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Abstract

The way we look at leadership determines in many ways what we think leadership is. And how we approach leadership study influences us the same way. Taking a more holistic, philosophical approach to leadership research may offer us more encompassing and transcendent views of what leadership is as distinct from other social activities. This approach allows us to grapple with leadership authenticity in interesting ways. Is leadership authentic because the people who are called leaders are authentic people? Or, is authentic leadership a notion that can be thought of in holistic ways, differentiating it from other notions of social engagement, like management? If so, what are some different conceptions of leadership and how can we determine whether they really reflect leadership philosophy or some other version of collective interaction?

This paper examines a more holistic approach to studying leadership. It offers a framework to analyze the different perspectives people describe and experience as leadership and reviews a model of leadership perspectives. In the end, we see that leadership might be better described as a holarchical system of ever more encompassing and transcendent perspectives of social interaction best understood in terms of a framework of analysis consisting of values, vision, vector, and voice, and that the more encompassing and transcendent the perspective of leadership is, the more authentic the leadership becomes. This kind of analysis has far-reaching impact on the field of Public Administration (and indeed all of social-organizational life) because it offers both
description and prescription as to what (public) managers do (and could or should do) every day as they run (public) organizations.

Introduction

The way we look at leadership determines in many ways what we think leadership is. And how we approach leadership study influences us the same way. If we take a reductionist approach to leadership research we find ourselves with many parts that don’t always seem to add up to the whole of leadership. Taking a more holistic, philosophical approach to leadership research may offer us more encompassing and transcendent views of what leadership is as distinct from other social activities.

This latter approach allows us to grapple with leadership authenticity in interesting ways. Is leadership authentic because the people who are called leaders are authentic people? Or, is authentic leadership a notion that can be thought of in holistic ways, differentiating it from other notions of social engagement, like management? If so, what are some different conceptions of leadership and how can we determine whether they really reflect leadership philosophy or some other version of collective interaction?

This paper examines a more holistic approach to studying leadership. It offers a framework to analyze the different perspectives people describe and experience as leadership. It also summarizes briefly recent research on the Leadership Perspective Model. The paper concludes with some implications for practice that the framework and model present. In the end, we see that leadership might be better described as a holarchical system of ever more encompassing and transcendent perspectives of social interaction best understood in terms of a framework of analysis consisting of values,
vision, vector, and voice, and that the more encompassing and transcendent the
perspective of leadership is, the more authentic the leadership becomes. This kind of
analysis has far-reaching impact on the field of Public Administration (and indeed all of
social-organizational life) because it offers both description and prescription as to what
(public) managers do (and could or should do) every day as they run (public)
organizations.

Background

Defining leadership is a recent academic activity, though the phenomenon of
leadership has been ever present in human relations. Stogdill (1974) reminds us that the
word “leader” has origins back to the 1300s and the word “leadership” dates back to the
1800s. He reviewed over 3,000 studies directly related to leadership and suggested that
there are almost as “many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who
have attempted to define the concept” (p. 7). Bennis and Nanus (1985) found 350
definitions from thousands of studies. Rost (1991) found 221 definitions in 587 books
and articles written from 1900 to 1990. One can only imagine how many more have
emerged since 1990. Bennis and Nanus conclude that “[n]ever have so many labored so
long to say so little” (1985, p. 4). Rost is even more indicting when he comments that
“these attempts to define leadership have been confusing, varied, disorganized,
idsyncratic, muddled, and, according to conventional wisdom, quite unrewarding”
(1991, p. 99). Yet these researchers, and many others, continue their work studying,
defining, identifying, and developing leadership. For example, Yukl (1988) encourages a
continued focus on leadership study by trying to integrate many of the previous
leadership theories into an overarching “supermodel” of leadership. Yukl’s attempt illustratively hints at a more holistic approach to understanding what leadership really is.

However, leadership scholars have usually unpacked the question of what leadership is by unpacking leadership itself. It is a tried and true methodology of scientific inquiry to separate the thing itself, study its parts, and, thereby understand the thing that was taken apart. It is a mechanical, scientific approach based on reductionist principles. When adopted by leadership scholars we find two main avenues of research. First, we develop numerous studies on the parts of leadership. The field has chopped leadership into so many parts, it is difficult to even begin a list of “leadership topics,” knowing that a majority of concepts will be left out. The following list is, however, illustrative of the reductionist categories hoping to get us to an understanding of leadership: power, influence, motivation, personality, traits, behaviors, situations, contingencies, selflessness, emotional intelligence, culture, and many more. Second, we find studies focusing on the leader, suggesting leadership is best understood by studying specific individuals in specific situations (see for example Bennis 1984; Carson 1987; Kouzes and Posner 1990; Sanders 1998). Proponents of this method focus on the qualities, behaviors and situational responses of those who claim to be, or are given the title of, leader: leaders define leadership.

While this general approach has yielded an enormous amount of research, knowledge, and leader biographies, the information has to do more with the individual topics than with leadership itself. We find we know a lot about culture, power, traits, personality, situational contingencies, organizational design, planning and the like. But putting the pieces back together again to inform the question of what leadership qua
leadership really is has proven to be very difficult – the definitions still proliferate and so the phenomenon of leadership still eludes us.

The reductionist approach to leadership study is and will continue to be with us. Its fruits are useful in engaging in organizational life and point to the personal dimensions of social interaction. However, more and more leadership scholars are taking a more holistic approach, treating leadership not as a whole to be understand by its parts but more like a philosophy of social interaction that, when understood, shapes the various parts it seems to encompass. Leadership studies pioneers like Robert Greenleaf (1977) and James MacGregor Burns (1978) foreshadowed this emerging approach. While they certainly focused on leaders, they also tried to describe leadership in ways that helped us see why some people are leaders and why some people are not, focusing on the phenomenon of leadership generally rather than the reductions of the leader or a person’s position.

This approach rejects the idea that leadership per se is a summation of the qualities, behaviors, or situational responses of individuals in a position of authority at the head of organizations (see Burns 1978; DePree 1992; Greenleaf 1977; Heifetz 1994; Wheatley 1999). To study leaders or elements of leadership technique is not, in this sense, to study leadership. In saying this there is an implicit acceptance that leadership is something larger than "leader" – that leadership encompasses all there is that defines who a leader may be. Hence, the meaning of leader (or who may be labeled a leader) is dependent upon the leadership displayed, not the position held or the person holding it.

One way to see leadership as a holistic concept is the notion of authentic leadership. This approach sees authentic leaders as being leaders who:
• Know who they are and what they believe in.
• Are transparent and show consistency between their values, ethical reasoning and actions.
• Focus on developing positive psychological states such as confidence, optimism, hope, and resilience within themselves and their associates.
• Are widely known and respected for their integrity.

Key to this notion is that the values and integrity of people are central to the phenomenon of leadership. Such ideas become more philosophical and less subject to reduction into unique and reconstructable elements. However, the concept is still focused on the leader, rather than on the notion of leadership.

Summarizing then, in one sense leadership is what leaders do, and therefore the meaning of leadership derives from the work of the leader. In another sense, leadership encompasses all there is that defines who a leader may be, and therefore the meaning of leader (or who may be labeled a leader) is dependent upon the definition or perspective of leadership. The first approach is very much an aggregation of reductionist elements or a mechanistic system. The second is much more an organic system, even philosophical, and entertains the idea that what some call leadership may not really be authentic leadership at all.

Leadership is essentially a phenomenon of social interaction, social change, and individual change. As players in the social and interpersonal world, people have their own conceptions of leadership; in other words, “We know it when we see it.” While many researchers recognize this, few study leadership with that notion in mind. Researchers in the past have failed to account for the personal, more intimate idea of
defining leadership for oneself. They ignored the personal frames of reference, world views, and cultural constructs that call for each of us to answer for ourselves the question, “What is leadership?” Leadership experts such as McWhinney (1984) who recognized the importance of taking into account paradigmatic perspectives and more recently Fairholm (2000) who began work on understanding different leadership perspectives, or “virtual realities,” within which people operate and measure the success or failure of leadership, have pointed to an approach that is definitively philosophical, yet ultimately practical because it is grounded in the experience and values of people engaged in the leadership phenomenon. This approach demands different methods to see leadership for what it is.

To enhance the attempt recently reinforced by the ideas of authentic leadership, to see leadership as a whole instead of an aggregation of parts, this paper outlines a general framework to analyze the phenomenon of leadership as people see it, as they experience it, and as they practice it. In essence it is a descriptive and prescriptive tool – descriptive in that it offers avenues of analysis; prescriptive in that it helps us see how we may practice leadership in more transcendent and encompassing ways. Again this framework offers a comprehensive, but simple way to analyze whether leadership (rather than a leader) is authentic or not.

Discerning Authentic Leadership: The Four V’s of Leadership

The framework to analyze a holistic view of leadership is summarized by the “Four V’s of Leadership.” These four constructs include values, vision, vector, and voice. They provide a framework to analyze the authenticity of a person’s leadership perspective – what they know when they see it. In other words, the Four V’s help us see
upon what foundation a person’s leadership perspective is based and whether that particular conception fits with contemporary views of what leadership really is. No matter the perspective of leadership one may hold, using the four concepts described below provides a useful framework to understand and apply leadership in organizations. These concepts reveal common elements of organizational activity that help define what is meant by leadership. These ideas are not only a prescription of what leadership involves, but also provide descriptive power as we look at the “leadership” of others.

Values

The first of the Four V’s is Values. Leadership is a values displacement activity. As DePree (1992) put it, leadership is meddling in people’s lives. More bluntly, leadership is messing with, tinkering with, people’s values. Milton Rokeach studied extensively both the notion of values and the specific values that people have. He believes that the values concept is an intervening variable that is applicable across many domains involving human behavior. In other words, values drive almost every aspect of human behavior. He helped clarify how some values are instrumental in nature and others terminal. Both notions of values shed light on how authentic leadership both shapes what we and others do as well as how we and others do them (see Rokeach and Ball-Rokeach 1989).

Gardner (1995) offers the following explanation of the importance of values:

Most human beings crave an explicit statement of value - a perspective on what counts as being true, beautiful, and good. … At times of stability, the accepted norms may be adhered to without discussion. But particularly in times of crisis or cataclysmic change, individuals crave a larger explanatory framework. They pay special - and perhaps undue - heed to those who can provide some kind of broad orientation, if not definitive answers, to essential questions: the purpose of work, the just distribution of rewards and punishment, and the stance to assume in the face of death and other ultimate human concerns (p. 23).
The values and beliefs we hold not only influence the decisions we make, but the credibility we have in trying to influence others through our decisions. In this context, it is impossible to separate the issues of leadership and values. How well others will carry out actions resulting from our decisions, or to what degree people are changed because of what we do, is inevitably tied to the credibility we, and our values, have with them.

Values-based leadership is a term of art in recent literature. Fairholm (2000) suggests that “the values-based leadership focus deals with leader actions to create specifically defined values contexts within which to practice leadership and a unique technology with definable techniques” (p. 59). O’Toole (1996) suggests that values-based leadership is the “creation of moral symmetry among those with competing values” (p. 258). Essentially, the effort is one of bringing order through transcendent values that provide an environment to sufficiently and satisfactorily capture the aspirations of others.

Speaking about the values component of leadership is not new to the field (see also Covey 1992; Fairholm 1991; O'Toole 1996). In fact, two of the seminal works in leadership studies, Servant Leadership by Robert Greenleaf (1977) and Leadership by James MacGregor Burns (1978), based their ideas on the power of recognizing and basing the impact of values on the work of leadership. It is this focus that in some ways separated the study of leadership from the more general and pervasive study of management and/or organizational success techniques of the time. Unfortunately, we may have forgotten those values roots of the field, but experience and research shows that values impact, even trigger, behavior in others and if we can get to someone’s values, we can lead them.
Vision

The way leaders act, react, and interact in a values connotation – considering their own and the values and motives of followers (see Burns 1978) – brings us to the very practical element of vision. The vision operationalizes values, explicitly placing values into an organizational or relationship context. Rokeach offers two ways to help us see how vision is linked to values: his definition and his notion of values systems. He says “a value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence.” (1974, p.5). Rokeach also suggests that while values are pervasive they are not always mutually supportive. In other words, we have to prioritize our values to make sense of our world and our behavior in it. This ordering and prioritizing creates a “values system” that guide individual beliefs and behaviors.

Visions, then, more than merely stating a potential future state or goal, help people make sense of their values and how they might order them into meaningful values systems. While visions can be future oriented in that they help us determine terminal values we hold dear, they are also instrumental in nature, helping us know who we are and how we are going to accomplish certain things. Visions operationalize our values by telling us who we are now (are values priorities) and what we can become because of who we are now (our desired end states consistent with our values). Senge (1990) reminds us that, “vision not consistent with values that people live by day by day will not only fail to inspire enthusiasm, it will foster outright cynicism” (p. 223). Indeed, visions anchor our relationships in values that govern us now and in the future.
A focus on values, operationalized by vision, gives us the opportunity to think about what we value the most and why. It allows us to gain a deeper self-knowledge and self-awareness that can contribute to positive achievement, and help to identify and develop our strengths and gifts. It also gives us the opportunity to see that there are many different values that others can hold. Realizing this, we can choose to be in harmony with some and not with others (the essence of the choice of following someone). It can also especially help in creating meaningful relationships – the stuff of leadership.

When we talk of vision as a principle of leadership, we are not referring to the statements that hang on the wall (though they have their purpose). We are not talking about what we see the future to be in 20 years (though these goals can help shape an organization's future). Vision is rather the articulation of who we are, what we care about, and why we do what we do. Visions represent the essential nature of the organization and tap into the real values that drive the people in an organization. Collins and Porras (1997) suggest visions articulate and preserve a “cherished core ideology” defined as “timeless core values and enduring core purpose” (p. 220). A vision wraps the organization in a value-laden field within which individuals view themselves and others in certain ways and act consistent with the value contexts. In simple terms, visions take the drudgery out of our work and help us put forth the kind of effort our values dictate we should. In essence, a vision can be thought of as an explicit value system, or rank ordering of values that shows how that values set will be put into practice within a specific context, like a work organization or a family or a civic group.

Vector
The third of the Four V’s is vector. The term vector has to do with the direction and magnitude of something. The vector sends the values and vision in a direction, towards a goal, fulfilling a mission. As the vision operationalizes the values, vectors operationalize visions. Talking about vectors sounds much like the literature on mission statements and strategic planning. Mission statements may be more usefully considered as the bringing together of certain inevitable vectors emerging from our sense of values and vision.

It is here that we link the notions of strategic thinking (see Mintzberg 1994; Whitlock 2003) with the stuff of traditional strategic planning. Vectors offer us the starting point, the key results areas, the critical success factors (consistent with our values and vision), that give us something to do in our social interactions. They become, through long-term goal planning and short-term action planning, measurable activities or events. However, because some of what leadership is about is often unmeasurable and uncountable, in the strictest sense, the results of leaders are sometimes dismissed. Vectors are in essence the mission, what we are to do now that we have come together in a relationship/organization. Vectors help us realize that values and vision can be put into practice. Vectors make it possible to go where our values and vision can and should take us.

Voice

The last of the Four V’s is Voice. Voice represents the notion that leadership and followership are voluntary activities – both leader and follower (and their free will) are involved in the phenomenon. Leaders and followers must be free to choose to lead and to
follow. In this way, all choose to act and not be acted upon. If freedom of choice is not involved in the relationship than something other than leadership is taking place.

Simply put, we rarely have the chance in organizational life to choose our boss – they are given to us by the hierarchy and are positionally based. However, even in organizational life, we *always* choose who we will follow, independent of that person’s position. That choice is made, by the way, on how well someone articulates the values, vision, and vector and whether we agree with them or not.

Voice has three ways, then, of shaping the leadership activity. The first is that it recognizes that freedom of choice is the foundation of leadership. The second is that the leader must choose to voice or articulate a certain set of values, a vision, and vector. It is a leader’s responsibility to articulate purpose – voicing the meaning and direction that others come to understand, accept, and adopt. The third is to recognize the contributions (in terms of actions and ideas) of followers. Followers voice ideas, concerns, and approval. They choose to be mutually engaged with the leader and their involvement impacts the relationship and even, over time, may shape the values, vision, and vectors at play. Understanding the role of Voice in leadership and respecting its strength are fundamental to success. We can have a set of values, a compelling vision, and sound, consistent vectors, but without voice, the vectors remain undone, the vision unfulfilled, and the values never actualized.

In sum, values trigger behavior and reflect meaning, purpose, and commitment of both leader and led. Visions operationalize the values set. Vector operationalizes the magnitude and direction of vision-driven action and is akin to the idea of group missions. Voice is shorthand for that which makes the leadership relationship work – the nature of
the interaction (or lack thereof) between leader and led – and emphasizes the notion that the leadership relationship is essentially a voluntary one based on the level of alignment with the values, vision, and vector at play (see Figure 2). The formidable challenge confronting the leader is to offer a story, an embodiment (a vision), which is built on the most credible of past values syntheses, revisit them in the light of present concerns and relationships (vectors), leave open a place for future events, and allows individual contributions (voice) by the persons in the group.

By looking at the type, emphasis, and interplay of values, vision, vector, and voice, we can determine the authenticity of the leadership being practiced or perceived. This Four V’s of Leadership framework can help us analyze perspectives of leadership that others hold.

**Leadership Perspectives**

The holistic, more philosophical approach to leadership studies mentioned earlier guides recent research developing empirical evidence that different perspectives of leadership exist and that these perspectives shape the behavior of individual practitioners in ways specific to their mindsets. This is a “personal conceptions” or “perspectival” approach to leadership study.

Recent research has found that public administrators see leadership in at least five different ways, thus validating an emerging theory that at least five perspectives of leadership exist and are distinguishable in terms of the general descriptions of what leadership is, the leader’s tools and behavior, and the leader’s approaches to followers (Fairholm 2004). This theory suggests leadership is a phenomenon best described as a holarchical (see Koestler 1970) system of ever more encompassing and transcendent
perspectives of social interaction best understood in terms of a framework of analysis consisting of values, vision, vector, and voice. Understanding leadership, then, may entail understanding people’s conceptions or mindsets about the phenomenon and framing these perspectives in a useful model.

Paradigmatic, perspectival, or worldview, conceptions of how we look at the world are not new in literature. Barker (1992) uses the term paradigm to suggest a system or pattern of integrating thoughts, actions, and practices. Graves (1970) describes different states of being, or levels of existence, which determine actions, relationships, and measures of success. Harman (1998), in reviewing the history of science and knowledge, suggests that there are three fundamental ways (perspectives) of seeing, knowing, and interacting with the world (and people) around us. Other authors see culture as shaping the way we view things in our everyday experiences (see Herzberg 1984; Hofstede 1993; Quinn and McGrath 1985; Schein 1992). Morgan (1998) also suggests that the way we see organizations influences how we operate within them and even shapes the types of activities that make sense within them. McWhinney (1984) explains the importance of looking at paradigmatic perspectives in studying leadership. He argues that the different ways people experience reality result in their having distinctly different attitudes toward change, and that understanding these different concepts contributes to new understanding about resistance to change and modes of leadership.

The leadership perspectives approach is receiving more and more empirical and anecdotal support, and points a way to determine how authentic the leadership may be in
The Leadership Perspectives Model

This Leadership Perspectives Model (see Figure 2) offers a way to identify particular perspectives of leadership. Some of the perspectives may not fully fit with the ideas of contemporary leadership research (looking more like control and prediction techniques of management), while others reflect authentic leadership relationships. We can determine whether the leadership perspective reflects authentic leadership ideals by analyzing the values, vision, and vectors at play along with the emphasis given to and the nature of “voice” in the relationship. This kind of analysis has far-reaching impact on the field of Public Administration (the field in which initial studies have been conducted), and, indeed all of social-organizational life, because it offers both description and prescription as to what (public) managers do (and could or should do) every day as they run organizations.

The Leadership Perspective Model draws upon a simple notion, though perhaps profound in its application. It is that people view leadership in at least five different ways: leadership as scientific management, leadership as excellence management, leadership as a values displacement activity, leadership as a trust culture activity, and leadership as a whole-soul or spiritual endeavor (see Fairholm 2000; Fairholm 2004). These perspectives shape not only how one internalizes observation and externalizes belief sets, they also determine how one measures success in oneself and others. Thus, the theory suggests our leadership perspective defines what we mean when we say “leadership” and shapes how we view successful leadership in ourselves and others. While the leadership perspective
someone holds may not be the objective reality about leadership (may not be a fully authentic, encompassing conception), people holding that view behave as if it were. Frustration, confusion, and even conflict may arise because individuals may simply have multiple, competing, even conflicting, conceptions of what leadership is. Individuals immediately draw upon their own conceptions to internalize conversations about leadership. They define leadership for themselves and use their perspective as the basis for judging whether or not others are exercising leadership.

Leadership as (Scientific) Management equates leadership with the type of management that draws upon the scientific management movement of the early part of the 20th century, which still has relevance for many even today. In this perspective, much emphasis is placed on managers understanding the one best way to promote and maintain productivity amongst the employee ranks (see Gulick 1937; Taylor 1915). Leadership as Excellence Management, suggests that leadership is really management but focuses on what has been called the excellence movement. This perspective focuses on systematic quality improvements with a focus on the people involved in the processes, the processes themselves, and the quality of products that are produced (see Deming 1986; Juran 1989; Peters and Waterman 1982).

Leadership as a Values Displacement Activity (or simply Values Leadership) defines leadership as a relationship between leader and follower that allows for typical management objectives to be achieved primarily via shared values, not merely direction and control (Fairholm 1991; Nirenberg 1998; O'Toole 1996). Leadership success is dependent less on organizational authority and more on the leader’s own values that he articulates into an eventually shared set of values operationalizes by a shared vision.
Leadership in a Trust Culture shifts the focus more on the environmental culture within which leadership operates where trust and shared values characterize the interaction between the leader and the led (see Fairholm 1994; Kouzes and Posner 1993; Manz and Sims 1989; Schein 1996). This mind-set emphasizes teams, culture, and mutual trust between leader and follower which are the methods leaders use to institutionalize their values. Whole Soul (Spiritual) Leadership builds on the ideas of displacing values and maintaining a culture of trust, as it focuses attention on the whole soul nature of both the individual leader and each follower (see Autry 1992; Bolman and Deal 1995; DePree 1989; Fairholm 1997; Vaill 1989). This perspective assumes that people have only one “spirit” defined in terms of the basis of comfort, strength, happiness; the essence of self; the source of personal meaning and values; a personal belief system or inner certainty; and an emotional level of being, and this spirit manifests itself in both our personal and professional lives. The activity of leadership engages individuals at this core level.

The theory suggests these five perspectives are distinct but related hierarchically (more accurately, holarchically) leading to a more accurate and comprehensive conception of leadership. This hierarchy suggests that succeeding perspectives encompass and transcend lower order perspectives and that individuals must move through simpler perspectives before being able to comprehend and engage in leadership activities characterized by more complex perspectives (Fairholm 2004). Within this compilation of leadership perspectives and elements are some that transcend others to a degree as to make the less encompassing elements look less like true leadership. As we move up the model, the distinctive elements of leadership as differentiated from management become more refined.
The Leadership Perspectives Model explains leadership in terms of these encompassing perspectives. The model shows five concentric triangles, the smaller of which is scientific management and the largest of which is whole soul leadership. Thus, in two-dimensions, we are able to see how one perspective can encompass and transcend another perspective. For example, Values Leadership encompasses the ideas of Scientific Management and Excellence Management, but transcends them in ways that help us to see distinct activities and approaches that create a line between management theories of the past and authentic leadership ideas in contemporary literature. Overall, the model points a way not only to understand the phenomenon of leadership better, but also to teach leadership and develop individuals in their leadership activities.

**Discerning Authentic Leadership: The Impact of the LPM and the Four V’s**

The “Four V’s” of leadership is a framework and an analysis tool separate from the five perspectives but related to them. These four constructs (values, vision, vector, and voice) provide a framework to see upon what foundation a person’s leadership perspective is based and whether the perspective fits with contemporary views of what leadership really is. No matter the perspective of leadership one may hold, using the four concepts described below provides a useful framework to understand and apply leadership in organizations. These concepts reveal common elements of organizational activity that help define what is meant by leadership (and to some extent what is meant by management). These ideas are not only a prescription of what leadership involves, but also provide descriptive power as we look at the “leadership” or “management” of others.

Combining the Four V’s with the LPM gives us distinct constructs to be used to analyze leadership qua leadership. The authenticity of a leadership perspective (meaning
is the perspective really reflecting a leadership notion per se or, rather, an idea about management) can be assessed by looking at the Four V’s. For example, in recent training sessions with public managers, a list of values was created for Scientific Management after seeing a video clip that illustrated that LPM perspective. The list of values included ideas like order, efficiency, obedience, discipline, and hard work. The vision of the leader was implicit but effectively put those kinds of values on a journey that would make the objects of the leadership (the followers) conform to those kinds of values as they matured. The vectors were well-spelled out in terms of routine tasks, conformance to standards, accomplishment of objectives and even punishment for lack of accomplishment. When looking at the voluntary nature of the relationship and the extent to which leader and followers had a say in the relationship, it was found that, though the leader had much say in the process and engaged in “power over” (see Follett 1926) others, the followers themselves were quite disenfranchised, subordinated and sometimes even ignored.

On the other extreme of the perspectives hierarchy, a video clip illustrating Whole-soul Leadership yielded different anecdotal responses. The values evident in this perspective were ideas like love, concern for others and for their development, integrity, community, sense of self-worth or pride, service, commitment, and hard work. The vision was one of individual growth through engagement with an organization of integrity that then fosters organizational growth. The vectors included activities and measures that focused on ensuring competence in routine and analytical activities, a constant concern for growth (personal and organizational), explicit example and teaching to reinforce core values, and continual attachment to the followers and stakeholders. The
relationship was one of mutual respect and volition – encouraging participation and freedom of choice and opportunity.

Comparing the two extremes of the perspective model reveals stark differences in the feel of the leadership going on, not to mention difference in vocabulary, action, and emphasis. The first perspective revealed power tactics and relationships typical in discussions of management. In fact, that whole perspective of leadership is in reality a reflection of what is typically called today management. The other perspective fits much more squarely in the realm of authentic leadership ideas, activities, and behaviors, and in fact may reveal new aspects to authentic leadership that we need to consider, such as the impact of one’s spiritual core to the workings of leadership among individuals and within organizations (see also Vaill 1989). Using the Four V’s simply gives us the ability to take different leadership perspectives, different descriptions of leadership, different end results of different models of leadership and determine the richness of the leadership taking place, making judgment as to whether it is really leadership at all.

The ability to make those judgments impacts the work of organizational and personal interaction in powerful ways. People in positions of organizational authority, managers, and those not in positions of authority perform their work guided by their views and perspectives on leadership. Indeed, “managers” and “leaders” in any context benefit from understanding their perspective of leadership, it’s impact on their work and measures of success, and what makes it authentic or not.

**Implications of the Model for the Practice of Public Administration**

Van Wart (2003) aptly demonstrates that public administration as a field has not devoted sufficient scholarly attention to the topic. He describes a dearth of research
focusing on leadership in public administration literature. Only recently have PA theorists entered the leadership literature with an consistency (see Behn, 1998; Sanders, 1998; Terry, 1995). Agreement on what leadership is and whether it should be a part of what public administrators do are, however, still open questions. Questions of accountability (see Finer, 1940; Friedrich, 1940; Gilmour & Jensen, 1998; Malmberg, 1999; Stivers, 1994), the uses and abuses of administrative discretion (see Box, 1999; Frederickson, 1997; Moe, 1997), and the bases for the field’s legitimacy (see McSwite, 1997; Rohr, 1986; Stivers, 1993) often over shadow or reject questions of leadership practiced by public administrators everyday. But doing leadership is something practitioners feel they have been doing all along. Time has come to study the different views of leadership that actual public managers have so that public managers may engage in it with practical and theoretical vigor.

Like managers in any field, the views and perspectives on leadership that public managers have guide their work in public organizations and may reveal important themes inherent in public administration. Their perspectives of leadership impact their implementation of public policy and the shape and culture of public organizations. It determines in large part, their public administrator identity (see Kass & Catron, 1990) – whether they see themselves as neutral technocrats, social reformers, or somewhere in between (or beyond). Understanding the leadership perspectives, then, will help the field overcome its traditional animosity towards “leadership.” It will also help the field acknowledge that leadership is practiced everyday by public managers and their views of it influence how they ply their craft. The impact may be felt in fields other than public administration. Indeed, “managers” and “leaders” in any context benefit from
understanding their perspective of leadership, it’s impact on their work and measures of success, and what makes an authentic or not – this last point being most helpful in developmental terms.

The impact of the Four V’s framework and leadership perspectives, then, is twofold: one theoretical and one practical. Theoretically, the LPM research and the values, vision, vector, voice analysis may give us a reason to rethink what James MacGregor Burns (1978) first offered in terms of transactional and transforming leadership. He seemed reluctant to drop leadership from what we have more recently termed management – the transactional approaches to collective action based on “lower order” values. In every-day usage the management positions and activities of organizations are often deemed leadership, even though distinctions between the two are possible (see Baruch 1998; Kotter 1990; Nirenberg 1998). We may now have a framework to help differentiate inauthentic leadership conceptions from those that align more closely to both transformational and transforming leadership. Figure 3 illustrates one way of linking Burns’ work to the LPM.

Practically, the perspective approach gives us clearer guidance on unique philosophies, tools and behaviors, and approaches to followers that both characterize different leadership perspectives and can be learned, developed, and applied (see Figure 4 for a generic training plan). The Four V’s also provide a way for individuals to evaluate and measure the “leadership” of others as they answer the question, “why do I follow her?” or “why don’t I follow him?” or “why don’t they follow me?” That last question may be the most important as people do leadership. We can now frame the answers to that question in terms of the values at play in the relationship, the integrity and
compelling nature of the vision, the practicality and consistency of the vectors (or mission), and the voluntary, mutually rewarding nature of the relationship between leader and follower. If incongruence is found at any stage, if my values or my sense of direction collide at any point in the analysis, or if the people involved do not act consistently with the talk, we can better see whether the leadership is integrated and authentic or not. In this sense the authenticity of the leader him or herself does impact the authenticity of the leadership at play.

In sum, understanding leadership in terms of the different perspectives people hold and then applying a values, vision, vector, voice framework to analyze those perspectives gives people a concise and powerful way to experience, explain, and engage in leadership qua leadership that is based in the real, but makes possible the ideal.
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Figure 1: The Four V’s of Leadership – A Framework to Discern Authentic Leadership

Values
- An essential element of leadership is developing the ability to grasp and work with the core beliefs and values of oneself and others -- the followers.
- These values trigger behavior.

Vision
- Vision is the articulation of who we are, what we care about, and why we do what we do, and, therefore, what we can become.
- It operationalizes the values.

Vector
- There is purpose and direction to the work of organizational leadership. This is the mission. It is the direction and magnitude of the organization’s work.
- It operationalizes the vision.

Voice
- Voice has three ways of shaping the leadership activity:
  1. it recognizes a leader’s responsibility to articulate purpose,
  2. it recognizes and accepts the contributions (in terms of actions and ideas) of followers, and
  3. It represents the notion that leadership and followership are voluntary activities - leaders and followers must be free to choose to lead and follow.
Figure 2: Leadership Perspectives Model (LPM)

1. Ensure efficient use of resources to ensure group activity is controlled and predictable to ensure verifiably optimal productivity and resource allocation.

2. Foster continuous process improvement environment for increased service and productivity levels to transform the environment and perceptions of followers to encourage innovation, high quality products, and excellent services.

3. Help individual contribute to group action based on shared values and agreed upon goals to encourage high organizational performance and self-led followers.

4. Ensure cultures conducive to mutual trust and unified collective action consistent with the prioritization of mutual cultural values and organizational conduct in terms of those values.

5. Relate to individuals such that concern for the whole person is paramount in raising each other to higher levels of awareness and action so that the best in people is liberated in a context of continuous improvement of self, culture, and service delivery.

Implementation Descriptions

Whole-Soul (Spiritual) Leadership

Trust Cultural Leadership

Values Leadership

Excellence Management

Scientific Management

Approaches to Followers

Tools and Behaviors

1. Incentivization
2. Control
3. Direction

4. Motivation
5. Engaging people in problem definition and solution
6. Expressing common courtesy/respect

7. Values
8. Prioritization
9. Empowering (fostering ownership)

10. Trust
11. Team Building
12. Fostering a shared culture

13. Inspiration
14. Liberating followers to build community and promote stewardship
15. Modeling a service orientation

1. Measuring/appraising/rewarding individual performance
2. Organizing
3. Planning

4. Focusing on process improvement
5. Listening actively
6. Being accessible

7. Setting and enforcing values
8. Visioning
9. Focusing communication around the vision

10. Creating and maintaining culture through visioning
11. Sharing governance
12. Measuring/appraising/rewarding group performance

13. Developing & enabling individual wholeness in a community (team) context
14. Fostering an intelligent organization
15. Setting moral standards
Figure 3: Links Between Leadership Research Past, Present, and Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burns’s Dichotomy (The Past)</th>
<th>Current Literature Distinction (The Present)</th>
<th>Leadership Perspectives (The Future)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>Management Technology</td>
<td>Scientific Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bridge – elements of transactional and transformational leadership (or management and leadership)</em></td>
<td>Excellence Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership Technology</td>
<td>Values Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trust Cultural Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whole-Soul Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Generic Leadership Training Program for Public Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>Implementation Description—What leadership looks like</td>
<td>Implementation Description—What leadership looks like</td>
<td>Implementation Description—What leadership looks like</td>
<td>Implementation Description—What leadership looks like</td>
<td>Implementation Description—What leadership looks like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills Development</strong></td>
<td>• Measuring/appraising/rewarding individual performance</td>
<td>• Focusing on process improvement</td>
<td>• Setting and enforcing values</td>
<td>• Creating and maintaining culture through visioning</td>
<td>• Developing and enabling individual wholeness in a community (team) context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizing (to include such things as budgeting, staffing)</td>
<td>• Listening actively</td>
<td>• Visioning</td>
<td>• Sharing governance</td>
<td>• Fostering an intelligent organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning (to include such things as coordination and reporting)</td>
<td>• Being accessible (to include such things as managing by walking around, open door policies)</td>
<td>• Focusing communication around the vision</td>
<td>• Measuring/appraising/rewarding group performance</td>
<td>• Setting moral standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follower Relationship Concepts</strong></td>
<td>• Incentivization</td>
<td>• Motivation</td>
<td>• Values Prioritization</td>
<td>• Trust</td>
<td>• Inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Control</td>
<td>• Engaging people in problem definition and solution</td>
<td>• Teaching/Coaching</td>
<td>• Team-building</td>
<td>• Liberating followers to build community and promote stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Direction</td>
<td>• Expressing common courtesy/respect</td>
<td>• Empowering (fostering ownership)</td>
<td>• Fostering a shared culture</td>
<td>• Modeling a service orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>Public Administration Practice – Each day discuss what this leadership perspective tells me about my work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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