leader’, and ‘leading’ can be done without need to define their key concepts anywhere. It is possible, however, to construct definitions in some cases from their discussions. For example, from ‘Really Leading: Leadership That is Authentic, Conscious, and Effective’ the reader may construct a definition of ‘leadership’ as ‘providing stability in time of change’, ‘shaping reality’, ‘challenging obsolete constructs, structure, systems and procedures’, ‘clarifying a consistent set of values or principles to make the process of change sustainable’, ‘developing the capacity to engage the urgent with the emergent’ and ‘holding the tension of knowledge and actions at the same time’ and it proposes ‘conscious leadership’ as “a process that rests on two fundamental principles: ...the principle of integration [making the complex coherent] and ...the principle of transformation [creating so much synergy in a system that change happens spontaneously]”.³⁹

To be clear, mentioning the reader having to put together the concept of ‘leadership’ for an author, reminds us to say our expectation is not that there must be a clear definition of a concept right at the outset or even near the beginning of an article or

book, desirable and helpful as that could be to readers. It may, indeed, be acceptable to the writer to have their reader construct the author's implicit and undeclared concept, even if inconvenient and possibly problematic as to whether there will be a shared understanding of what is being talked about.

Terms can be used initially and defined later on. It is when they are not defined at all or is so vague that it is not at all clear what the concept being used is or indeed what the subject matter actually is, so an author's concept is not even constructable by the reader that there is an issue.⁴⁰

It is a bit like 'fruit' being used initially, say, in the context of leaving home to go shopping, we may say I am going to buy 'fruit' and later, in the context of the food market, even if we go to the 'fruit section', we know we don't buy 'fruit' – we buy 'apples' or 'oranges', indeed we buy 'apples' of a specific kind, say, green apples, and so on.

It is the same way with 'leadership', when broadly there are leaps, like 'fruit' we do not know what we are buying. Terms can be defined carefully later, or they can be referenced to somewhere else or, even if they have to be constructed, while not the most convenient, nevertheless we can get by with the matter at hand if we can be confident that our construction is close enough to what the author intends, if there is an intention, there is not much harm done.

Somewhere, however, we hold that there should be clarity about what meaning is being assigned to the term 'leadership', even if only as summary statement, when it is a key term and, especially, when that is the subject of what the writing purports to be about. If an author is writing a piece that draws on other work, there should at least be a reference for the reader to follow up to locate what the writer may have in mind, if interested, rather than be left in ignorance of what the author is talking about. That is not asking too much even in publications aimed at the business community, who usually by themselves are quite precise about their own business and do not leave important matters to the vagaries of random understandings.

Returning to the book under review, we briefly note the other options for the concept of 'leadership'. Judith A. Neal talks about "an unusual breed of leaders called edgewalkers" with unique skills of 'visionary consciousness', 'multicultural responsiveness', 'intuitive sensitivity', 'risk-taking confidence',

and 'self-awareness'.⁴¹

The contribution by Jim Collins, 'Creating the Vision of Manager Growing from Good to Great', follows his well-known theme and clearly is about 'management', even when he refers to 'leaders' and 'leadership'.⁴²

Derek Bell writes about 'ethical ambition'.⁴³

Chris Turner, in 'Leading in Interesting Times', says: says that we are in "a world where old ideas of leadership and management no longer serve us; a world that calls for a rethinking of all our assumptions about the nature of organizations and our roles within them" and proposes that, of those "who are leading effectively, some "lead from powerful positions" while others "lead informally and have huge influence on their organisations", and "yet all of them share certain mindsets and practices": 'leaders don't take themselves too seriously', 'leaders sometimes manage grudgingly', 'leaders are good at conversations and relationships', leaders don't hang onto their own assumptions and beliefs', 'leaders are politely tenacious', 'leaders thrive in ambiguity', 'leaders are curious, always learning', 'leaders understand that fear is corrosive', 'leaders talk like real people', and 'leaders understand the power of context'.⁴⁴

Stan Davis, reflecting on the "challenges facing leadership in the face of global terrorists threats and recession", says: "If ever there was a time for leadership, it's now" and adds: "No one is leading us to a great leap forward. Leadership is taking one step back to take two steps forward - but we're still at the one-step-back point." Pointing out that "leadership isn't the exclusive preserve of those at the top", he continues in the only passage actually devoted to 'leadership' to say:

On 9/11 the firefighters embodied leadership as much as New York Mayor Giuliani did. Too much of the stuff on leadership is about CEOs, presidents, and generals. I wonder how an ordinary person is supposed to apply what they learn from them to their own lives and work. Jack Welch, for example, was probably the greatest business leader in the second half of the last century, and he was also very vocal about leadership. But how many of his leadership skills get applied outside of GE by ordinary people like a local sales manager in Kansas City or a plant supervisor in Milwaukee? So another leadership lesson from the past year should be to focus more on leadership by ordinary people.⁴⁵

Kjell Nordstrom, in *Meaningful Leadership*, holding that “the new world of work requires even more thoughtful and meaningful leadership”, says: “Leaders must challenge people to depart from the patterns of the past and to create new ones. This new form of leadership is about stirring the pot instead of putting on the lid. The new leaders are creators of chaos as much as originators of order. It is the job of great leaders to support the organization in combining order and chaos.” Then, talking about ‘meaningful leadership in action’, he says that is about ‘telling stories’, ‘encouraging innovation’, and ‘caring for human capital’.⁴⁶

Don Blohowiak says that flat organisations and ‘debossing’ does not mean an end to ‘leadership’ in organisations: “Team - or process-oriented organizations may need fewer bosses, but they depend on bountiful cadres of *leaderful* people to make their teams and task forces productive. As Tom Peters recently opined, ‘We’re going to see leadership emerge as the most important element business - the attribute that is highest in demand and shortest in supply’”. Stating that “[t]oday’s market decrees that an organization can survive only by consistently demonstrating increasing capacity for such hard-earned virtues as speed, innovation, responsiveness, value, productivity, quality, and teamwork”, he says the “means to achieve such virtues lies in the province of leadership” and include ‘clarity of direction and priorities’, ‘decisiveness’, ‘adaptability to changes in technology, customer expectations, and society at large’, ‘proficiency of the workforce’, and ‘consistency of execution’.⁴⁷

Jim Kouzes says:

If there is one thing I’ve learned in over three decades of studying and teaching leadership, and working with numerous outstanding leaders, it’s this: *leadership is a relationship*,

adding:

Leadership is all about how people influence other people to do something. It’s all about human relationships

and

It’s about working with and guiding people in new directions. It’s about achieving the most positive interaction between customers, employees, shareholders, vendors – whomever!

He says:

Each generation ... has to redefine leadership for its own historical context” and “Leadership is not just about skills, no more than any relationship is just about skills. Credibility is the foundation of all relationships. So, you can have all the skills in the world, but if people don’t believe in you as a person, they simply won’t want to follow you. We call it the First Law of Leadership: If you don’t believe in the messenger, you won’t *believe* the message” and this brings up “another practice too many leaders discount. Leadership requires self-knowledge.”⁴⁸

The point to be noticed about these ten short articles, purportedly representing ‘gold standard’ thinking about ‘leadership’ in business, is how the idea of ‘leadership’ is so diverse and contradictory within even this narrow range of just one volume intended to be a ‘definitive resource’ for business. Further, the paucity of clear definitions of the *key term*, indeed of any definitions at all, is also disturbing.

In 2002, John C. Maxwell’s *New York Times* best-seller, *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership Workbook*, represents another type of writing about ‘leadership’ in business organisations, one that involves the reader in undertaking a series of exercises to impart skills and knowledge. One could expect a ‘workbook’ to provide a clear definition of the main concepts which it wants its participants in the workshop to think with. Maxwell opens by saying:

As I travel and speak to organizations and individuals, people frequently ask me to *define* the essentials of leadership...

This workbook contains *my answer to that often-asked question*. It has taken me a lifetime to learn these 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership...

One of the most important truths I’ve learned over the years is this: Leadership is leadership, no matter where you go or what you do. Times change. Technology marches forward. Cultures vary from place to place. But the true principles of leadership are constant ... Leadership principles stand the test of time. They are irrefutable.⁴⁹

And with that, the author is off talking about ‘leader’ and ‘leadership’ and his 21 ‘laws’ without answering the often-asked question of a definition. It is presumed participants undertaking the exercises know what the author and they (all in agreement?) mean by ‘leadership’:

Whether you are a follower who is just beginning to discover the impact of leadership or a natural leader who already has followers, you can become a better leader. Each law is like a tool, ready to be picked up and used to help you achieve your dreams and add value to other people. Pick up even one, and you will become a better leader. Master them all, and people will gladly follow you.⁵⁰

This approach was repeated in subsequent workbooks by Maxwell without managing to offer a definition of the concept of 'leadership' in business organisations.⁵¹ We see again what is to be defined being presumed:

The greatest leadership principle that I have learned in more than thirty years of leadership is that those closest to the leader will determine the success level of that leader... The determination of a positive or negative outcome in my leadership depends on my ability as a leader to develop those closest to me. ... Within my organization, leadership development is continually emphasized.⁵²

A workbook by Warren Bennis, who wrote much about 'leader' and 'leadership', *Learning to Lead: A Workbook on Becoming a Leader*, does better, offering that 'character counts in leadership' and 'leadership is character' as the conceptual definition to work with in exercises to 'improve ourselves as character-based leaders' so that the process of becoming a 'leader' is "much the same as the process of becoming an integrated human being".⁵³

In 2002, John Adair continued expounding his idea of 'action-centered leadership' in his *Effective Strategic Leadership*, his second book on 'leadership' in his 'Effective Leadership and Management Series', and one of a number he wrote on 'leadership training'.⁵⁴ The military influence is apparent in the way he begins this book with two chapters on the military sources of 'strategy'. Then, in the chapter headed 'What is Leadership?', a question he says he first asked himself when he was just eighteen and coming to the end of his school days, he says:

In the army, I encountered two theories of leadership, as they might be called. One - the Qualities or Traits Approach - I had largely been working with already. The other - the Functional Approach, as I named it - was implicit in the selection system for officers but not overt. Long after my military service

I came to see that there were in fact *three* distinct approaches to understanding leadership - Qualities, Situational and Functional - and it is that fuller conceptual sketch map that I follow [in this book].⁵⁵

He was prompted to formulate his idea of 'leadership' by his dissatisfaction with his 'leadership training' experiences in the military and did so when lecturing at the Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst. This definition of 'leadership' is based on 'some key leadership functions': planning, initiating, controlling, supporting, informing, and evaluating.⁵⁶ He thus defines 'leadership' in terms of 'responsibility' for three overlapping areas to deliver these functions: 'task', 'team', and 'individual':

...a leader is the sort of person [individual] with the appropriate *qualities* and *knowledge* - which is more than technical professional - who is able to provide the necessary *functions* to enable a team to achieve its task and to hold together as a working unity. And this is done not by the leader alone but by eliciting the contributions and willing cooperation of all involved.⁵⁷

Adair illustrates his 'leadership' concept by a diagram of three intersecting circles, which he calls 'The Three Circle Model, and which he says was a 'key breakthrough that made this success [of 'Action-Centred Leadership'] possible'.⁵⁸ This model was developed to train 'leaders' *after* they have been selected.⁵⁹

In 2003, in Des Dearlove's *The Ultimate Book of Business Thinking: Harnessing the Power of the World's Greatest Business Ideas* again in a series called 'Ultimates' aimed at busy business people and in the encyclopedia mode of synopsis. The author opens by saying: "people have been debating the nature of leadership for as long as records have been kept - certainly as far back as Homer. Today, the topic continues to fascinate and enthrall us, but the way we understand the role is changing. Where once we looked to military and political leaders for inspiration and insight, today, increasingly, it is business leaders who occupy our attention and provide our role models."⁶⁰

He continues:

The new interest is reflected in a plethora of business books and articles on the subject. Most writings on good management and what

it takes to get to the top focus on leadership. No wonder, then, that it is regarded as one of the most important areas of personal development. This is reflected in the growing interest in leadership courses.⁶¹

He then says that “what makes an effective leader is...elusive”, that “there must be almost as many theories on leadership as there are leaders”, and “certainly too many to cover here in all their glorious detail”.⁶² Thus, in giving his ‘potted history’ of ‘theories of leadership’ he runs through ‘Machiavelli Power and Influence’, ‘Great Man’, ‘Trait’, ‘Behaviourist’, ‘Situational’, and ‘Contingency’.

He notes that “Leadership models have come and gone but, until quite recently, in one important regard ideas about leaders remained constant. The image of the all-powerful leader at the top of the hierarchy persisted right up until recent times. Today that is changing” and mentions ‘traditional command and control structures’ giving way to ‘flatter de-layered ones’ bringing new ideas about ‘leadership’. He refers to an important 1988 article in the *Harvard Business Review*, ‘In Praise of Followers’, as beginning the shift away from “the machismo of leadership to the less glamorous side with the same equation, the role of ‘followership’.”⁶³ This, he says, “moved the leadership debate” toward ‘Transactional’, to which he adds ‘Attribution’, ‘Transformational’ and ‘Emotional Intelligence’.

Referring to the ‘most important of all, the role of leaders in developing the next generation’ being ‘too often neglected’, he quotes Adrian Cadbury observing: “Good leaders grow people, bad leaders stunt them; good leaders serve their followers, bad leaders enslave them.”⁶⁴

Despite all the listed developments, the author gives place of honour to Adair’s concept of ‘functional leadership’ which originated in the military.⁶⁵

We might note here two other volumes in the ‘Ultimate’ series over the years. The first is *The Ultimate Business Library: 75 Books That Made Management* by Stuart Crainer, which came before the previous example in 2000. The index entry for ‘leadership’ lists 11 authors (including Sun Tzu, Machiavelli, and von Clausewitz), with each cited with variously defined concepts of ‘leadership’.⁶⁶

For example, to take ones not mentioned elsewhere, Argyris, is quoted as saying:

Increasingly, the art of management is manag-

ing knowledge. That means we do not manage people *per se*, but rather the knowledge that they carry. And leadership means creating the conditions that enable people to produce valid knowledge and to do so in ways that encourage personal responsibility.⁶⁷

John MacGregor Burns, another prominent name in leadership thinking, is quoted as saying in the prologue to his 1978 book, *Leadership*:

The crisis of leadership today is the mediocrity or irresponsibility of so many of the men and women in power, but leadership rarely rises to fill the need for it. The fundamental crisis underlying mediocrity is intellectual. If we know all too much about our leaders, we know far too little about leadership.⁶⁸

The author continues:

There are literally hundreds of definitions of leadership. Burns suggests, that, as a result, ‘leadership as a concept has dissolved into small and discrete meanings. A super abundance of facts about leaders far outruns theories of leadership’. Undaunted, in *Leadership*, Burns provides yet another - but one which has proved more enduring; ‘Leadership over human beings is *exercised* when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or in conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological and other resources so as to arouse, engage and satisfy the motives of followers’.⁶⁹

An interesting feature of this example are the comments made on each writer by Gary Hamel, who says about here:

There is no theme in management literature which is more enduring than leadership. Among the many contributions which Burns makes to our understanding of leadership, two seem central: leadership must have a moral foundation; and the responsibility for leadership must be widely distributed. Self-interested autocrats, whether political or corporate, ignore these truths at their peril.⁷⁰

Warren Bennis is represented by *Leaders*, his book of 1985 with Burt Nanus which is cited as exploding a number of myths about ‘leadership’, including the idea of ‘leader as hero’ as well as for identifying the four common abilities mentioned above. This book has them saying: “leaders align others behind an attractive goal” and that this ability can be taught.⁷¹

The Hamel comment on *Leaders* is:

Here we find the antithesis of a technocratic view of management. This truly is a book about leaders, not about managers. And while Bennis and Nanus succeeded in isolating the deep attributes of leadership, *I remain unconvinced that leadership can be taught*. Nevertheless, I'm absolutely convinced that we must all aspire to be leaders.⁷²

As the final example from this selection, we take Henry Mintzberg's *The Nature of Managerial Work* of 1973 for which Crainer gives 'leader' as "motivating subordinates, unifying effort".⁷³

The second example from the 'Ultimate' stable, *The Ultimate Business Skills Book: The 100 Most Important Techniques for Being Successful in Business* by Tony Grundy and Laura Brown in 2004, is promoted as a 'Capstone Reference' which is described as "the home of definitive resource books for the modern professional. ... all titles in this series are up-to-date, relevant, robust, comprehensive, accessible and... affordable." This example, as the title would indicate, takes a skills approach and the section on 'Leadership Skills' covers topics such as 'chairing', 'coaching', 'empathising', 'listening' and 'stakeholder management'.⁷⁴

In 2003, *Key Management Models: The Management Tool and Practices That Will Improve Your Business*, an example from the Financial Times Prentice Hall and published under the banner 'Management Models: What They Are and When to Use Them', focused their 'leadership' entry on John Kotter's 1990 'big idea', the eight phases of change, saying:

Kotter makes a clear distinction between management and leadership. Management is a set of processes that can keep a complex system of people and technology running smoothly. Leadership, on the other hand, defines the future, aligns people, and inspires them to pursue that vision. Kotter argues that too much emphasis is placed on *managing* change, whereas the key to success is in *leading* change.⁷⁵

In 2003, Kouzes and Posner reached the third (paperback) edition of their best selling *The Leadership Challenge*⁷⁶ which was commended by Tom Peters in the following terms:

Leadership books are a dime a dozen, and most don't last a week let alone years. *The*

Leadership Challenge has lasted because it is research based, it is practical, and it has heart.⁷⁷

Kouzes and Posner, in common with many authors in this field, set off talking about 'leaders' and 'leadership', which is fair enough, but never come back around to define the concept. They say that leadership is not about "being in a *position* (as if leadership was a place) but then also refer to "people first [taking] on their roles as leaders - whether they're appointed or whether they volunteer...".⁷⁸

Nor is it about personality⁷⁹ but about having the courage and the spirit to make a significant difference⁸⁰ and that:

Leaders do exhibit certain distinct practices when they are doing their best. This process varies little from industry to industry, profession to profession, community to community, country to country. Good leadership is an understandable and universal process. Though each leader is a unique individual, there are patterns to the practice of leadership that are shared. And that can be learned.⁸¹

They focus on the 'Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership' as "revealed by their research" into "personal-best leadership experiences" of apparently already identified 'leaders'.⁸² Thus, "[w]hen getting extraordinary things done in organizations, leaders engage in these Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership": 'Model the Way', 'Inspire a Shared Vision', 'Challenge the Process', 'Enable Others to Act' and 'Encourage the Heart'.⁸³ These practices, they say,

...aren't the private property of the people we studied or of a few select shining stars. They are available to anyone, in any organization or situation, who accepts the leadership challenge. And they're not the accident of a special moment in history. They have stood the test of time, and our most recent research confirms that they're just as relevant today as they were when we first began our investigations over two decades ago - if not more so.⁸⁴

For Kouzes and Posner:

Leadership is a performing art. Leaders don't 'act' in the same sense as Broadway performers, of course. However, they *enact* the meaning of the organization in every decision they make and in every step they take toward the future they envision. Leaders understand that they bring shared values to life in a variety of settings....⁸⁵

They reject 'charismatic' as being "an almost useless descriptor of leaders."⁸⁶ The same, we might add, could be said of the overworked 'leader' based on our findings in this chapter.

About developing 'leadership', they say:

Leadership development is self-development. Engineers have computers; painters, canvas and brushes; musicians, instruments. Leaders have only themselves. The instrument of leadership is the self, and mastery of the art of leadership comes from mastery of the self. Self-development is not about stuffing in a whole bunch of new information or trying out the latest technique. It's about leading out of what is already in your soul. It's about liberating the leader within you. It's about setting yourself free.⁸⁷

The focus of the accompanying *The Leadership Challenge Workbook*, branded 'The Most Trusted Source on Becoming a Better Leader' and "designed for anyone in a leadership role", is on 'becoming a better leader' by applying the five principles.⁸⁸

Reflecting their view that 'leadership is everyone's business', they state:

You get to be a leader in the eyes of others because of what you *do*. Leadership is about having the courage and spirit to move whatever circumstances you are in to a place of making a difference in the world. This workbook is designed to help anyone who has the desire to lead and the will to make the difference, It's for anyone who is in a role that requires mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations.⁸⁹

In 2005, James March, a major thinker in organizational studies, opening the preface of his different, idiosyncratic, and thought-stimulating book, *On Leadership*, says:

This book is about leadership. The topic is a contemporary publishing cliché. It is hard to imagine anything except the conceits of the authors and the overconfidence of the publisher that would generate another book on leadership. Without denying either the conceits or the overconfidence, I hope that this little volume might be justified by both its modest size and by its relatively unusual genesis and character.⁹⁰

It was one of the earliest books we read carefully as we fell into this project, and it is a measure of our

desperation about the lack of clarity for our purposes in the field of thinking about 'leadership' in business organisations that we had to ignore March's warning.

This book, recommended for its distinctive thinking and literary approach, is derived from March's lectures at Stanford University over fifteen years which, he says, were based on three primary convictions:

The first was that the major issues of leadership were indistinguishable from issues of life. A proper discussion involves reflecting on grand dilemmas of human existence as they presented themselves in the leadership context. The second conviction was that great literature was a primordial source of learning about such issues for educated people. And inquiring skeptical and tolerant gaze was cast on leadership, primarily through a lens provided by four great works of literature [*Othello*/Shakespeare, *Saint Joan*/Shaw, *War and Peace*/Tolstoy, and *Don Quixote*/Cervantes]. The third conviction was that education, including education and business schools, should not attempt to furnish students with recipes or prescriptions for success. Education was seen in the more classical spirit, as helping humans to consider ways to understand the essential dilemmas of human existence and essential nature of the human spirit.⁹¹

This approach arises from the view that:

The fundamental issues of leadership - the complications involved in becoming, being, confronting, and evaluating leaders - are not unique to leadership. They are echoes of critical issues of life more generally. As a result, they are characteristically illuminated more by great literature than by modern essays or research leadership.⁹²

This is March's approach which, for all its validity, it presumes 'leaders' and 'leadership' at the outset and does not provide a conceptual definition. It variously refers to 'leadership' and 'leaders' in terms of features such as: as being generally seen as a 'force for coherence'; emphasises reason more than foolishness, strategy and vision more than serendipity and improvisation; thinking more than imitation; and both instrumental and symbolic to how organizations are coordinated and controlled to improve outcomes.⁹³

In his final chapter, March states: "We started by looking skeptically at leadership. It is not at

all clear that leadership requires any remarkable talents, or that major differences in the success of organizations reflect differences in the capabilities of their leaders, or that history is a product of leaders actions. Leadership - and our relationship to it - are important, however, if society is to function properly and if leaders themselves - and those under them - are to feel at ease."⁹⁴ Continuing that "[i]mproving the practice of leadership is, therefore, a major challenge", he says: "The argument here has been that the essential problems facing a leader are quite simply the problems of life" and elaborates on that theme.⁹⁵

March asserts that "[t]here are two essential dimensions of leadership: 'plumbing', i.e., the capacity to apply known techniques effectively, and 'poetry', which draws on a leader's great actions and identity and pushes him or her to explore unexpected avenues, discover interesting meanings, and approach life with enthusiasm."⁹⁶ "The plumbing of leadership", he explains, "involves keeping watch over an organization's efficiency in everyday tasks, such as making sure the toilets work and that there is somebody to answer the telephone. This requires competence, not only at the top but also throughout all parts of the organization; a capacity to master the context" He goes on to list a number of capacities which he says, "essential for the smooth operation of organizations, but they do not appear in most treatises on leadership, no doubt because they are too mundane or too closely linked to a precise context and specific techniques."⁹⁷

Leadership, according to March, "also requires ... the gifts of a poet, in order to find meaning in action and render life attractive. The formulation and dissemination of interesting interpretations of reality form the basis for constructive collective action. A leader is equipped with the power of words for this purpose. If power is not used as an instrument for winning personal influence, but as a means of encouraging other people to blossom, its charms can be enjoyed while the fear that it inspires is minimized. Words allow us to forge visions and poetic language, through its evocative power, allow us to say more than we know, to teach more than we understand."⁹⁸

His overall idea of 'leadership' is succinctly expressed as follows: "A leader must know how to appreciate life and be aware of reality, without falling

into the cynicism and bitterness that can arise from knowledge that our efforts are probably in vain. He or she must know how to savor the charms of the simple joys and appreciated glory of human willpower."⁹⁹

This bare summary does an injustice to the richness of March's thinking and his argument that "the essential problems facing a leader are quite simply the problems of life", which in itself conveys an idea of what March is doing. March is skeptical, for example, of the 'heroic man' view of 'leadership'. He notes "the sizeable industry devoted to producing books about leadership and optimal leadership styles" saying that:

For the most part, such books portray relatively heroic attributes of leadership as producing relatively heroic consequences. Organizations, their historians, and particularly their leaders are inclined to personalize organizational histories and to endow particular leaders with implausibly profound impacts on the flow of events.¹⁰⁰

March has no time for the 'great leaders are geniuses' genre, observing that:

... great leaders are characteristically heretics who are associated with the transformation of orthodoxy, but most heretics will be disasters as leaders.

And he asks:

What are the relations among genius, madness, and leadership? How do we recognize great leaders among the crazies? how do we not nurture genius if we cannot recognize it before history does?¹⁰¹

A book to be savored for its humanity and depth but not one giving us a crisp, clear conceptual definition such that we can work with easily.

In 2010 Grint, cited already, refreshingly recounted his experience of reading the leadership literature starting in 1986, having already, as he says, spent some time in "various leadership (*sic*) positions", when he had 'read little but understood everything' from the "University of Life". Reading brought him to the realisation, reflective of Bennis's comment above, that his "previous 'truths' were built on dubious foundations, so my understanding decreased as my knowledge increased".¹⁰² Having a 'Socratic moment' – wisdom only coming when one becomes aware of one's ignorance – he says:

I think I'm now on the road to recovery and have got past base camp with this conclusion: at its most basic, the 'essence' of leadership - as an individual leader - leaves out the followers and without followers you cannot be a leader. Indeed, *this might be the simplest definition of leadership: having followers.*¹⁰³

The notion of a 'leader' having 'followers', while frequently given as the definition, is superficial and tautological and begs too many questions to be of use. It is opting out of the task of coming up with a foundational conception of 'leadership'.

Military thinking has always influenced thinking in business, including about 'leadership', with, for example, the ancient Chinese text attributed to 'Sun Tzu' (c.400-320 BCE) drawn on continually as source for thoughts.¹⁰⁴ Military organisations have paid attention to the question of 'leadership' over thousands of years for reasons to do with the serious and fatal consequences of failure for individuals, their organisations, and their societies. This thinking has greatly influenced other domains of activity and organisations, including about heading up business organisations, although business is not war.

From around 2010, we look to the Australian Department of Defence, using what it calls a 'Defence Leadership Framework' for 'Growing Leaders at All Levels' of the organisation, for an example of contemporary military thinking about 'leadership' because of its comprehensiveness and clearness.¹⁰⁵ 'Leadership' is 'a whole of defence challenge' because 'defence requires leaders' at every level, both military and civilian, since no activity, whether operational or non-operational, can be conducted effectively without the motivation and inspiration provided by a leader' and because 'during the course of a career in defense, military or civilian, there will be times when all personnel are called upon to take up a leadership role in pursuit of mission' so that 'leadership ability is fundamental for all defense employees'.

The framework sets out the desired 'leadership' capabilities, proficiencies, and behaviours to implement this and for this purpose 'leadership' is defined as:

The process of influencing others in order to gain their willing consent in the ethical pursuit of missions.

It is constructed around five core capability areas identified as essential for 'the leadership task'. The capability areas are strategic thinking, results,

relationships, personal drive and integrity and communication and these capabilities are then further divided into a number of proficiencies with each proficiency describing the behaviours that an effective person is expected to demonstrate at each level of the organisation. This framework for 'leadership' development is a standard 'human resourcing' approach based on the basic template of Skills-Techniques, Knowledge-Understanding, and Attributes-Attitudes which is details an array of criteria and standards for all levels of the organisation.

In 2012, Hurst in *New Ecology of Leadership*, referred to the "primary role of leadership in every organisation" as the "making of meaning" where 'meaning' is "made by distilling experience". He refers to everyone knowing that:

...wisdom can neither be taught nor told, so you will not become wise just by reading this book. It will, however, help you distill your accumulated know-how into wisdom. For we make meaning by classifying the elements of our experience and those of others and then connecting them together in webs of cause and effect, which we call stories.¹⁰⁶

He says:

Leadership tools and settings can be thought of as the mirror images of management tools and settings. *Leadership is about synthesis, not analysis.* If management is about tasks and means (transactional), leadership is about relationships and ends (transformational). Leadership is about hunting, exploration, movement - *finding the right questions rather than supplying the right answers.*¹⁰⁷

In 2016, Kouzes and Posner, who as we saw have published extensively on 'leadership' and who refer to themselves as researching and writing about 'leadership' for over three decades, open *Learning Leadership: The Five Fundamentals of Becoming an Exemplary Leader*, with:

There is a leadership shortage in the world. It's not a shortage of potential talent. The people are out there. The eagerness is out there. The resources are out there. The capability is out there...The shortage is a result of three primary factors: demographic shifts, insufficient training and experiences, and the prevailing mindsets that discourage people from learning lead.¹⁰⁸

They refer to asking participants in their seminars: how many of you think of yourself as a leader? They report that in a group of 50 people, typically only six raise their hands; only about 10% identified themselves as leaders although they are usually people who have come together for leadership development.¹⁰⁹ The authors consider a number of possibilities for this but not that it may be because people have different understandings of what 'leadership' is or may not agree with the authors ideas since they plunge into their book with liberal use of the words 'leader' and 'leadership' without giving any definition.

Instead, they say 'leadership potential' is not something that some people have, and other people do not:

It's much more broadly distributed than traditionally accepted views suggest. You already have the capacity to lead, but some prevailing myths and assumptions about leadership get in the way of your becoming the best leader you can be. To become an exemplary leader, you have to move past the myths and get down to applying the fundamentals that will enable you to learn and grow as a leader.

By the 'fundamentals' they mean "a universal set of leadership practices", which is "associated with exemplary leadership" and which is "within the capacity of everyone to follow: 'believe you can', 'aspire to excellence', 'challenge yourself', 'engage support', and 'practice deliberately'.¹¹⁰

They cite their definition from one of their previous books in an endnote as: "Leadership is the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations."¹¹¹

Also in 2016, there is an example of the genre of celebrities giving their secrets of 'leadership' success in Alex Ferguson, the famed manager of the Manchester United Football Club, in:

It was to say very high standards. It was to help everyone else believe they could do things that they didn't think they were capable of. It was a chart a course that had not been pursued before. It was to make everyone understand that the impossible was possible. That's the difference between leadership and management.¹¹²

The world of politics also offers ideas about 'leadership'. There is always cross-fertilisation of thinking between the political and the business realms going

on. Heads of government nowadays have a disposition to talk about themselves and so are inclined to express their thinking about themselves as 'leaders' and their ideas about 'leadership'. We may tend to be dismissive of such usually self-serving and rarely thoughtful utterances and to purport to be disdainful and not bothered listening in the belief they are not having any effect on us. That, we suggest, would be a mistake. They have powerful means of communication under their control which they use constantly to promote themselves and thereby their thinking, including about 'leadership'. Politicians, in propagating their ideas about 'leadership' through various media, affect the climate of opinion about many matters, not least, even subliminally, about what is 'leadership'. The news media enlarge this effect by following suit in describing any head of government a 'leader'. What they say slips into people's minds and becomes habit of thought. Hence, we need to attend to this channel of influence on thinking about 'leadership'.

We turn for a representation of this kind of thinking, although not in book form, to a recent U.K. Prime Minister, Theresa May, who, although it appears personally uncharacteristic, publicly shared her thoughts on 'herself' as 'leader' on occasions and thereby on 'leadership', as in this example during the 2017 general election campaign.¹¹³

The common conflating of headship of government with the phenomenon of 'leadership' in the world of politics is illustrated in this speech centred on 'leadership' which the Prime Minister gave at the Royal United Services Institute. Stating that "the question of leadership has always been at the heart of this campaign - and it is absolutely crucial that we get it right", the then Prime Minister went on to say, "what leadership means to me" and what "I offer to the British people at this election" is:

The ability to say the courageous thing and do the difficult thing. To face up to and address great challenges, not to pretend they don't exist or seek to wish them away. The strength to be straight with people and not just tell them what they want to hear. The ability to get the job done.¹¹⁴

Nothing in the speech suggested any thoughtfulness about the matter, although the claim being made was a significant one and was being made by a Head of Government. There was nothing, aside from a few trite phrases, about 'leadership' in the

speech to add anything to the meaning of the word 'leader'. In this case, the use of these words was effectively tautological or meaningless.¹¹⁵ The script shows that the desirable words 'leadership' and 'leader' were effectively being exploited and could equally be considered to be *misleading* rather than leading.¹¹⁶

This typical example is also representative of another common phenomenon in politics and business relating to 'leadership', that of presuming the title 'leader' for oneself, on the basis of holding a position or title, rather than being bestowed with such recognition by independent observers for good reason, say like Churchill for his headship of the Government during the Second World War.

In 2017, Nancy Koehn, a historian at the Harvard Business School who has 'coached leaders from many organisations', analysed five 'remarkable life journeys', Ernest Shackleton, Abraham Lincoln, Frederick Douglass, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, and Rachel Carson, in a series of biographical profiles in *Forged in Crisis: The Power of Courageous Leadership in Turbulent Times* to show, as the back cover blurb has it, how 'great leaders' are made in adversity and the skills they summon to prevail and the power to lead resides in each of us'.¹¹⁷

History, she says, is "a sharp lens through which to view ordinary people doing extraordinary things" (*pace* Drucker) and

It also exposes the fallacies in some of our current assumptions about leadership. For example, these five stories make clear that leaders can emerge from many different backgrounds, genders, races, and personality types.... Charisma and aggressiveness, two attributes we often associate with important leaders, aren't essential to making a big, worthy impact. Nor is real leadership primarily a result of specific endowments with which a few people are born.¹¹⁸

There is no definition of a concept or concepts of 'leadership' as such and, as is often the mode of such books, we are given a characterisation of the main idea of "courageous leadership", in terms of personal attributes and so on, as:

...actually a result of individual people committing to work from their stronger selves, discovering a mighty purpose, and motivating others to join their cause. In the process, each of the leaders and the people they inspire are

made more resilient, a bit bolder, and, in some instances, even more luminous.¹¹⁹

Noting that none of these "unforgettable leaders" knew the full power of their influence, she says:

What each person *could* see was that he or she was in the midst of a profound personal crisis. It was not of his or her making. And none of the five had seen such turbulence coming. But once they were in the middle of calamity, they recognized that they couldn't falter and then failed to recover; they couldn't give up. Rather, each resolutely navigated through the storm and was transformed.¹²⁰

The central message of Koehn's argument about 'leadership' is that all "these leaders were made. They were not born" and, echoing March, says:

In my experience as a scholar and executive coach, the concept of leaders being made rather than born is often difficult to appreciate. We live in an age that assumes individuals of great vision and impact are the result of rare, valuable endowments: all nature, little nurture. Whether these gifts are magnetism, strategic planning, public-speaking abilities, or something else, we tend to assume they're divinely ordained. (Perhaps this assumption explains some of the very destructive run-up in executive compensation during the last thirty years.). So we search ardently – if vainly – for those haloed men and women, only to find ourselves angry and disappointed when so many leaders from different walks of life turn out to be incompetent, greedy, or worse.

She tells her stories of 'leadership' in terms of the "self-conscious making of effective leaders" and states that: "*Effective leadership* is a term much bandied about today. But it is often used on frustratingly vague, and, at times, self-serving, ways." She continues that the best definition she has encountered is from David Foster Wallace, a novelist and essayist writing in *Rolling Stone* about the John McCain's first presidential campaign:

In the piece, Wallace riffed on the broader subject of real leadership, including how the word *leader* has become a cliché that is so boring our eyes glaze over when we see it. This is weird, he continued, because 'when you come across somebody who actually *is* a real leader, that person isn't boring at all; in fact he is the opposite of boring'.¹²¹

She gives Wallace's definition of the 'real' as being what she calls 'courageous' or 'effective' individuals:

... who can help us overcome the limitations of our own individual laziness and selfishness and weakness and fear and get us to the do better, harder things than we can get ourselves to do on our own. This definition captures a whole lot about courageous leaders - men and women from whom we can learn and draw credible inspiration - including their ability to see the intersection of human agency and the larger historical forces and then, from this perspective, to incite others to right action.¹²²

She adds, this "conception of effective leaders also explains why they command influence and exercise impact - on-on-one - as well as in groups and institutions" and quotes Wallace:

A leader's true authority is a power you voluntarily give him, and you grant them this authority not in resigned or resentful way but happily; it feels right. Deep down, you almost always like how a real leader makes you feel, how you find yourself working harder and pushing yourself and thinking in ways you wouldn't be able to if there weren't this person you respected and believed in and wanted to please.

Koehn then says: "Each of the five people in this book became a *courageous leader of the kind that Wallace had described*."¹²³

From 2018, again in the political vein, Doris Kearns Goodwin, *Leadership in Turbulent Times*, is a substantial historical study of four U.S. Presidents, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Johnson. This kind of inspirational study is often how 'leadership' in politics is brought to the business community and it is a popular genre. Goodwin's is pitched as a 'seminal work providing an essential and accessible road map not only for aspiring and established leaders *in every field* but for all of us in our *everyday lives*'.¹²⁴ It was widely reviewed in the major mainstream newspaper and business media as well as being on *The New York Times* bestseller list for some time.

Goodwin admits that after writing four extensive books, one on each of her subjects, she thought she knew them well before she embarked on her present study of leadership. But, she says, as she observed them through the *exclusive lens of leadership* she felt "as if I were meeting them anew".¹²⁵ This 'lens' of

'leadership' is not specifically defined and so her conception of 'leadership' has to be inferred from what she says about these 'leaders', people somehow already considered 'leaders'.

Goodwin's account of her subjects and their 'leadership' prompts asking the question whether, as often as not, an alternative idea and term to 'leadership' can be substituted without loss of meaning and even at times with greater clarity.

In her foreword, Goodwin distils her thinking about 'leadership' being the match of situation and personality:

For leadership does not exist in a void. Leadership is a two-way street. 'I have only been an instrument', Lincoln insisted with both accuracy and modesty, 'the antislavery people of the country and the army have done it all'... 'With public sentiment, nothing can fail', Abraham Lincoln said, 'without it nothing can succeed'. Such a leader is inseparably linked to the people. Such leadership is a mirror in which the people see their collective reflection period.¹²⁶

Goodwin says her examples "show how their leadership fit the historical moment as a key fits a lock". As is the story telling approach of historians dealing with the complexity of human affairs and characters, we are told that:

No key is exactly the same; Each is a different line of ridges and notches along its blade. While there is neither a master key to leadership nor common lock of historical circumstance, we can detect a certain family resemblance of leadership traits as we trace the alignment of leadership capacity within its historical context.¹²⁷

In that vein, Goodwin states:

Scholars who have studied the development of leaders have situated resilience, the ability to sustain ambition in the face of frustration, at the heart of potential leadership growth. More important than what happened to them was how they responded to these reversals, how they manage in various ways to put themselves back together, how these watershed experiences at forced impeded, then deepen, and finally indecisively molded their leadership.¹²⁸

She sees situation as a central factor along with character:

'If there is not the war', Theodore Roosevelt mused, 'you don't get the great general; If there is not a great occasion, you don't get the great statesman if Lincoln had lived in times of peace, noble would have known his name now'.¹²⁹

Goodwin says,

While the nature of the era a leader chances to occupy profoundly influences the nature of the leadership opportunity, the leader must be ready when that opportunity presents itself. One leader's skills, strengths, and style may be suited for the times; those of another, less so.¹³⁰

In the judgment of one presidential speechwriter about Franklin Roosevelt "[the G.I. Bill of Rights was] one of the greatest examples of statesmanlike vision" and

It was that vision, Perkins concluded, Roosevelt's uncanny ability 'to keep his head above the welter of administrative problems' to see 'the whole picture' and 'keep his eye on the objectives of highest importance' that persuaded all the key members of the cabinet and White House staff that the president, regardless of diminished energy and health, was a superior man to lead.¹³¹

We can reasonably ask here whether we can substitute words like 'head' and 'exemplar' in the above and it makes just as much sense, if not more, in terms of what is being said about 'leadership'.

Speaking of Lyndon Johnson, Goodwin asks: "But to what end did one accumulate such power?" and replies, giving her clearest conception of how she sees 'leadership': "Regardless of one's impressive title, power without purpose and without vision was not the same thing as leadership."¹³² 'Power', *i.e.*, office, with purpose and vision is 'leadership'.

In Goodwin's view, the 'leader' was ready depending on how they responded to the reversals and how they managed in various ways to put themselves back together after 'watershed experiences' which suggests we can replace 'leadership' with personality, responsibility, or character, and it fits with the title, approach, and theme of the book. For example, Goodwin refers to Abigail Adams, writing to her son John Quincy Adams in the midst of the American Revolution, as "suggesting that the habits of vigorous mind are formed in contending with difficulties.

Great necessities call out great virtues."¹³³

Goodwin states that:

No fixed timetable governs the development of leaders. While Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Roosevelt all possessed inherent leadership capacities, the period of time when they first perceived themselves as leaders and were considered leaders by others occurred at different stages of their growth.

Hardship quickened Abraham Lincoln's self-reliance. Early on, he revealed a number of traits associated with leadership - ambition, motivation, resoluteness, language skills, storytelling gifts, sociability. The people who knew him from boyhood to young manhood saw the makings of a leader, just as he was beginning to feel the same potential within himself.

Theodore Roosevelt came later to the sense of himself as a leader, though clearly others had clearly seen flashes of unique nature - a remarkable will-power, intellectual vitality, irrepressible liveliness, wide ranging interests, and a growing gratification connecting with people from different backgrounds and stations in life.

Franklin Roosevelt ... was the latest bloomer of the three. The fierce ambition to succeed, so apparent in young Abraham and Theodore, was largely concealed, just as he concealed so much else in his life. There was little evidence of exceptional motivation or focus. ... At the age of 28, when both Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt had already evidenced striking leadership attributes, Franklin had not impressed the partners of his law firm with either his native intelligence, his work ethic, or his sense of purpose. Yet, when fortune shone on him in the form of a wholly unexpected offer [to run for a safe seat in the State Assembly], Franklin hastened to accept, revealing a great eagerness to jump into politics. He knew something about himself that others did not - that beneath his complacent demeanor, he craved adventure, desire for freedom from the confines of his insulated world. In all likelihood, he felt the promptings of ambition within himself long before others detected it. Some impulse told him the political world might provide the best fit for his gregarious temperament, natural abilities, and undeveloped talents.¹³⁴

Referring to Lincoln remaining quietly in the background during his first term in the state legis-

lature, Goodwin observes in this vein:

... Lincoln was neither bashful nor timid. He was simply paying close attention, absorbing, readying to act as soon as he had accumulated sufficient knowledge to do so. I finely developed sense of timing - knowing when to wait and when to act - would remain in Lincoln's repertoire of leadership skills for the rest of his life.¹³⁵

This was in his character:

Still in his twenties, Abraham Lincoln had already developed a conception of leadership based upon the leader's shared understanding of his followers' needs for liberty, equality, and opportunity. In less than half a dozen years, seemingly from nothing and from nowhere, he had risen to become a respected leader in this state legislator....¹³⁶

Here we might consider whether ideas such as 'exemplar' would work just as well here and also check Goodwin's use of 'leadership' and whether 'headship' of government would do as well or even better.

Goodwin's focus on character as central to 'leadership' is well illustrated when she says of Lincoln that:

In his first foray into politics, Lincoln also pledged that if he's opinions on any subject turned out to be erroneous, he 'stood ready to renounce them'. With this commitment, Lincoln revealed early on a quality that would characterize his leadership for the rest of his life - a willingness to acknowledge errors and learn from mistakes.¹³⁷

Where Goodwin says that "[Theodore] Roosevelt understood from the start that leadership had to be earned as it was not something to be granted by rank or title"¹³⁸ we could easily replace the word 'leadership' with trust, confidence, reliability, or influence and it would give as much sense if not more.

Goodwin's personality or character aspect in her conception of 'leadership' is conveyed in statements that "Eloquence without judgment, however, counts for nothing, and without the will to sustain both, leadership would fail"¹³⁹ and about Lincoln never forgetting that "in a democracy the *leader's strength* ultimately depends on the strength of his bond with the people."¹⁴⁰

Stating that "No single path carried them to the pinnacle of political leadership", for which we can

substitute headship of government, Goodwin says:

They were united, however, by a fierce ambition, and inordinate drive to succeed. With perseverance and the hard work, they all essentially made themselves leaders by enhancing and developing the qualities they were given.¹⁴¹

Goodwin illustrates this with Lincoln:

He came to trust 'that he was going to be something', his cousin Sophie Hanks related, slowly creating what one leadership scholar calls 'a vision of an alternative future'. He told a neighbor he did not intend to delve, grub, shuck corn, split rails and the like. I'll study and get ready, and then the chance will come.¹⁴²

Theodore Roosevelt, Goodwin says, distinguished two types of *success* when, at age fifty-three, he reflected on his path from his 'first run for office to the White House':

The first success, he argues, belongs to the man 'who has in him the natural power to do what no one else can do, and what no amount of training, nor perseverance or willpower, will enable an argument to do.'¹⁴³

The second type of success in Roosevelt's schema is:

...a more common type of success [and] is not dependent on such unique inborn attributes, but on a man's ability to develop ordinary qualities to an extraordinary degree through ambition and the application of hard, sustained work. Unlike genius, which can inspire, but not educate, self-made success is democratic, 'open to the average man of sound body and fair mind, who is no remarkable mental or physical attributes', but who enlarges each of these attributes to the maximum degree. He suggests that it is 'more useful to study this second type', for with determination, anyone can, if he chooses, find out how to win a similar success for himself.¹⁴⁴

Goodwin says:

It is clear from the start of Roosevelt's story of his *leadership journey* that he unequivocally aligns himself with his second type of success his story. His story is the tale of a sickly boy with a timid temperament, who, believing in the 'gospel of will', transforms his body and emboldens his spirit. Through great ef-

fort and discipline, his weak body becomes strong; through visualization and practice, he confronts fear and becomes brave. 'I like to believe that, by what I have accomplished without great gifts, I may be a source of encouragement to Americans'.¹⁴⁵

Her assessment is that:

This picture of a young boy building his character, brick by brick, until he develops a moral concept of leadership based upon that character, is simplistic and incomplete; yet, remarkably, however, it contains large elements of truth.¹⁴⁶

Character, with allowance for situation, is clearly the key to Goodwin's conception of 'leadership' as conveyed by what she says about Theodore Roosevelt:

[His]recognition that he was not suited for science revealed a growing self-awareness - a deepening understanding of his own temperamental strengths and weaknesses - that would become an essential tool in his leadership arsenal.¹⁴⁷

Goodwin says that the young Theodore's experience of his father's treatment by the corrupt politics of the Port of New York helped to "shape his embattled style of leadership".¹⁴⁸

From 2018, and returning to the business realm, we cite Brené Brown in her *Dare to Lead: Brave Work, Tough Conversations, Whole Hearts*, on the *New York Times* Business Best Seller list for many years:

I define a leader as anyone who takes responsibility for finding the potential in people and processes, and who has the courage to develop that potential.¹⁴⁹

This is just another definition of 'leadership' in terms of personal attributes.

The promotion for a 2018 book from the prestigious Harvard Business Review Press with a promising main title, *The Mind of a Leader: How to Lead Yourself, Your People, and Your Organisation for Extraordinary Results*, for example, asserts that the authors have 'conclusively found that three qualities stand out as being foundations for leaders today: mindfulness, selflessness and compassion'. They call this the 'MSC leadership Mind'.

We hope the above details satisfy our claim that the repetitiveness, lack of clarity, vagueness, and the drawing of 'definitions' of 'leadership' from

anecdotal stories has continued since Rost's survey up to 1990. The field continues to lack thorough explorations and clear analyses with the view of providing a sustainable and workable concept of 'leadership' for thinking with. The conclusion we suggest is that the findings from the Rost survey in Chapter 2 of *The Leadership Mind* remain valid.

■ ENDNOTES

- 1 Max De Pree. *Leadership is An Art*. Currency Doubleday, New York, 1990, page 11.
- 2 Same, page 11.
- 3 Same, page 12.
- 4 Same, pages 13 – 21.
- 5 Same, pages *xxi* – *xxii*.
- 6 John W. Gardner. *On Leadership*. The Free Press, New York, 1990, page *xiii*.
- 7 Same, page 1.
- 8 Same, page 69. See endnote 174.
- 9 Same, pages 2-3.
- 10 Same, page 3.
- 11 Same, pages 3, 4.
- 12 Same, page 4.
- 13 For example, Robert McNamara moving from Secretary of Defense in the US government during the Vietnam War period to President of the Ford Motor Company.
- 14 Government, United Kingdom. Committee on Standards in Public Life. Guidance: The Seven Principles of Public Life, 31 May 1995. Accessed on GOV.UK on 3.5.2021 at www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-7-principles-of-public-life/the-7-principles-of-public-life--2.
- 15 Stuart Crainer. *Key Management Ideas: Thinking that Changed the Management World*. Management Masterclass FT Pitman Publishing, Pitman, London, 1996, pages 177-191.
- 16 Same, page 178, emphasis added.
- 17 Same, page 178.
- 18 Same, page 178, emphases added.
- 19 Same, pages 178-180, emphases added.
- 20 Same, page 179.
- 21 Same, page 180.
- 22 Same, page 183.
- 23 Same, page 186.
- 24 Same, page 185.
- 25 Same, pages 188 -189.
- 26 Same, page 187.
- 27 Sue Harding and Trevor Long. *MBA Management Models*. Gower, Aldershot, Hampshire, 1998, pages 101 – 103.
- 28 John P. Kotter. *On What Leaders Really Do*. Harvard Business Review, Boston, 1999, page 10.
- 29 Same, page 10
- 30 Same, pages 10-11.
- 31 Noel M. Tichy with Nancy Cardwell. *The Cycle of Leadership: How Great Leaders Teach Their Companies to Win*. Harper Business, New York, 2002, page 74.
 - 32 Same, page 151.
 - 33 Same, page 75.
- 34 Noel M. Tichy with Eli Cohen. *The Leadership Engine: How Winning Companies Build Leaders at Every Level*. Harper Business Essentials, New York, 2002, page 51.
- 35 Same, page 52.
- 36 [Perseus Publishing]. *Business: The Ultimate Resource*. Perseus, [New York], 2002.
- 37 [Perseus Publishing]. *Best Practice: Ideas and Insights from the Worlds foremost Business Thinkers*. Perseus, [New York], 2003.
- 38 Same, pages 336-337.
- 39 Same, pages 338-341. We might note here that the author rejects ‘charisma’ as a defining feature of ‘leadership’ in the following terms: “Often leaders see charisma as being the defining skill of leadership. The difficulty is that charisma is frequently ineffective or inappropriate: it often dominates people and creates reliance on the leader, instead of breeding initiative. Developing a successful workforce requires empowering leadership.” Same, page 340.
- 40 We may note John Maynard Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment Interest and Money*, Macmillan, London, 1936, pages 23 and 27 as exemplary in this regard.
- 41 [Perseus Publishing]. *Best Practice: Ideas and Insights from the Worlds Foremost Business Thinkers*. Perseus, [New York], 2003, pages 342-345.
- 42 Same, pages 346-349.
- 43 Same, pages 350-354.
- 44 Same, pages 355-358.
- 45 Same, pages 359-361.
- 46 Same, pages 362-365.
- 47 Same, pages 366-370.
- 48 Same, pages 371-374.
- 49 John C. Maxwell. *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership Workbook*. Thomas Nelson, Nashville, 2002, page *ix*, emphases added.
- 50 Same, page *xi*.
- 51 For instance: John C. Maxwell. *Developing the Leaders Around You Workbook: How to Help Others Reach Their Full Potential*. Thomas Nelson, Nashville, 2003; John C. Maxwell. *The 17 Indisputable Laws of Teamwork Workbook: Embrace Them and Empower Your Team*. Thomas Nelson, Nashville 2003.
- 52 Maxwell, *Developing the Leaders Around You Workbook*, pages 4-5.
- 53 Warren Bennis and Joan Goldsmith. *Learning to Lead: A Workbook on Becoming a Leader*. Updated edition. Perseus Books, Cambridge, MA, 1997, page *xii*.
- 54 John Adair. *Effective Strategic Leadership*. Macmillan, London, 2002.
- 55 Same, page 63.
- 56 Same, pages 77-79.
- 57 Same, page 79.
- 58 Same. page 80.
- 59 Same, page 76.
- 60 Same, page 131.
- 61 Same, page 131.
- 62 Same, page 131.

- 63 Same, page 132.
- 64 Same, page 132 - 133.
- 65 Des Dearlove. *The Ultimate Book of Business Thinking: Harnessing the Power of the World's Greatest Business Ideas*. Capstone, Oxford, 2003, pages 124 – 137.
- 66 Stewart Crainer. *The Ultimate Business Library: 75 Books That Made Management*. Second edition. Capstone, Dover, New Hampshire, 2000.
- 67 Same, page 17-18.
- 68 Same, page 44.
- 69 Same, page 44, emphasis added.
- 70 Same, page 46.
- 71 Same, pages 44, 43, and 44.
- 72 Same, page 35, emphasis added.
- 73 Same, page 152.
- 74 Tony Grundy and Laura Brown. *The Ultimate Business Skills Book: The 100 Most Important Techniques for Being Successful in Business*. Capstone, Chichester, West Sussex, 2004, pages 171 -203.
- 75 Steven ten Have, Wouter ten Have, and France Stevens. *Key Management Models: The Management Tools and Practices That Will Improve Your Business*. FT Financial Times Prentice Hall, London, 2003, page 114.
- 76 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. *The Leadership Challenge*. Third Edition. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco. 2003.
- 77 Same, first blurb on inside blurb page.
- 78 Same, pages xxiv and 115.
- 79 Same, page xv.
- 80 Same, page xxiv.
- 81 Same, page xv.
- 82 Same, pages xvii, xviii, 13, and xxv.
- 83 Same, page 13.
- 84 Same, page 13.
- 85 Same, page 84.
- 86 Same, page 158.
- 87 Same, pages 390-391.
- 88 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. *The Leadership Challenge Workbook*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 2003, pages 4-5.
- 89 Same, page 4.
- 90 James G. March and Thierry Weil. *On Leadership*. French edition 2003, Blackwell, Oxford, 2005, page 11.
- 91 Same, page xi.
- 92 Same, page 1.
- 93 Same pages 3, 4, 5 respectively.
- 94 Same, page 97.
- 95 Same, page 97.
- 96 Same, page 98.
- 97 Same, page 98.
- 98 Same, page 98-99.
- 99 Same, page 99.
- 100 Same, page 113.
- 101 Same, page 2.
- 102 Grint, page 1.
- 103 Same, page 2, emphasis added.
- 104 There are many editions, including scholarly ones, of Sun Tzu, *The Art of War* from the early Chinese period. There is also an extensive industry relating the ideas of *The Art of War* to business in various way. (For example, Donald G Krause, *Sun Tzu The Art of War for Executives*, Nicholas Brealey, London, 1996; Gerald Michaelson with Steven Michaelson, *Sun Tzu for Success: How to Use The Art of War to Master Challenges and Accomplish Important Goals in Your Life*, Adams media, Avon, Massachusetts, 2003; Steven W. Michaelson *Sun Tzu The Art of War for Execution: How to Use The Art of War to Get Results*, Adams Business, Avon, Massachusetts, 2007; and Robert Greene, *The 33 Strategies of War*, Penguin Books, New York, 2006.) There are also many books joining Sun Tzu *The Art of War* and Niccolò Machiavelli *The Prince*, from the much later renaissance period in Italy (for example, Anthony Jensen, *Sun Tzu & Machiavelli Leadership Secrets: How to Become a Superior Leader Utilizing the Principles of the Art of War and The Prince*, Make Profits Easy on CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, n.p., 2016) as well as those adding in von Clausewitz (1780 - 1830) on war and military strategy. A simple search (ignoring overlaps) on Amazon.co.uk on 1.7.2021 threw up 611 results for 'Sun Tzu the art of war and business', 414 results for 'Sun Tzu the art of war and management', and 40 for 'Sun Tzu the art of war and executives'. To that can be added von Clausewitz being joined to Sun Tzu and/or Machiavelli and there can be no doubt about the role and influence of war as a grounding metaphor and military thinking, especially 'command and control', on business, including about 'leadership'.
- 105 Australian Government, Department of Defence. *The Defence Leadership Framework: Growing Leaders at All Levels*. Australian Government, Department of Defence, 2010.
- 106 David K Hurst. *The New Ecology of Leadership: Business Mastery in a Chaotic World*. Columbia Business School, New York, 2012, page 3.
- 107 Same, page 153.
- 108 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. *Learning Leadership: The Five Fundamentals of Becoming an Exemplary Leader*. Wiley, San Francisco, 2016, page xv.
- 109 Same, page xvii.
- 110 Same with chapters devoted to each of these topics.
- 111 Same, page 223.
- 112 Alex Ferguson and Michael Moritz. *Leading: Lessons in Leadership from the Legendary Manchester United Manager*. Paperback edition, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 2016, page 239.
- 113 John Ashmore. Transcript: Read the FULL text of Theresa May's speech this morning. *Politics Home*, 5 June 2017. Accessed at 5.1.2018. The full transcript of May's speech can also be found at *The Spectator* (Theresa May's 'strong leadership' speech, full transcript. *The Spectator* (spectator.co.uk), 5 June 2017. Accessed on 16 April 2022, 17:05 at www.spectator.co.uk/article/theresa-may-s-strong-leadership-speech-full-transcript .

114 This sounds very much like 'leadership-as-willpower in the sense, for example, of Hitler as a person with "a will of iron". Paul Ham. *Young Hitler: The Making of the Fuhrer*. Doubleday, London, 2017, page 238.

115 As succinctly exposed by a political sketch-writer, John Crace, Theresa May (unwittingly) conveyed the essence of the attitude to thinking about 'leadership' when she effectively averred over two sentences:

'We will show leadership, because that is what leaders do.'

Of course, it is. But what is 'leadership'? Did it *really* mean anything to say essentially that? Perhaps some hurried scriptwriter felt this was statesmanlike because it reflects the kind of cliché thinking which passes for statesmanship today. (The final two sentences in the transcript are: "That is what the election in three days' time is about. It's about *who can provide the leadership* to do what's right for Britain. And with the support of people across the country at the ballot box on Thursday, *that's what I will do.*".) John Crace. Maybot malfunctions under pressure over disappearing police. *The Guardian*, 5 June 2017. Accessed on 5th January 2018 at <http://bit.ly/2DyOfcE>, emphasis added.

116 The transcript shows references to 'leadership' as 13 times, 'leader' as 7, 'lead' as 2, with 1 reference to 'leaders' in a vague way, and aside from the use of words like 'leave', 'leading' and 'led' in their casual sense, in a short campaign speech. Reading through the speech transcript shows the way an unthinking mind segues surreptitiously into contradiction. Stating that the "the *job* of Prime Minister" and the "number one priority for any Prime Minister" is to keep "our country safe", the Prime Minister then turns on her opponent in the election. While criticising his security *policy positions*, she also calls Mr Jeremy Corbyn a 'leader' three times but then immediately says, referring to his policy positions: "That's not leadership. It's an abdication of leadership." In addition to her shifting here to a definition in terms of policies, from her earlier definition of 'leadership' as some personal characteristics, she is also conflating the Prime Minister post ('job') with 'leadership'(emphases added).

117 Nancy Koehn. *Forged in Crisis: The Power of Courageous Leadership in Turbulent Times*. Times, John Murray, London, 2017.

118 Same, page 3.

119 Same, page 3.

120 Same, page 3.

121 Same, page 7.

122 Same, page 7-8.

123 Same, page 8 (emphases added).

124 Doris Kearns Goodwin. *Leadership in Turbulent Times*. Simon and Schuster, New York 2018, page xv.

125 Same, page xi.

126 Same, page xvi.

127 Same, page xv.

128 Same, page xii.

129 Same, page xiii.

130 Same, page, xiv.

131 Same, page, 360.

132 Same, page 200.

133 Same, page, xiii-xiv.

134 Same, page 39-40.

135 Same, page 14.

136 Same, page 19-20.

137 Same, page 12.

138 Same, page 151.

139 Same, page 110.

140 Same, page 368, emphasis added.

141 Same page, xii.

142 Same, page 9.

143 Same, page 23.

144 Same, pages 23-24.

145 Same, page 24.

146 Same, page 24.

147 Same, page 31.

148 Same, page 29.

149 Brené Brown. *Dare to Lead: Brave Work, Tough Conversations, Whole Hearts*. Vermilion, London, 2018, page 4.

