

Leadership & Empowerment

W. Warner Burke

To empower others is to affect their personal interests. One is not born with the skill, or perhaps art, of empowerment. The process must be learned. No doubt the learning comes easier for some than for others, but learning is necessary nevertheless. Moreover, my central thesis is that one's effectiveness in empowering others depends on whether one is a manager or a leader. The two processes differ significantly. A working assumption is that an executive is more leader than manager. Organizational size is an important variable, of course. The hypothesis of differences between managers and leaders for effective empowerment holds for medium to large organizations, not a local supermarket

Excerpted with permission from W. Warner Burke, "Leadership as Empowering Others." Excerpts as submitted from S. Srivastva and Associates, Executive Power: How Executives Influence People and Organizations, pp. 63-75. Copyright (c) 1986 by Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 433-1767.

(although perhaps it holds true for the corporation that owns the local store, among others) or a local YMCA (although perhaps it holds true for the national organization of the YMCA).

Distinguishing between a manager and a leader is not unique to this paper. Others in the recent past have made such a distinction—most notably, Abraham Zaleznik and James McGregor Burns. We shall now consider their respective writings as prerequisite to understanding how the empowering process differs for managers and leaders. Since Zaleznik's (1977) award-winning paper in the *Harvard Business Review*, in which he contrasted leaders and managers, there has been a gradually increasing interest in the notion that fundamental differences may indeed exist between leaders and managers, between leaders and administrators. For example, Wortman (1982) has distinguished between operating and strategic managers in corporations. His thesis is that top managers (executives) should think and act strategically (that is, long range), whereas managers must be more

**"To put it plainly, the reform will not work, will not yield the results we expect, if it does not affect the personal interests of literally every person."
—Mikhail Gorbachev
June 28, 1988**

concerned with daily operations. He laments that executives in U.S. corporations have acted entirely too managerially; that is, they are overly concerned with short-range operations. This shortsightedness, he contends, has contributed to the decrease in productivity in our country. Others have made arguments similar to Wortman's, yet Wortman casts his points within the context of leader-follower roles. Executives (that is, leaders), as opposed to managers, exercise strategic management not only via the more obvious dimensions of analysis, policy formulation, evaluation and planning, but also in their behavior. Leaders must be more charismatic, inspiring and flexible. They must have the skills to inspire followers to accept change, to take initiative and risks. Moreover, Wortman argues that leaders must take a highly participative approach to their management of subordinates. Wortman implies that there may be basic differences in personal characteristics between those who rise to executive, leader status and those who remain in the middle ranks.

This implication of Wortman's is Zaleznik's primary premise. In his 1977 paper, Zaleznik argues that leaders and managers do indeed differ in fundamental ways. Not only do leaders behave differently; they also differ in personality, needs and attitudes. Zaleznik

draws his differences between leaders and managers across four dimensions: attitudes toward goals, conceptions of work, relations with others, and senses of self (see Table 1). In short, then, managers enjoy relating with people, attain much of their sense of self from such activities, and work to maintain order. Leaders are loners, risk takers, and visionaries.

In his Pulitzer Prize-winning book, Burns (1978) distinguishes between two kinds of leadership: transformational and transactional. There are similarities between Burns' transformational leader and Zaleznik's leader and between the transactional leader and Zaleznik's manager. More specifically, for Burns, a transformational leader "recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower. But, beyond that, the transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents." A transactional leader, on the other hand, is one who views the leader-follower relationship as a process of exchange: rewards for work, jobs for votes, favor for favor. Burns contends that most leader-follower relationships are transactional.

Table 1. A Comparison of Leaders and Managers According to Zaleznik (1977)

Dimensions for Comparison	Leaders	Managers
Attitude toward goals	Personal, active	Impersonal, reactive
Conception of work	Projecting ideas into images that excite people; developing options	An enabling process of coordinating and balancing; limiting options
Relation with others	Prefer solitary activities; relate intuitively and empathetically	Prefer to work with people; relate according to roles
Sense of Self	Feel separate from their environment; depend on personal mastery of events for identity	Belong to their environment; depend on memberships, roles, and so on for identity

Table 2 is a summary comparison of transformational and transactional leaders (managers) according to Burns. Some of Zaleznik's views are included also, to provide a fuller range of comparison. It should be noted that Table 2 represents an interpretation of what Burns and Zaleznik mean and does not reflect their exact words. Moreover, the dimensions for comparison are selective and somewhat arbitrary.

Leaders—that is, the transformational types—are visionary, solitary, inspirational figures consumed with certain ideals and goals; they engender intense emotions in their followers. In a word, they are charismatic. These transformational leaders, Burns contends, know what their followers' needs are, even they the followers themselves are not aware of their needs. It may be that transformational leaders have stronger empathy skills than the average person. They may be much more accurate in their perceptions of others.

Transformational leaders accurately assess and provide a mission and goals that, when achieved, respond to the followers' needs. The leaders expect the followers to be as dedicated as the leaders themselves are to their joint purpose and mission; when this expectation is not met, leaders will often act in such a way that followers may experience guilt feelings. Mahatma Gandhi, for example, when his followers continued to fight among themselves and did not cooperate with one another as he wished, would fast until near death. Gandhi's act would usually and eventually cause the followers to meet his expectations. Such behavior, although less drastic and dramatic than Gandhi's, is not unusual for transformational leaders. Rather than fasting, a leader might express disappointment and remind the followers of the mission, purpose, or goals and of their responsibility to work toward those goals.

Table 2. A Comparison of Transformational Leaders and Transactional Leaders (managers)

Dimensions for Comparison	Leaders	Managers
Emotional involvement	With the institution and with ideas/vision	With the task and the people associated with the task
Personal life	Work and personal life not that distinguishable	Work is separate from personal, private life
Achieves commitment via	Inspiration	Involvement
Holds people accountable via	Guilt induction; want whole person	Contractual transactions; want task accomplishment
Value emphasis	Terminal; end state	Instrumental; means
Problems	Create them	Fix them
Plans	Long range	Short range
Appreciates from followers/subordinates	Contrariness	Conformity
Engenders in followers	Intense feelings—love, sometimes hate; desire to identify with; turbulent	Feelings not intense but relations smoother and steadier

Transformational leaders, by definition perhaps, never leave matters as they find them. Change is the rule, not the exception. They usually have a clear change objective, some particular end state in mind, according to Burns. They are far less concerned with how to achieve that end than they are with accomplishing the purpose and the mission. They are, therefore, tolerant of differences of opinion about paths to goals, but they are not tolerant about any equivocation regarding the goals themselves.

Transactional leaders, or managers, with their penchant for teamwork, task accomplishment and problem solving, and their steadier, less turbulent manner of working with others, complement and supplement transformational leaders. For clarity of goals and direction, managers need leaders. For indispensable help in reaching goals, leaders need managers.

These comments and Table 2 are meant to provide a flavor of what Burns and Zaleznik have written, not an exhaustive discourse. The works of Burns and Zaleznik are based on their observations of interactions and experiences with leaders and managers, their understanding and interpretation of the research literature, and their theorizing. Even though Burns particularly uses numerous illustrations to support his points, hard scientific evidence that documents a difference between leaders (transformational) and managers (transactional) is only beginning to materialize (Bass, 1985). Yet the ideas of Burns and Zaleznik are reasonable, coincide with others' observations and views and, in any case, are provocative. Their ideas, more importantly, represent newer thinking regarding leadership.

Given the assumption that leaders and managers differ in their personal characteristics and in their behavior, the process of empowering others, followers and subordinates, should differ for leaders and managers as well. These hypothesized differences will be contrasted according to five possible empowering processes: (1) providing direction for followers and subordinates, (2) stimulating followers and subordinates, (3) rewarding followers and subordinates, (4) developing followers and subordinates, and (5)

appealing to follower and subordinate needs. The perspective I am taking is one of effective or successful empowerment—that is, what leaders and managers do that effectively empowers their followers and subordinates. (See Table 3).

Providing Direction

Leaders provide direction with their ideals, visions, and purpose. They inspire followers by challenging them to work toward a higher purpose, something that is not only highly worthy of their time and energy but cannot be achieved without a collective effort. Leaders talk and write about superordinate goals. As persons, leaders embody these goals, this purpose, this vision. Direction comes as much from who they are as individuals as from what they say. Successful leaders provide high clarity regarding what is to be accomplished and ambiguity about how to accomplish the mission. Leaders need managers for the latter activity. Empowerment, then, comes from leaders providing clarity of direction, but not just any direction—a direction that encompasses a higher purpose, a worthy cause, an idea, and will require collective and concerted effort.

Managers provide direction through clarity of paths to the goals, the *how* or implementation part of the process. Empowerment, however, depends on the degree to which managers involve their subordinates in the determination of that clarity. A participative process increases the likelihood of empowerment among subordinates. Managers therefore are managing a process, not goals or end states. Direction, in this case path direction, evolves. The two critical concepts for success as a manager in providing direction are involvement and evolvment.

Stimulating Followers and Subordinates

Successful leaders are intellectually stimulating; they challenge followers' thinking by suggesting some new direction that the followers had not thought of before or, at least, not in quite the same way as the leader suggests. Empowerment comes from the stimulation of an intellectually exciting idea. The idea is, of course, cognitive but the stimulation is emotional and therefore, energizing.

Not only do leaders behave differently (than managers); they also differ in personality, needs and attitudes.

Even more emotionally stimulating is the idea of a higher morality, which Burns (1978) contends, transformational leaders convey. Mahatma Gandhi stimulated and inspired his people by pointing to the oppression of British rule and by advocating passive resistance to counter that oppression. Passive resistance, Gandhi pointed out, was not only justified under such circumstances but represented a higher morality. Perhaps most other leaders would agree with Gandhi's ideals and methods. Yet other leaders could claim a higher morality, and most of the world would not agree. For Hitler, a super race represented a higher morality, and this ideal clearly stimulated many within his immediate domain; but this position was not considered a higher morality by most of the world. In both instances, however, the appeal to a higher morality was stimulating and emotional and therefore not readily amenable to rational scrutiny and judgment.

For managers, stimulation comes from action—from doing things, accomplishing tasks, moving mountains, achieving the impossible. The American attitude or philosophy of “can do” is a significant stimulant for managers. An old U.S. army adage is “Do something, soldier, even if it's wrong.” While most managers, and no doubt most army sergeants, would not go to that extreme, the emphasis, nevertheless, is on action. Empowerment, again, comes from managers giving their subordinates a piece of this action, providing them with significant and relevant tasks to do that help the action along.

Rewarding Followers and Subordinates

Successful leaders reward their followers primarily through an informal and spontaneous process. They enjoy catching their followers in the act in a spontaneous manner. Thus, they look for opportunities to reward their followers. Moreover, they reward their followers in a fairly consistent manner. They do not positively reinforce their followers merely for the sake of providing “strokes;” rather, their rewarding is for following behavior that is directed toward accomplishing the leaders' goals. The followers' behavior

may not always be completely successful; as long as it represents an attempt to accomplish the leaders' goals, it is likely to be positively recognized. Empowerment, then, comes from being positively recognized by a power figure, the leader; that is, to be recognized by that power holder for doing the right thing is to share, even though perhaps momentarily, that power.

Rewarding by managers is more formal. Their rewarding of subordinates is by way of incentive systems, promotions, merit awards, and the like (extrinsic rewarding). The more managers base their rewarding on individual, subordinate performance, however, and the more they attempt to provide interesting and meaningful jobs for their subordinates to do (intrinsic rewarding), the more likely they will experience success as managers—in other words, the more likely their subordinates will be motivated to put forth and to perform quality work. Empowerment, as with the leader, derives from recognition. In the managers' case, this recognition is typically more a function of extrinsic rewards and related more directly to job performance, but even greater effectiveness is likely to be derived from intrinsic rewarding.

Empowerment comes from leaders providing clarity of direction, but just not any direction—a direction that encompasses a higher purpose, a worthy cause, an idea.

Developing Followers and Subordinates

Successful leaders develop their followers by inspiring them to do more than they thought they could. Leaders often set high standards and may even establish goals that seem impossible to achieve. These leaders then challenge their followers by coaxing, cajoling, encouraging (“You can do it!”), and constantly reminding them of what the goals and mission are. Successful leaders work hard to keep their followers focused and directed toward the goals with constant and consistent reminders. Harold Sperlich in his “Conversations” (Burke, 1984) noted that he frequently talked about the three common objectives for all Chrysler employees: objectives that managers and subordinates have in common, objectives that management and the unions have in common, and objectives that Chrysler and its con-

Table 3. Differences in the Empowering Process as a Function of Role: Leaders Compared with Managers

Empowering Process	Leaders	Managers
Providing direction for followers/subordinates	Via ideals, vision, a higher purpose, superordinate goals	Via involvement of subordinates in determining paths toward accomplishment
Stimulating followers/subordinates	With ideas	With action; things to accomplish
Rewarding followers/subordinates	Informal; personal recognition	Formal; incentive systems
Developing followers/subordinates	By inspiring them to do more than they thought they could do	By involving them in important decision-making activities and providing feedback for potential learning
Appealing to followers'/subordinates' needs	Appeal to needs of followership and dependency	Appeal to needs for autonomy and independence

stituents (suppliers, government, and others) have in common. Chrysler employees have been amazed at how much the corporation has been able to accomplish with the unions, with their suppliers, and with the hourly workers in the plants. They seem to say "We have achieved far more than we thought possible." Empowerment comes from accomplishing more than expected.

Managers' development of subordinates differs from that of leaders; at least the process is different, but the outcome is similar—personal growth. And the managers' approach is based on the same participative and involvement process mentioned before. Successful managers involve their subordinates in important and relevant decision making and, as part of the process, help them to learn about (1) the consequences of their decisions and actions (managers providing feedback) and (2) management itself (managers providing modeling behavior, especially concerning the act of decision making). Empowerment comes from participation in important and relevant decisions and activities, and individual development comes from the consequent learning.

Appealing to Followers' and Subordinates' Needs

Perhaps the greatest difference between leaders and managers regarding empowerment is the type of follower and subordinate need to which each appeals. Leaders appeal to a dependency need. Managers appeal to an independence need. Followers need to have direction. Subordinates need not be cast in the role of subordinate for every aspect of their work. Yet followers and subordinates are usually the same individuals. The point is that successful leaders appeal to one need that most people have, and successful managers appeal to quite another need that these same people have.

Even though adults have outgrown their need to be dependent on more powerful people in their past (parents, teachers, coaches, and the like), this need may have changed in nature and thus becomes fulfilled via slightly different forms. But the basic need remains. Some adults accept this dependency need fairly readily; others deny it. The Japanese regard it as an appropriate need, and it is highly indigenous to their culture. (See Doi, 1973 for a thorough analysis of

this phenomenon, called *amae* by the Japanese.) Americans, however, often equate dependency with powerlessness. And, in fact, being too dependent can lead to a follower's being subsumed completely within and under the power of the leader; as a consequence, feelings of powerlessness may emerge and gradually replace the feelings of empowerment. Jim Jones' religious cult of a few years ago where his followers at his command committed suicide, might illustrate this point—that is, the replacement of earlier feelings of empowerment with complete submergence and submission.

But the successful leader is one who is sensitive to what the group wants and what is good for the system. By being in tune with the group's desires and by conceptualizing and envisioning these desires, the leader is responding. This leader response to real desires on the part of the followers is empowering. A typical follower reaction might be: "Thank goodness, someone has finally provided the direction we need, and we can get on with it." Dependency, in this case, is the need for that clarity of direction.

And let us not overlook the fact that followers have power. Leadership, after all, is a reciprocal process. By definition, no followers, no leader. The followers' power is manifested when the leader does not respond to their desires. Most experienced leaders and managers at one time or other have faced passive resistance from followers. This resistance may take a variety of forms—"Gee, I forgot" or "I didn't really understand that you wanted it that way"—and is often a reaction to the leaders' lack of response to follower desire and needs.

People have needs for autonomy too. Like dependency, these needs vary in intensity from one individual to another. For Americans this is a strong need, deeply imbedded in their culture. The cultural term is individualism, "standing on one's feet." Managers are in the best position to respond to this need, and they can best respond to it via a participatory process.

Successful leaders develop their followers by inspiring them to do more than they thought they could.

Summary and Conclusions

Although leaders and managers may differ in personal characteristics, in role, and in behavior, the outcomes of their acts can be the same. People can grow and develop with either one or both. Feelings of empowerment can come from both leaders and managers. The primary position of this paper, however, is that the empowering process must differ as a function of whether one is in a leadership or management role—even if some perceive themselves as leaders rather than managers regardless of normal role. Recent research in executive competence has shown, for example, that highly competent executives in a federal agency tend to perceive themselves more as leaders than comparatively less competent executives do (Burke and Myers, 1982).

For organizational effectiveness, of course, both leaders and managers are necessary. To refer again to the Chrysler example, Harold Sperlich conceived of himself as both a leader and a manager but said that his role was more managerial and Lee Iacocca's role was more one of leadership. To use Sperlich's words:

"The dramatic leadership that Iacocca provided was in the classic leadership mode—a guy you believe in, you'd follow into battle. He was so strong that, at the worst time, knowing his hand was on the helm, a dealer would keep his money in the business; a supplier would bankroll us; a man would stay with us; a guy would come over from Ford. His personal strength, or the perception of his personal strength, was crucial....[He] provided leadership in battle, his fundamentals are right, and he behaves consistently....My own leadership style is a little bit like his, but on a smaller scale. I'm not big enough and I'm not supposed to be....I'm more actively involved in trying to promote results through common goals and an enabling style....But as chairman and chief executive officer, he's got to establish the fundamental values." [Burke, 1984, pp. 35-36].

A further role distinction—or, perhaps more accurately, a personality difference—is that Iacocca is more of an entrepreneur, a term I have not used in this paper; Iacocca is marketing oriented, promotes the company and the business, and is more external—dealing with car and truck dealers, government, and suppliers. Frequently entrepreneurs are more leader in nature than manager. Their typically strong achievement needs are met by building a business, a company. They usually have a clear idea of what they want their business and company to be. But as managers they are often less effective, especially as the business grows and when delegation on their part is needed. They like to hold on, to continue to do what they enjoyed in the first place.

The Iacocca-Sperlich combination—leader/entrepreneur and manager—seems to be highly productive. In any case, their example highlights the two distinctive roles that the two men play and the differences in their personal characteristics.

In large, complex organizations, it is not always clear when one is a leader and when one is a manager. Executives serve in both capacities. But those executives who lean more naturally toward leader behavior and desires and have more leadership responsibility need capable managers to help them implement their goals. Those executives who lean more naturally toward manager behavior and inclinations and have more management responsibility need capable leaders to help them by providing clarity of mission, purpose and goals. Thus, leaders and managers are interdependent. While managers are bosses, they are at the same time followers. They need overall direction and inspiration, but leaders cannot function successfully without managers.

At the risk of oversimplification, but nevertheless to summarize the main thesis of this paper as succinctly as possible, leaders empower via direction and inspiration and managers via action and participation.

Epilogue

I have been a student of leadership for a long time. My dissertation in 1963 was a study of the interactive nature of the leader, the follower and the situation. A condensed version of the study was published two years later (Burke, 1965). For the next 10 or so years I continued to read the leadership literature but found it disappointing and stagnant. But in 1977 ideas about leadership changed for me. Zaleznik's HBR article that year hit me between the eyes. You mean there's a difference between a leader and a manager? I had not really thought about such a distinction prior to Zaleznik's provocative paper—as naive as this admission may sound today. These days when I speak to an executive or managerial audience there is little or no question about the distinction; differences between a leader and a manager seem to be taken for granted. Our thinking has clearly been affected in the last decade or so; in any case, this change in thinking is certainly true for me.

This leader-manager distinction is important for the practice of organization development. When you think about it, shouldn't an OD practitioner aspire to behave more like a leader than a manager? Leadership stems from personal influence; so does OD consulting. While we should not be in the position of providing a vision or setting direction—that is our client's job—we can, of course, facilitate this process and do so in an inspiring, energizing, and focused manner, which, after all, are leadership qualities.

A final point: There is growing evidence that self-awareness on the part of leaders and managers is related to performance. The more aware we are of how we come across to others, the more likely our performance will be well above average. It behooves us OD practitioners, I submit, to work on this process of self-awareness, especially in terms of how much we lean toward leader qualities and characteristics as compared with manager qualities and characteristics. Leanings in the latter direction are terrific for management, but not optimal for OD consulting. Zaleznik does not believe that leadership can be learned; you either have the qualities or personality for leadership

For organizational effectiveness, of course, both leaders and managers are necessary. Thus leaders and managers are interdependent.

or you do not—period! I am not as persuaded. There are qualities that are important to leadership that can be learned, for example, oral presentation skills, using metaphorical language when appropriate, providing persuasive arguments, etc. OD practitioners need these skills. Some of us can be more inspiring and energizing than others, but we can all work on these qualities, and no doubt, improve them for ourselves.

By the year 2007 another provocative article or book on leadership may appear. If so, you take up the gauntlet. I'll be on my boat in the Gulf of Mexico.

REFERENCES

- Bass, B.M. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free-Press, 1985
- Burke, W. W. (1965) Leadership behavior as a function of the leader, the follower, and the situation. *Journal of Personality*, 33(1), 60-81.
- Burke, W. W. "Conversations with Harold K. Sperlich." *Organizational Dynamics*, 1984, 12 (4), 23-36.
- Burke, W. W., and Myers, R. A. *Assessment of Executive Competence*. Washington, D.C.: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 1982.
- Burns, J. M. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Doi, T. *The Anatomy of Dependence*. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1973.
- Wortman, M. S. "Strategic Management and Changing Leader-Follower Roles." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1982, 18, 371-383.
- Zaleznik, A. "Managers and Leaders: Are They Different?" *Harvard Business Review*, 1977, 55, (3), 67-78.

W. Warner Burke, Ph.D., is a professor of psychology and education and director of the graduate programs in social and organizational psychology at Teachers College, Columbia University. He is also president of W. Warner Burke Associates, Inc., an organization consulting firm working with a wide variety of organizations in business-industry, government, religious and medical systems. The author of more than 80 articles and book chapters and the author, coauthor, editor, or coeditor of 13 books Warner is a diplomate in industrial/organizational psychology, American Board of Professional Psychology. In 1989 he received the Public Service Medal from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; in 1990 the Distinguished Contribution to Human Resources Development Award from the American Society for Training and Development Professional Practice Area Award for Excellence—the Lippitt Memorial Award—also from ASTD.

Leader to Leader

NUMBER 10 FALL 1998

NEW PARADIGMS

The New Source of Power

Subtle shifts in the style and motivation of a new generation of leaders may hold the key to sustained organizational performance—and suggest new strategies for assessing, training, and rewarding leaders at all levels.

So says David H. Burnham of Boston's Burnham Rosen Group. A social psychologist and leadership trainer, Burnham has studied organizational behavior and business performance for more than three decades. His research shows that the attitudes that produced results for managers of the '60s, '70s and '80s are becoming less effective for managers of the '90s. Twenty or 30 years ago managers saw themselves as distinct from, and holding power over, their employees. Today, high-performing leaders, far more than their predecessors, see themselves bound to the teams that do a growing share of the work in knowledge organizations, he says.

The Three Great Motivators

In groundbreaking research begun in the 1940s, Burnham's late collaborator

David McClelland found that 80 percent of people, regardless of culture or social class, are motivated by one of three things:

- Achievement (performing a given task well)
- Affiliation (enjoying friendship and community)
- Power (influencing others or maintaining relationships of influence)

However, an important change has occurred in *how managers view power* and therefore how they carry out their roles: For decades, managers saw the source of their power as their personal charisma or position of authority; their power was bestowed by the hierarchy. Burnham calls them *institutional managers*. But around 1990 the managers he studied began to identify the source of their power as the group itself; their power was earned by virtue of their effective-

*Power is now lent by the group,
not bestowed by the hierarchy.*

Now, as in years past, managers of units that showed the highest morale and greatest performance (in terms of sales or other objective measures) are primarily motivated by power (defined as the ability to influence others), according to the researchers. This power motivation is evident across all large organizations and management functions. Furthermore, group performance and morale improves among two-thirds of managers who were trained in the skills and attitudes of effective influencers. (Other types of training produced no significant improvement in performance.)

ness and standing in the work group. These *interactive managers* see themselves as dependent on the group, even as they seek to enhance group performance (see figure, next page).

Power from the People

"The new interactive leaders derive their power from the group," says Burnham. "They are attuned to the collaborative nature of work in knowledge organizations, and they encourage others to take initiative, share information, and co-create a

STAGES OF LEADERSHIP

Research into the motivations of leaders shows a full-circle progression from Stage I (Dependent) leaders, who draw power from others but focus on their own actions, to Stage IV (Interactive) leaders, who draw power from others but use it to enhance the performance of the group. Most leaders, says David Burnham, have not moved past Stage III (Institutional) leadership, drawing power from themselves and seeking to influence others.

SOURCES OF POWER

		Others	Self
TARGET OF POWER	Self	I. Dependence: influenced by others, directed at self	II. Independence: influenced by self, directed at self
	Others	IV. Interactive: influenced by others, directed at others	III. Institutional: influenced by self, directed at others

sense of purpose.” The new orientation corresponds to the growing numbers of women and minorities in management ranks. “Changes in management attitude are another benefit of diversity in organizations,” he adds.

The skills of institutional leadership—providing an inspiring vision and direction, setting clear goals for others, and making decisions in the best interest of the group—are laudable but limited aspirations, according to the research. “The institutional manager sees it as his responsibility to do what is ‘right’ for the organization,” says Burnham. “It is not a responsibility he shares with subordinates.” That approach still produces acceptable results. But in a five-year study of 140 leaders in 18 organizations, those fitting the interactive profile—those, for instance, who shared decision making, focused on the group, and stimulated dialogue—outperformed their institutional counterparts, who tended to make unilat-

eral decisions, focus on the individual, and coach and cheerlead others.

“Effective leaders understand what each person in the group needs, what obstacles they face, and how he or she, the manager, can support them,” explains Burnham. “That is a very different set of competencies from that of the ’70s-style institutional manager who simply wants to better direct the work of others.”

New Leadership Skills

Because few organizations have kept pace with the changing psychographics of their top performers, most continue to train leaders in skills that are fast becoming obsolete, he adds. “Even if you’re learning how to be a better listener or how to set clear goals, if you’re doing this so you can better control the work of others, that message is going to come through—and it is not a message that brings out the best in others.” If you

see your power as coming from others, he notes, it’s more important to know “how to pursue multiple paths toward a common end than to be adept at selling ‘the one best way’ to others.”

Dictating solutions produces “short-term comfort for some and long-term dissatisfaction for others, while always reinforcing the mind-set that, in the end, only the leader holds the responsibility for success.” That view, he believes, is out of step with current realities.

Through simulation and case studies, managers can be trained to better diagnose a situation, understand their own motivations and those of others, and develop the traits, behaviors, and attitudes that produce superior performance. Burnham says leaders must develop five skills of interactive leadership:

- *Knowing yourself.* Be genuine, self-disclosing, and accessible to others.
- *Acting with agility.* Be flexible, responsive, and willing to experiment.
- *Drawing power from others.* Encourage others to share information and make decisions.
- *Focusing on the group.* Value individuality and diversity while maintaining team performance.
- *Mobilizing entire systems.* Understand how the parts affect the whole, and focus on long-term goals.

High-performing organizations of the future will provide training and incentives in these skills. “We know that people can change their thinking and their actions when given the tools,” he says. “And we know that these new ways of thinking and acting produce better results. We need training that supports our best leadership practices.”