

Reviewing Leadership Styles: Overlaps and the Need for a New ‘Full-Range’ Theory

Marc H. Anderson and Peter Y. T. Sun¹

Department of Management, College of Business, Iowa State University, 2350 Gerdin Business Building, Ames, IA

50011-1350, USA ¹Centre for Enterprise & Leadership, Waikato Management School, University of Waikato, Hamilton 3240, New Zealand

Corresponding author email: mha@iastate.edu

A central topic in leadership research concerns the impact of leadership style – the pattern of attitudes that leaders hold and behaviors they exhibit. Since the year 2000, several new leadership styles have been proposed to capture important missing aspects beyond the dominant charismatic/transformational and transactional framework. The authors review the emerging literature on these new styles – ideological leadership, pragmatic leadership, authentic leadership, ethical leadership, spiritual leadership, distributed leadership, and integrative public leadership – as well as the recent work on servant leadership. They also comment on the Ohio State studies on leadership, and then discuss the ways in which these many styles overlap with transformational leadership and each other, and issue a call to leadership researchers to collectively develop a new ‘full-range’ model of leadership that encompasses and distills what is unique about these various styles. The authors argue that such an integrated full-range model is necessary for research on leadership style to progress.

Introduction



Suddaby (2010) stressed the need for construct clarity in management research and the need to ‘create precise and parsimonious categorical distinctions between concepts’ and to ‘show their semantic relationship to other related constructs’ (Suddaby 2010, p. 347). Nowhere is this need more apparent than in the burgeoning literature on leadership styles.

The ‘dominant conceptualization of leadership in organizational behavior’ is the charismatic/transformational style (Judge *et al.* 2008, p. 335), a style often contrasted with a transactional style. Our examination of the abstracts¹

of articles concerning leadership over the period 2000–2014 found that a staggering 22.7% (275 of 1212 articles) addressed transformational leadership. Research since 2000 has examined a bewildering number of other leadership styles, including shared/distributed (37 mentions), authentic (34), ethical (29), initiating structure and consideration (24), integrative public (15), spiritual (15), pragmatic/ideological (14) and servant (12).

Other adjectives used by researchers to modify the noun ‘leadership’ to describe styles of leadership include: empowering,² responsible, directive,

Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Administration Science Quarterly, and Organization Science.

²In reviewing the overlaps of the leadership styles, we have omitted certain styles of leadership, such as empowering and responsible leadership. As can be appreciated, it is difficult to consider all the many styles in a single manuscript. Empowering leadership is defined as ‘leader behaviors directed at individuals or entire teams and consisting of delegating

¹These abstracts came from the following journals: *The Leadership Quarterly*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Organizational*



self-sacrificial, Pygmalion, paternalistic, heroic, despotic, egotistical, altruistic, relational, e-leadership and functional. Even the list presented thus far is not exhaustive, as still other terms are used in such a way that it is unclear whether they are describing leadership styles or merely contexts where leadership is required: project leadership, cross-cultural leadership, global leadership, female leadership and political leadership. We confine this review to the most frequently studied newer styles – ideological, pragmatic, servant, authentic, ethical, spiritual, integrative public and shared/distributed – and comment on the classic consideration and initiating structure styles. We also briefly review the most widely researched transformational, charismatic and transactional leadership styles.³

Although there are reviews of several of these leadership styles individually (e.g. charismatic/transformational – van Knippenberg and Sitkin (2013); authentic – Gardner *et al.* (2011); servant – van Dierendonck (2011)), this review differs by examining each of these nine styles, including an examination of the dominant transformational/transactional paradigm, which then sets the stage for discussing the hugely important question of whether and how these styles differ from each other. This leads us to

 authority to employees, promoting their self-directed and autonomous decision making, coaching, sharing of information, and asking for input' (Sharma and Kirkman 2015, p. 194). Arnold *et al.* (2000) reported correlations between the dimensions of empowering leadership (i.e. leading by example, coaching, participatory decision making, informing, and showing concern) and initiating structure and consideration that were all high and significant (the minimum value was 0.62, and all correlations were significant at $p=0.001$). We direct readers to the recent review of empowering leadership by Sharma and Kirkman (2015), who note overlaps that it has with transformational leadership, though they argue that transformational leaders may not necessarily transfer control and power to followers, which is central to empowering leadership. We do not review responsible leadership in this paper because the bulk of the literature on this style is found in one recent issue of the *Academy of Management Perspectives* (August 2014), and this falls outside the journals reviewed. We believe it is premature to assess whether this leadership style is simply 'good' leadership that is seen across all other leadership styles, or is unique and transcends the styles we discussed. We note, however, that Waldman and Balven (2014, pp. 231–232) mention the conceptual overlap between responsible leadership and the transformational, ethical and servant leadership styles.

³We do not examine leader-member exchange (LMX) theory, as this is not a style of leadership, but rather a concept that describes the strength and the type of relationship between leader and follower.

conclude in the Discussion section that it is time for a new 'full-range' conceptualization of leadership style that encompasses what is distinctive about these newer styles, in order to bring some integration to the chaos that characterizes the existing literature on leadership styles. We begin with a brief review of charismatic/transformational leadership style.

Charismatic and transformational leadership

Charismatic leadership

The first models of charismatic leadership styles appeared in the late-1970s (see Conger 1999, for a history). Charismatic leadership is characterized by leaders who articulate an inspirational vision of a desirable future that motivates followers to sacrifice their self-interests and devote exceptional effort to the causes advocated by the leader. Studies by Conger and Kanungo (1994) support a five-factor model consisting of being sensitive to constraints, threats and opportunities in the external environment, articulating an appealing strategic vision, taking personal risks, exhibiting unconventional behavior, and being sensitive to follower needs. House (1977) and House and Podsakoff (1994) argue that charismatic leaders exude passion and self-confidence, engage in self-sacrificial behavior and promote a collective identity, role model desirable behavior, establish high expectations for followers and express confidence that followers can achieve them. These behaviors help explain the inspirational influence on followers that charismatic leaders have. They are seen by their followers as having extraordinary abilities and qualities. Their personal magnetism and visionary appeals cause followers to identify personally with their leaders, and internalize their leaders' goals, values and beliefs, resulting in followers desiring to emulate their leaders (House 1977).

A crucial question is how morality factors into charismatic leadership. Many are disturbed by the fact that some charismatic leaders engage in unethical behavior – what scholars have termed the 'dark side' of charisma. Such concerns are addressed in what has become the most influential distinction between types of charismatic leaders: socialized vs personalized (Howell and Shamir 2005). Socialized charismatic leaders transcend their own self-interests, empowering and developing their followers and articulating visions that serve the collective

(Conger 1999). Personalized charismatic leaders are self-seeking and manipulate followers to achieve their own interests. They are authoritative narcissists, and their high need for power is partly driven by their low self-esteem (Conger 1999).

Social charismatic leadership is said to reduce organizational and work group deviance, and this relationship is partially mediated by the value congruence between leaders and followers (Brown and Treviño 2006). Such leaders are perceived to be effective (Fuller *et al.* 1996; Sosik 2005); followers show greater satisfaction with such leaders (Fuller *et al.* 1996); and this style results in follower's giving extra effort and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) (Sosik 2005). Leader performance moderates the relationship between charismatic leadership and OCB and follower extra effort; the relationship is stronger for high-performing than low-performing charismatic leaders (Sosik 2005). DeGroot *et al.* (2000) found that charismatic leadership is more effective at increasing group than individual performance.

Transformational leadership

Bass (1985) built on Burns' (1978) description of 'transforming leadership' and developed a model of transformational leadership that encompasses four dimensions:

1. *Charisma*, which Bass termed 'idealized influence', represents 'the degree to which the leader behaves in admirable ways that cause followers to identify with the leader' (Judge and Piccolo 2004, p. 755).
2. *Inspirational motivation* is 'the degree to which the leader articulates a vision that is appealing and inspiring to followers' and 'challenge followers with high standards, communicate optimism about future goal attainment, and provide meaning for the task at hand' (Judge and Piccolo 2004, p. 755).
3. *Intellectual stimulation* is 'the degree to which the leader challenges assumptions, takes risks, and solicits followers' ideas' and how much they 'stimulate and encourage creativity in their followers' (Judge and Piccolo 2004, p. 755).
4. *Individualized consideration* is 'the degree to which the leader attends to each follower's needs, acts as a mentor or coach to the follower, and listens to the follower's concerns and needs' (Judge and Piccolo 2004, p. 755).

Other models with somewhat distinctive elements are those by Podsakoff *et al.* (1990) and Rafferty and Griffin (2004).

An important question is whether charismatic leadership and transformational leadership are distinct styles. Most researchers appear to concur with Fiol *et al.* (1999), who said: 'the similarities among these theories are, in our opinion, far greater than their differences' (Fiol *et al.* 1999, p. 451). Recent reviews have combined studies of charismatic and transformational leadership (Judge and Piccolo 2004; van Knippenberg and Sitkin 2013; Walter and Bruch 2009), arguing that 'the findings from studies of charismatic, transformational, and visionary leadership generally converge' (Walter and Bruch 2009, p. 1428). Recent empirical comparisons of the dominant measures of transformational and charismatic leadership found that transformational leadership as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and charismatic leadership as measured by the Conger–Kanungo Scale (CKS; Conger and Kanungo 1994) were significantly correlated at $r = 0.88$ (Rowold and Heintz 2007). In light of the virtual consensus by scholars, and this empirical evidence of their extremely high intercorrelations, we believe it is time for scholars to abandon the distinction between charismatic and transformational leadership.

A very similar distinction to the socialized/personalized distinction in charismatic leadership is the distinction between pseudo- and authentic transformational leadership (Bass and Steidlmeier 1999). The essence of the distinction is that authentic transformational leadership rests on 'a moral foundation of legitimate values' (Bass and Steidlmeier 1999, p. 184). Such an ethical foundation is essential to the charismatic/transformational leader's vision (Rowold and Heintz 2007).

The meta-analysis by Wang *et al.* (2011) shows the importance of transformational leadership. It found transformational leadership to be strongly related to followers' job satisfaction, satisfaction with the leader, motivation, organizational commitment and effort, three types of job performance (task, contextual and creative), as well as team and organizational performance. Other studies have shown that transformational leadership is related to leader effectiveness (DeRue *et al.* 2011; Judge and Piccolo 2004; Piccolo *et al.* 2012), followers' commitment to change (Herold *et al.* 2008), OCB (Podsakoff *et al.* 1990) and work engagement (van Dierendonck *et al.* 2014).

Studies have pointed to several mediating variables. Cognitive-based trust, team potency (Schaubroeck

et al. 2011) and team cohesion (Bass *et al.* 2003) partially mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and team performance; affect- and cognitive-based trust mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and employee helping behavior (Zhu and Akhtar 2014); psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and employee task-performance and OCB (Dust *et al.* 2013); and leadership effectiveness mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment (van Dierendonck *et al.* 2014).

Evidence suggests that transformational leadership may be more effective in government organizations vs industrial organizations (Mumford and Van Doorn 2001), organic vs mechanistic organizations (Dust *et al.* 2013), and that it has stronger motivational effects when followers have contact with people who are affected by their work (e.g. clients and customers) (Grant 2012). Also, there is evidence that females show higher levels of transformational leadership than males do (Eagly *et al.* 2003). Most empirical studies on transformational leadership are survey-based, with the MLQ being the most widely used measure, while the second most commonly used measure is the Transformational Leadership Inventory (Podsakoff *et al.* 1990).

Transactional leadership

Bass's (1985) 'full-range' model of leadership conceptualized transactional leadership as consisting of three dimensions: contingent reward and two forms of management by exception (MBE). Contingent reward is 'the degree to which the leader sets up constructive transactions or exchanges with followers: the leader clarifies expectations and establishes the rewards for meeting these expectations' (Judge and Piccolo 2004, p. 755). Management by exception 'is the degree to which the leader takes corrective action on the basis of results of leader–follower transactions' (Judge and Piccolo 2004, p. 755), and it takes two forms (active and passive). 'Active leaders monitor follower behavior, anticipate problems, and take corrective actions before the behavior creates serious difficulties. Passive leaders wait until the behavior has caused problems before taking action' (Judge and Piccolo 2004, p. 756).

The most important refinement to transactional leadership is Goodwin *et al.*'s (2001) finding that the MLQ measure of contingent reward consists of

two separate factors: 'explicit psychological contract' and 'implicit psychological contract'. The implicit psychological contract is more closely associated with transformational leadership behaviors (Goodwin *et al.* 2001), supporting the argument that contingent reward behavior should be merged with the dimensions of transformational leadership (Judge and Piccolo 2004). Subsequent work by Hinkin and Schriesheim (2008) confirmed the multidimensionality of contingent reward.

A meta-analysis by Podsakoff *et al.* (2006) further distinguished between contingent reward, contingent punishment, non-contingent reward and non-contingent punishment. This work showed that both contingent reward and non-contingent punishment were strongly related to a large range of follower outcomes (including task and overall performance, several types of satisfaction, and commitment), with effects due to increasing perceptions of fairness and reducing role ambiguity. Research on the two MBE dimensions is rare, but the meta-analysis by Wang *et al.* (2011) reported that MBE-passive was more strongly related to organization-level performance (negatively) than was contingent reward, and they found strong negative relationships between MBE-active and individual contextual performance and team-level performance.

Other studies have shown that transactional leadership (i.e. contingent reward and MBE-active) is related to team performance (Bass *et al.* 2003), the ethics of justice (Simola *et al.* 2010) and employee creativity (Herrmann and Felfe 2014). Contingent reward is related to follower job satisfaction, follower satisfaction with the leader, leadership effectiveness (Judge and Piccolo 2004), and commitment to change (Kool and van Dierendonck 2012). The relationship between contingent reward and commitment to change is mediated by justice (interpersonal and informational) and optimism (Kool and van Dierendonck 2012).

Initiating structure and consideration

It is worth commenting on the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and two styles with a much older history: the 'initiating structure' and 'consideration' styles that originated from the Ohio State studies in the 1950s and 1960s. Initiating structure is role related and captures behaviors surrounding the way leaders organize their roles and the roles of their followers. These behaviors focus on

goal attainment through the proper management of tasks. Consideration is people related, and involves developing relationships and mutual trust with followers. It seeks to enhance the self-efficacy of followers in their ability to complete assignments and tasks effectively.

There is ongoing debate regarding the overlap of these two types of behaviors with transformational and transactional leadership, though empirical studies show that estimates of the criterion-related validity of the two models are similar (Judge and Piccolo 2004; Judge *et al.* 2004a). Piccolo *et al.* (2012) report the results of a meta-analysis that found that transformational leadership was related to consideration at a very high level of $\rho = 0.74$ and to initiating structure at $\rho = 0.50$. Another empirical study shows that transformational leadership adds to initiating structure and consideration when explaining followers' satisfaction with the leader and leader effectiveness (Seltzer and Bass 1990).

Empirical studies show that initiating structure and consideration are related to leadership effectiveness, team performance and satisfaction with the leader (DeRue *et al.* 2011; Piccolo *et al.* 2012). Neubert *et al.* (2008) show that initiating structure is negatively related to follower deviant behaviors, mediated by regulatory focus. Another study shows that initiating structure is a better predictor of technical quality in development projects than in research projects (Keller 2006). The similarities between these and the dominant transformational leadership style suggest that future research is needed to clarify whether they can be largely subsumed under a more comprehensive taxonomy of leadership styles.

Ideological and pragmatic leadership

Studies have found that charisma is not essential to successful leadership (Pasternack and O'Toole 2002; Yukl 1999), and that other qualities may be more crucial (Khurana 2002). Work on the CIP (charismatic, ideological, pragmatic) model of leadership has argued that *ideological* and *pragmatic* leadership styles are alternatives to charismatic/transformational leadership that can also lead to outstanding leadership.

Ideological leadership was developed as a distinct style in Strange and Mumford's (2002) historiometric analysis of 60 historic leaders. Since then, several publications by Mumford and co-authors have emerged. This work argues that there are two distinct types of vision. Whereas the charismatic

leader's vision is future-oriented and stresses social needs and required changes to bring about a desired future, the ideological leader's vision emphasizes 'personal values, standards to be maintained, and the derivation of meaning through adherence to these standards' (Strange and Mumford 2002, p. 346).

The seminal statement articulating pragmatic leadership is a case study by Mumford and Van Doorn (2001) analyzing ten leadership episodes of Benjamin Franklin, including his efforts to start the University of Pennsylvania and establish a paper currency. In each of these cases, Franklin's success came not from charismatic vision, but instead from a more functional and problem-centered leadership approach, which they labeled pragmatic leadership. This style is characterized by knowledge of practical, day-to-day problems that people and organizations face and a focus on identifying cost-effective solutions that address functional needs. It involves motivating others through appeals to their self-interest and by showing how proposed solutions will effectively realize shared goals. This pragmatic leadership style requires a deep knowledge of the social fabric of the relevant parties who have a stake in the problems and the economic and technical issues associated with problems and their solutions. Its problem-solving approach is believed to require a greater degree of intelligence, critical thinking, judgment, wisdom and expertise. More recently, Antonakis and House (2014) extended transformational and transactional leadership theory by adding on a set of behaviors that they refer to as instrumental leadership (and which they explicitly equate to pragmatic leadership).

The theoretical underpinning of the differentiation between charismatic, ideological and pragmatic leadership is a sensemaking model (Mumford 2006) of how leaders respond to crises (Hunter *et al.* 2009). Charismatic leaders resolve crises by articulating an inspiring future-oriented vision and role-modeling self-sacrificial behavior (Mumford *et al.* 2008). Ideological leaders resolve crises by also articulating an inspiring vision, but one rooted in strong personal and social values that they share with followers and a desire to return to a glorious past rather than an idealized future vision of what could be (Mumford *et al.* 2008). In contrast to vision-based approaches to resolving crises, pragmatic leaders focus on a deep examination of the causes responsible for the current crisis, and articulate achievable goals based on the objective threats and opportunities present in the situation at hand (Mumford *et al.* 2008).

Mumford and colleagues argue that the distinction made between charismatic leaders who have a socialized orientation vs those with a personalized orientation also applies to ideological and pragmatic leaders (Mumford 2006; Strange and Mumford 2002). Socialized charismatic, ideological and pragmatic leaders are ‘those who initiated action for the betterment of society, or institutions, regardless of personal consequences’, while personalized leaders are ‘those who initiated action to acquire, maintain, and extend power . . . regardless of the consequences of their actions for others or social institutions’ (Strange and Mumford 2002, p. 348).

A study done by Bedell-Avers *et al.* (2009) shows that pragmatic leaders were the most flexible and able to work with other leader types when it came to problem solving, while charismatic and ideological leaders conflicted with other leader types. However, this study found that pragmatic leaders were the most Machiavellian of the three types. Ligon *et al.* (2008) conducted a historiometric study of biographies of 120 leaders that examined the frequency of six types of life events that may have shaped the leaders’ different styles. They found that ideological leaders had a higher proportion of anchoring events that ‘provided an instantiated foundation for a belief system’, charismatic leaders had more turning point events – ‘concrete episodes that suddenly revise a life direction [and] . . . become tied to future goals and motivate life actions’, and pragmatic leaders had more originating events – ‘experiences that mark the beginning of a career path, [and] come to be tied to long-term goals and to an implicit plan of action for meeting those goals’ (Ligon *et al.* 2008, p. 315). The authors also coded the events and found that ‘socialized leaders were exposed to life events that would build an ethical dedication to others’ (Ligon *et al.* 2008, p. 325).

In terms of methodology, the existing empirical literature on ideological and pragmatic leadership (and the CIP model, which also encompasses charismatic leadership) has primarily used the historiometric method, which involves coding chapters from biographies of leaders to identify the frequency of various characteristics, and then using discriminant analyses to identify characteristics that differ among leaders categorized by type (charismatic, ideological or pragmatic leadership) and orientation (socialized vs personalized). Other methods include experiments (using university students) and a computer simulation. At present, there is no survey instrument to measure ideological leadership. Once one is created, we

believe that it will probably spur further research that differentiates these styles.

Servant leadership

Servant leadership is a style that focuses on the growth of those who are being simultaneously led and served (Stone *et al.* 2004). Servant leaders begin with the natural feeling of serving first, to ensure that others’ ‘highest priority needs are served first’ (Greenleaf 1970, p. 4). Spears (2002) elicited ten servant leadership characteristics from Greenleaf’s writings. This rejuvenated scholarly interest in this style of leadership, producing a number of studies that define and measure its dimensions differently (e.g. Barbuto and Wheeler 2006; Liden *et al.* 2008; Sendjaya *et al.* 2008; van Dierendonck and Nuitjen 2011).

Studies that have developed measures for servant leadership have elicited 43 overlapping dimensions. We argue that these dimensions can be synthesized into 12 more conceptually distinct dimensions:

1. *Altruistic calling* is the leaders’ deep-rooted desire and spiritual purpose to make a positive difference in others’ lives through service (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006).
2. *Persuasive mapping* describes the extent to which leaders uses sound reasoning and mental frameworks to map issues and conceptualize greater possibilities for the future (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006; Liden *et al.* 2008).
3. *Courage* is the ability to see things differently and taking risks with new ways to deal with old problems (van Dierendonck and Nuitjen 2011).
4. *Agapao love* is moral (Dennis and Bocarnea 2005), unconditional and considers the whole person rather than treating them as means to an end (Russell and Stone 2002).
5. *Emotional healing* can help in the spiritual recovery from hardship and trauma when individuals’ dreams, aspirations, hopes and relationships are broken (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006).
6. *Forgiveness* is the ability to let go of perceived wrongdoings and not carry past grudges to other situations (van Dierendonck and Nuitjen 2011).
7. *Humility* is the understanding of one’s own strengths and weaknesses, i.e. putting one’s strengths in proper perspective (Dennis and Bocarnea 2005).
8. A *covenantal relationship* is developed by accepting individuals as they are, engaging with

- them as equal partners, and displaying open-ended communication and trust (Sendjaya *et al.* 2008).
9. *Behaving ethically* means holding oneself to high moral standards and always acting with moral integrity (Liden *et al.* 2008; Sendjaya *et al.* 2008).
 10. *Authenticity* is being true to self, accurately reflecting both public and private selves (van Dierendonck and Nuitjen 2011).
 11. *Creating value for the community* is the extent to which leaders prepare an organization to make a positive contribution to society (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006; Liden *et al.* 2008).
 12. *Accountability* is holding followers accountable to deliver on what they can control (van Dierendonck and Nuitjen 2011).

Empirical studies typically use composite measures of servant leadership, with most using Liden *et al.*'s (2008) measure. Composite servant leadership has been found to influence team performance positively (Hu and Liden 2011; Irving and Longbotham 2007; Schaubroeck *et al.* 2011), mediated by affective-based trust and team psychological safety (Schaubroeck *et al.* 2011). Servant leadership enhances team members' beliefs about their collective ability (i.e. team potency) and strengthens clarity around team goals and processes (Hu and Liden 2011). It creates a perception of organizational justice and enhances followers' need satisfaction, which improves their job satisfaction and work engagement (Mayer *et al.* 2008; van Dierendonck *et al.* 2014). Servant leadership enhances team service climate (Liden *et al.* 2014), which decreases follower turnover intentions (Liden *et al.* 2014) and promotes helping behaviors (Liden *et al.* 2014; Neubert *et al.* 2008). This style also evokes a promotion focus in employees, resulting in helping and creative behaviors in the organization (Neubert *et al.* 2008). Servant leaders reduce followers' emotional exhaustion and enhance their personal learning, and this goes beyond organizational boundaries to reduce work-to-family conflict and enhance work-to-family positive spillover (Tang *et al.* 2015). At the firm level, servant leadership positively influences firm performance (Peterson *et al.* 2012). Few empirical studies have examined the separate servant leadership dimensions (exceptions are Sendjaya and Pekerti 2010; Pekerti and Sendjaya 2010). Pekerti and Sendjaya (2010) found that Australian and Indonesian cultures emphasized different servant leadership dimensions.

Authentic leadership

Leaders, especially personalized charismatic leaders, sometimes use impression management tactics to mislead followers about their abilities, intentions and the benefits of their visions (Conger 1999; Gardner and Avolio 1998). Scholars and practitioners alike are increasingly seeing such inauthentic behavior as problematic.

Authentic leadership is 'a pattern of leader behavior that draws on and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development' (Walumbwa *et al.* 2008, p. 94).⁴ The majority of work published on authentic leadership has been theoretical and definitional, but empirical research is growing due to two validated and theory-based measures: the 16-item Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) by Walumbwa *et al.* (2008) and the 14-item Authentic Leadership Inventory (ALI) by Neider and Schriesheim (2011).

The ALQ and ALI are both based on a four-dimensional model that includes:

1. *self-awareness*, which is 'showing an understanding of one's strengths and weaknesses and the multifaceted nature of the self, which includes gaining insight into the self through exposure to others, and being cognizant of one's impact on other people'
2. *relational transparency*, which is 'presenting one's authentic self (as opposed to a fake or distorted self)'
3. *balanced processing*, which is the extent to which leaders 'show that they objectively analyze all relevant data before coming to a decision [and] ... solicit views that challenge their deeply held positions'
4. *internalized moral perspective*, which 'refers to an internalized and integrated form of self-regulation ... [that] is guided by internal moral standards and values versus group, organizational, and societal pressures' (Walumbwa *et al.* 2008, pp. 95–96).

An unresolved question is whether ethics should be an inherent part of authentic leadership. Gardner *et al.* (2011) noted that there is an 'explicit inclusion of an

⁴We note that six articles co-authored by Fred Walumbwa have been retracted and are thus not cited in our review.

ethical component in most conceptions of authentic leadership' (Gardner *et al.* 2011, p. 1130). Others argue that authenticity is not intrinsically ethical (Algera and Lips-Wiersma 2012; Cooper *et al.* 2005). Walumbwa *et al.* (2008) explicitly state that their incorporation of ethics means that it automatically excludes narcissistic leaders, but Sparrowe (2005) argues that 'because 'to thine own self be true' looks inward before recognizing others, its basic orientation is narcissism' (p. 424). More fundamentally, the authentic leadership literature does not recognize the complexities of determining what is and is not ethical behavior, or how ethical standards are relative to historical and localized norms (Donaldson and Dunfee 1994).

One paradox in the authentic leadership literature concerns leaders' relationships with their followers. Walumbwa *et al.* (2008, p. 105) note that 'a core prediction of authentic leadership theory is that the leaders' espoused values/beliefs and actions become aligned over time and across varying situational challenges', and suggests that because of authentic leaders' transparency, their followers would adopt their values. But this ignores the fact that followers may have beliefs and values different from those of their leaders, and encouraging followers to be authentic to their own values and beliefs suggests a possible increase in value divergence rather than convergence (Algera and Lips-Wiersma 2012).

The empirical research on antecedents and outcomes of authentic leadership is just beginning. Jensen and Luthans (2006) found that the positive organizational behavior 'states of optimism, resiliency, and hope and the overall measure of Psychological capital (PsyCap) were positively related to' authentic leadership (Gardner *et al.* 2011, p. 1138). Few studies have linked authentic leadership to outcomes. Sometimes, these studies control for other leadership styles (most importantly, transformational leadership), but sometimes they do not. As part of their scale development efforts, Walumbwa *et al.* (2008) found relationships between authentic leadership and OCBs, organizational commitment and follower satisfaction with supervisors, after controlling for transformational leadership (in one study) or ethical leadership (in another study), but did not control for transformational leadership or ethical leadership in their Study 3, which found authentic leadership to be related to follower job performance and satisfaction. Wang *et al.* (2013) found that authentic leadership positively influences follower performance, with the effect being mediated by LMX. In addition, this

relationship was stronger for followers with low PsyCap. However, this study did not control for transformational leadership. At the firm level, Hmieleski *et al.* (2012) found that shared authentic leadership of top management teams increases positive affective tone, and this positively influences firm performance. Gill and Caza (2015) found that authentic leadership has positive associations with various follower outcomes (such as identification with the leader, leader trustworthiness, positive follower states and positive social exchanges) via direct effects on followers and indirect effects through leadership among followers' co-workers. However, this study also did not control for transformational leadership.

Ethical leadership

Although consideration of ethics within leadership has been recognized in the organizational literature, Brown *et al.* (2005) theorized ethical leadership as a distinct style by drawing on social learning theory. Ethical leadership is defined as 'the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making' (Brown and Treviño 2006, p. 595). Essentially, an ethical leader is: (1) a moral person – one seen to be fair, honest, trustworthy and a principled decision-maker; (2) a moral role model – one who practices what he or she preaches, and is seen to be an attractive role model (Brown *et al.* 2005; Mayer *et al.* 2009); and (3) a moral manager – one who makes ethics an explicit part of his or her leadership agenda and uses rewards to hold followers accountable for ethical behavior. This transactional approach in managing ethical behavior is argued to differentiate it from transformational leadership (Brown and Treviño 2006).

The above conceptualization has been criticized as being vague, as their argument for the 'demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct' does not specify what constitutes normative ethical behaviors (Eisenbeiss 2012) and is overly Western in perspective. Taking both a Western and an Eastern moral philosophical approach, Eisenbeiss (2012) argues that ethical leadership has (1) a humane orientation (i.e. treating others with dignity and respect and seeing others as ends and not simply means), (2) a justice orientation (i.e. making decisions that are consistent, fair and without discrimination), (3) a responsibility and



sustainability orientation (i.e. concern for welfare of society and environment and taking a long-term view of issues), and (4) a moderation orientation (i.e. showing temperance and humility). Such ethical leaders are expected to have strong moral identities (Eisenbeiss 2012), and empirical results support this (Mayer *et al.* 2012).

Most empirical studies of ethical leadership are survey-based and use the composite 10-item measure developed by Brown *et al.* (2005). Kalshoven *et al.* (2011) developed a seven-factor measure that includes: (1) people orientation; (2) fairness; (3) power sharing; (4) concerns for sustainability; (5) ethical guidance; (6) role clarification; and (7) integrity. In our view, these seven factors appear to be general leader behaviors that are linked to effective leadership.

Using the composite measure developed by Brown *et al.* (2005), ethical leadership has been found to influence the behavior and performance of individuals, groups and the organization. At the individual level, ethical leadership is related to subordinate job performance (i.e. task performance and OCB), fully mediated by task significance and effort (Piccolo *et al.* 2010). Ethical leadership is also positively related to followers willing to report problems to management, and to put in extra effort (Brown *et al.* 2005). This style of leadership is also related to person- and task-focused citizenship behaviors (Kacmar *et al.* 2011). However, gender and perceptions of organizational politics moderate the relationship, such that for male followers the perception of ethical leadership is stronger under high perception of politics, whereas for female followers it is stronger under low perception of politics (Kacmar *et al.* 2011). Ethical leadership has also been found to be related to employee voice behavior, a finding partially mediated by psychological safety (Walumbwa and Schaubroeck 2009).

At the group level, ethical leadership has been found to be negatively associated with group-level deviance behavior and positively associated with group-level OCB (Mayer *et al.* 2009), negatively associated with unit-level unethical behavior and unit-level relationship conflict (Mayer *et al.* 2012), and positively associated with group conscientiousness. At the organizational level, ethical leadership is argued to reduce business costs (Thomas *et al.* 2004). However, one concern is that only the idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership is used as a control variable in these empirical studies.

Spiritual leadership

Spiritual leadership is defined as ‘comprising the values, attitudes, and behaviors that are necessary to intrinsically motivate one’s self and others so that they have a sense of spiritual survival through calling and membership’ (Fry 2003, pp. 694–695). Meaningful work that fulfills life’s purpose instills a sense of calling. ‘Membership’ is when one is understood and appreciated and this provides a sense of belonging to the organization. The combination of ‘calling’ and ‘membership’ enables one to survive spiritually within the organization and enhances one’s spiritual well-being (Fry 2003).

Spiritual leadership theory suggests that leaders’ values, attitudes and behaviors create a spiritual environment that helps followers thrive (Fry 2003; Reave 2005). Leaders’ altruistic love and a compelling spiritually grounded vision are the key dimensions of spiritual leadership that enhance spiritual well-being in the organization (Ferguson and Milliman 2008). Altruistic love is the leader’s care and concern for others, with an emphasis on their growth and development. Leaders therefore create a warm and caring environment, which increases the intrinsic motivation of followers to expend effort. An empirical study found that altruistic love demonstrated by spiritual leadership positively influenced followers’ faith in the organization’s leadership (Fry *et al.* 2005). Followers trust that leaders have their best interest at heart and are therefore intrinsically motivated to expend effort.

Vision in the spiritual leadership model gives intrinsic meaning and purpose to life (Chen and Yang 2012) and is spiritually grounded (Fairholm 1997). This gives individuals working for the organization a sense of purpose beyond simply making money (Ferguson and Milliman 2008). What keeps the vision alive is the hope instilled by spiritual leaders. Leaders display confidence that the spiritually grounded vision is achievable and they are able to inspire employees with confidence in the vision (Chen and Yang 2012).

Scholars disagree about the level of analysis of spiritual leadership theory (Phipps 2012), with some claiming it to be an individual-level phenomenon (Ashforth and Pratt 2003) and others an organizational-level one (Mitroff and Denton 1999). The scale items in Fry *et al.* (2005) reflect an organizational value system created by the leaders’ attitudes, values and behaviors (e.g. ‘my organization really cares about its people’). The individual behavior of



the leaders and how it creates a culture of spirituality is less understood (van Dierendonck 2011).

Empirical work on spiritual leadership is sparse, with most focusing on validating Fry's (2003) theoretical framework. Spiritual leadership theory, as suggested by Fry (2003), is a causal theoretical framework where the actions, values, attitudes, and behaviors of leaders create a core value system within the organization. The core values of altruistic love and a spiritually grounded vision result in a sense of 'calling' and 'membership'. This 'calling' and 'membership' influence individuals' commitment to the organization and their productivity. The model is firmly embedded in intrinsic motivation-based theories.

Fry (2003) tested his causal framework of spiritual leadership using soldiers in the US Army (see Fry *et al.* 2005). Chen and Yang (2012) examined Fry's (2003) model within the finance and retail industries in Taiwan, and found support. The effect size was stronger for the retail industry, suggesting that industry context can alter the impact of spiritual leadership.

Integrative public leadership

Integrative public leadership is defined as leadership necessary to bring 'diverse groups and organizations together in semi-permanent ways, and typically across sector boundaries, to remedy complex public problems and achieve the common good' (Crosby and Bryson 2010, p. 211). It is seen primarily in the domain of multi-sector collaboration (Morse 2010), and operates in contexts where there are no hierarchical relationships between the multi-sector collaborating partners. Actors in such collaborations partner for various reasons with diverse objectives that may not necessarily intersect. These differences have led scholars to argue that integrative public leadership is a new theory of leadership that differs from other leadership styles such as charismatic/transformational or ethical (Ospina and Foldy 2010), and a special issue on integrative public leadership was published in the *Leadership Quarterly* in 2010 (see Vol. 21, No. 2).

A recent review by Sun and Anderson (2012) synthesized the extant literature and suggested that integrative public leadership has four dimensions:

1. *Integrative thinking* is the cognitive ability of integrative public leaders to understand the various forces impacting the multi-sector collaboration and how they interrelate.

2. *Integrative behaviors* are the actions taken by integrative public leaders to foster semi-permanent connections in order to achieve public good.
3. *Integrative leadership resources* concern the moral desire of the integrative public leaders to serve the community by bringing in necessary expertise and use of appropriate social connections.
4. *Integrative structures and processes* are the use and institutionalization of required collaborative systems, structures, and processes that leaders pragmatically leverage to further the cause of the collaboration.

Sun and Anderson (2012) argued that Burns' (1978, 2003) original conceptualization of transformational leadership is quite similar to integrative public leadership. Bass and colleagues' (2003) conceptualization of transformational and transactional leadership explicitly ignored the civic component that was prominent in Burns (1978, 2003). Sun and Anderson (2012) argued that the four dimensions of transformational leadership as conceptualized by Bass and colleagues (2003) (i.e. idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration) explain much of integrative public leadership, but need to be augmented with an additional component, which they referred to as 'civic capacity'. Civic capacity is 'the combination of interest and motivation to be engaged in public service and the ability to foster collaborations through the use of one's social connections and through the pragmatic use of processes and structures' (Sun and Anderson 2012, p. 317). Civic capacity is essentially the social orientation of transformational leaders and their ability to be transactional in their approach in leveraging collaborative systems, structures and processes. They suggested that a measure for civic capacity can be developed to augment the MLQ-Form 5X. Unfortunately, a robust measure for integrative public leadership has yet to be developed, and hence empirical study of this style is limited to a few qualitative case studies.

Shared/distributed leadership

The final leadership style we review is shared or distributed leadership, defined as the 'distribution of leadership influence across multiple team members' (Carson *et al.* 2007, p. 1218). Although distributed leadership has gained increased attention with a 2011 special issue in the *International Journal of*

 *Management Reviews* (Vol. 13, No. 3), much of the research on distributed leadership has been confined to the educational sector (Bolden 2011). Distributed leadership is mostly relevant for teams, where individual members exercise leadership influence based on their expertise to meet shared goals and objectives. It can range from a few members exercising influence to the whole team exercising influence and subjecting themselves to the influence of one another, as the situation demands (Carson *et al.* 2007). Distributed leadership is seen as a group or shared responsibility where members rely on the skills of one another to enact a range of tasks (Thorpe *et al.* 2011). In contrast to distributed leadership, the conventional leadership paradigm either posits or assumes an external leader who is positioned hierarchically above the team members (Druskat and Wheeler 2003).

Distributed leadership is important for today's environment where complexity necessitates team members to take leadership roles, instead of relying solely on a single external leader to make all decisions (Carson *et al.* 2007). The use of self-managed teams in organizations also necessitates teams to self-lead through distributed leadership (Stewart *et al.* 2011).

There is still a need to develop an accepted measure for distributed leadership at the team level (Stewart *et al.* 2011). Some studies (e.g. Carson *et al.* 2007) use team social network density as a measure, arguing that teams with a more widely distributed leadership influence will have a higher network density. Using network density as a measure, empirical evidence points to a link between distributed leadership and team performance (Carson *et al.* 2007; Ensley *et al.* 2006). Carson *et al.* (2007) found that important antecedents for distributed leadership are an overall supportive internal team environment (consisting of shared purpose, social support and voice) and supportive coaching by an external leader (i.e. team manager).

Discussion: overlaps between the various leadership styles

Leadership scholars have long bemoaned the lack of integration in the field, and calls for integration have been growing recently (Avolio 2007; DeRue *et al.* 2011; Piccolo *et al.* 2012). The explosion of purportedly new leadership styles since the year 2000 exemplifies this lack of integration. While the 'two-factor' transformational/transactional leadership theory oversimplifies the complexity of leadership (Yukl 1989), and authors have pointed out key missing

elements (e.g. Antonakis and House 2014; Sun and Anderson 2012), the overlap between the many leadership styles currently being researched is highly problematic and represents 'construct proliferation' (DeRue *et al.* 2011) and probably 'concept redundancy' (Morrow 1983). To help advance future integration efforts, this section examines the overlaps among charismatic/transformational leadership, transactional leadership and the nine leadership styles discussed above. Afterwards, we suggest a path forward that we believe will represent the next significant advance in the understanding of leadership.

Overlap between CIP, transformational and transactional leadership

Strange and Mumford's (2002) initial study showed the overlap between ideological and charismatic leadership empirically. They found that ideological leaders displayed the same charismatic behaviors that charismatic leaders did, leading them to specifically state that 'ideological leadership can be viewed as a subtype of charismatic leadership', a 'form . . . where greater emphasis is placed on values and standards in vision formation than is typically the case for charismatic leaders' (Strange and Mumford 2002, p. 373). However, researchers studying charismatic leadership have long argued that values and ideology are also key aspects of charismatic leadership (Brown and Treviño 2009; House 1977; Howell and Shamir 2005). Charismatic leaders are argued to provide ideological explanations that are rooted in history (Shamir *et al.* 1993). While one can distinguish charismatic leaders who emphasize ideology in their visions from those who do not, and this distinction may be important, the value added by isolating these charismatic leadership behaviors and applying the new label of ideological leadership is not readily apparent. Furthermore, if existing conceptualizations of charismatic leadership have long included ideological appeals grounded in history, the extensive empirical body of work already incorporates ideological leadership. We suspect that many charismatic leaders would qualify as 'mixed type' leaders in the CIP model, which would render this distinction less useful in predicting leadership phenomena.

The pragmatic leadership style is frequently discussed as an effective leadership style that does not rely on the presence of a vision (whether ideological or not), or involve follower attributions of charisma. In describing pragmatic leadership, Mumford and Van Doorn (2001) note how prior work has found

that ‘successful leaders are capable of identifying and solving significant organizational problems using an analysis of organizational requirements and constraints, along with wisdom and perspective taking, to craft viable solutions likely to work within the organizational context’ (p. 282). We wonder whether these behaviors are required by all leaders, not just pragmatic leaders. Another aspect that supposedly distinguishes pragmatic leadership is the requirement for higher intelligence, but high intelligence distinguishes effective leaders (of all types) from ineffective ones (Judge *et al.* 2004b). The intellectual stimulation dimension of transformational leadership may also capture some of pragmatic leadership’s focus on intelligent problem-solving among groups that share values. Other aspects of pragmatic leadership seem to reflect components of transformational leadership. For example, although Mumford and Van Doorn (2001, p. 282) mention how charismatic and transformational leadership theories neglect ‘the role of leaders in enhancing the collective and individual capacity of the people to accomplish their work roles effectively’, this behavior would seem to be captured by the individualized consideration dimension of transformational leadership. Another statement Mumford and Van Doorn (2001, p. 293) make that sounds like individualized consideration is this: ‘because the success of pragmatic leaders depends on the identification and solution of social problems, they must be unusually aware of and sensitive to the needs of others, focusing their efforts on the generation of solutions to the problems evident in people’s lives’. These overlaps make us wonder how much of pragmatic leadership will be captured by transactional leadership and the intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration components of transformational leadership.

The overlaps identified above regarding ideological and pragmatic leadership with transformational and transactional leadership suggest that creating measures that attempt to isolate these differences as distinct leadership styles may prove difficult. It remains to be seen whether future research using the newly developed measure of instrumental leadership (Antonakis and House 2014) – which is conceptually very similar to pragmatic leadership – will support its distinction from measures of existing styles.

Overlap between servant and transformational leadership

Many of the servant leadership dimensions conceptually overlap with other leadership styles, especially

with transformational leadership. Like transformational leaders, servant leaders ‘encourage others to visualize the organization’s future and are persuasive by offering compelling reasons to get others to do things’ (Barbuto and Wheeler 2006, p. 319). Although transformational leaders’ visions can be driven by what leaders believe is beneficial to the organization (vs servant leaders’ visions that benefit organizational members; van Dierendonck 2011), others argue that transformational leadership visions can be prosocial (Grant 2012). Another purported difference is that servant leaders appeal to the affect-based trust of followers, while transformational leaders promote cognitive-based trust (Schaubroeck *et al.* 2011), but research has found that transformational leaders influence affect-based trust rather than cognitive-based trust (Conchie *et al.* 2012).

Ethical behavior is another hallmark of servant leaders (Liden *et al.* 2008), and Graham (1991) argues that, since servant leaders are guided by high internalized moral principles, this differentiates it from transformational leadership. Servant leaders are argued to engage in post-conventional moral reasoning, guided by internalized sets of high moral principles rather than the expectations of society and others (Graham 1991; Sendjaya *et al.* 2008). But transformational leaders also engage in post-conventional moral reasoning (Turner *et al.* 2002) and show high ethical standards of care (Simola *et al.* 2010).

The community orientation of servant leadership has also been argued to differentiate it from transformational leadership (Liden *et al.* 2008), although Burns’s original conceptualization of transformational leadership contained this aspect. We agree that this community orientation is missing from Bass and colleagues’ (2003) dominant conceptualization of transformational leadership, and needs to be added (Sun and Anderson 2012). Interestingly, however, Liden *et al.*’s (2008) study showed that all but two of the servant leadership dimensions correlated with the transformational leadership composite above 0.75 (empowerment was correlated at 0.43 and creating value for the community at 0.53).

Overlap of authentic leadership with other leadership styles

Scholars have raised concerns about the overlap between authentic leadership and other leadership styles. A table in Avolio and Gardner (2005, p. 323) compared authentic leadership components with transformational, charismatic, servant and spiritual

leadership, and there was a very high degree of overlap.

The review by Gardner *et al.* (2011) notes that early descriptions and definitions of authentic leadership did not adequately distinguish it from transformational leadership. Neider and Schriesheim (2011, p. 1148) stated that 'there is considerable conceptual ambiguity concerning the difference between authentic leadership and related constructs, particularly ... current conceptualizations of transformational leadership'. Interestingly, Jensen and Luthans (2006) even operationalized authentic leadership using transformational leadership items from the MLQ scale. A table in Walumbwa *et al.* (2008, p. 102) noted overlaps between authentic leadership and both transformational and ethical leadership, and contends that transformational leadership includes everything in authentic leadership plus a bit more, although some of the authentic leadership components are not as 'focal' to transformational leadership. The same study found that the four authentic leadership dimensions correlated highly with transformational leadership (0.42–0.59). A major impetus for developing authentic leadership was that it was a leadership style that promoted the positive organizational behavior states of optimism, resilience and hope. However, research shows that these states are related to both authentic leadership (Gardner *et al.* 2011) and transformational leadership (Peterson *et al.* 2009).

We note, however, that, although we see a high degree of overlap between authentic and transformational leadership, there is at least initial empirical research suggesting that authentic leadership can be distinguished using confirmatory factor analyses (Neider and Schriesheim 2011; Walumbwa *et al.* 2008). Nonetheless, we suggest that the question of whether authentic leadership adds something beyond transformational is far from answered. Especially troublesome is the practice of inconsistently controlling for transformational leadership in authentic leadership studies. We recommend that every future study of authentic leadership control for transformational leadership until their distinction is more adequately clarified.

Gardner *et al.*'s (2011) review also noted that Begley's (2001) 'alternative perspective ... equates authentic leadership with effective and ethical leadership' (p. 1123). As noted above, many authentic leadership scholars have argued that ethics is central to authentic leadership. Walumbwa *et al.* (2008) found that the four authentic leadership dimensions correlated highly with ethical leadership (0.51–0.58).

Similar to ideological leadership, Gardner *et al.* (2011) note that one of Shamir and Eilam's (2005, p. 1124) defining characteristics of authentic leaders was that they 'lead from conviction in pursuit of a value-based mission or cause'. Other statements also reflect this overlap, such as how authentic leaders

are anchored by their own deep sense of self; they know where they stand on important issues, values and beliefs. With that base they stay their course and convey to others, oftentimes through actions, not just words, what they represent in terms of principles, values and ethics. (Avolio and Gardner 2005, pp. 329–330)

Similar to servant leadership, Walumbwa *et al.* (2008, p. 96) note that authentic leaders 'show to others that they genuinely desire to understand their own leadership to serve others more effectively'. We also suggest that the balanced processing dimension of authentic leadership is likely to overlap with the pragmatic leadership focus on the rational evaluation of alternatives.

To explain the extensive overlap between authentic leadership and other styles, authentic leadership has been described as a 'root construct' that provides the basis for all forms of positive leadership (Avolio and Gardner 2005; Avolio *et al.* 2004). The meaning of this is unclear, but appears to suggest that authentic leadership is a requirement for all transformational, servant, ethical, spiritual and perhaps ideological leadership. While this claim of primacy for authentic leadership may be considered an empirical question, it strikes us as somewhat non-scientific. For example, if ethical leadership is essential to authentic leadership, how can authentic leadership be its root? A related issue is the question of how much inauthentic behavior can occur before a leader is no longer an authentic leader? As Cooper *et al.* (2005) argued, the key question is not whether scholars can theoretically distinguish authentic leadership from other leadership styles, but whether it can be distinguished empirically. They foreshadowed our concerns about the uniqueness of authentic leadership, arguing that 'researchers should not introduce a new construct if they are able to address the same questions using existing constructs' (Cooper *et al.* 2005, p. 490).

Overlap between ethical and transformational leadership styles

Brown *et al.* (2005) acknowledged that an ethical dimension of leadership is embedded within transformational leadership, and their motivation was

to tease this out into a separate leadership construct. In testing the added predictive power of their measure of ethical leadership on supervisor effectiveness, they only considered the idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership. Numerous other studies testing ethical leadership's added predictive power also only included the idealized influence dimension (e.g. Mayer *et al.* 2012; Walumbwa and Schaubroeck 2009). Had these studies included the full transformational leadership composite, the results might have differed. Although transformational leadership has not historically made ethics an explicit agenda (Brown and Treviño 2006; Brown *et al.* 2005), Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) argue that authentic transformational leadership explicitly requires a strong moral foundation. Ethics also figures heavily in both servant and authentic leadership, and is crucial to spiritual leadership. Given these overlaps, we question whether there is convincing evidence in the extant literature that warrants making ethical leadership a distinct style.

Overlap of spiritual leadership with other leadership styles

Spiritual leadership overlaps with authentic, ethical, servant and transformational leadership, as authenticity, being ethical and serving others form the basis of spiritual leadership (Fry 2003; Fry *et al.* 2005). The altruistic love dimension requires that spiritual leaders show authentic care and concern, gratitude and acceptance towards others (Fry 2003), and be self-aware and regulate their behaviors (van Dierendonck 2011) – characteristics that are the basis of authentic leadership. However, authenticity must be ethically centered on universally accepted altruistic principles (Fry *et al.* 2005; van Dierendonck 2011). Transformational leaders also engage in self-sacrificial behaviors (Halverson *et al.* 2004), and this 'individually considerate' behavior captures aspects of 'altruistic love'.

Similar to transformational leadership, visioning is an important component of spiritual leadership. While transformational leaders' visioning engages followers to envision an attractive future, spiritual leaders' visioning helps to create a sense of calling that gives meaning and purpose to followers' life. Some outcomes of authentic transformational leadership are similar to spiritual leadership outcomes, such as fostering group cohesiveness and a sense of belonging or 'membership' to a collective (Jung and Sosik 2002; Walumbwa and Lawler 2003), and encouraging self-transcendent behaviors among followers such as

going beyond self-interest for the benefit of the collective (Bass 1985, 1998; Burns 2003).

Altruistic love is also very similar to the 'agape love' dimension of servant leadership (Dennis and Bocarnea 2005). Just as servant leaders strive to enable those they serve to be freer, better, and more developed individuals (Graham 1991; Greenleaf 1977), spiritual leaders must humbly allow others to lead to help them grow and develop (Ferguson and Milliman 2008). Importantly, the empirical studies on spiritual leadership do not control for other leadership styles such as transformational leadership, and thus it is unknown whether spiritual leadership adds predictive variance above and beyond these other styles.

Overlap between integrative public leadership and transformational leadership

As Sun and Anderson (2012) have argued, the emerging literature on integrative public leadership has a high degree of overlap with transformational leadership. However, they suggest that this work does recognize the need to reintroduce to transformational leadership the civic orientation that figured prominently in Burns's original exposition of transformational leadership. Importantly, they suggested that rather than develop new measures of integrative public leadership, existing measures of transformational leadership could be augmented with items capturing what they termed 'civic capacity'.

Distributed leadership and other leadership styles

Distributed leadership is a team-level phenomenon (Stewart *et al.* 2011), and for this reason it is difficult to classify distributed leadership as an individual style of leadership. Further research is needed to examine the style of leadership exercised by the team members. One can only presume, given that the objective of distributed leadership is to solve team problems/issues, that the most relevant leadership style is pragmatic leadership.

The internal team environment characterized by shared purpose, social support and voice is an important antecedent for distributed leadership. The influence of the external leader (i.e. the team manager) is crucial to facilitating such an environment (Carson *et al.* 2007). Empirical research has shown us that transformational leadership by the team manager is able to create such a supportive internal team environment. Transformational leaders inspire a shared vision (Bass 1985) and are able to facilitate shared

purpose and shared goals in teams (Podsakoff *et al.* 1996). They are able to facilitate social support within teams by promoting group cohesiveness (Jung and Sosik 2002; Walumbwa and Lawler 2003), and encourage their followers to have a voice (i.e. encourage team members to participate and provide input) (Conchie *et al.* 2012). Transformational leaders provide supportive leadership (Rafferty and Griffin 2004) and are individually considerate and make good mentors (Sosik *et al.* 2011), and this has been found to be another important antecedent for distributed leadership (Carson *et al.* 2007). While empirical work on distributed leadership is starting to emerge, future research should consider how the leadership styles of external leaders, such as transformational leadership, can facilitate the emergence of distributed leadership within teams.



Future research directions

Given the extensive overlaps that we have identified among the leadership styles reviewed, we believe that a major reorientation of leadership research is necessary. Instead of adding to the number of individual leadership styles reviewed, we believe an explicit and coordinated integration strategy is needed to empirically boil down the bewildering assortment of leadership styles into what is truly distinct. These distinct leader behavioral dimensions will form a new ‘full-range’ style. This integration into a new ‘full-range’ style will enable future empirical research to cumulate work on leadership better, rather than the replications we see in the current leadership literature (i.e. studies of conceptually similar styles on the same dependent variables). A step in this direction has been recently taken by Antonakis and House’s (2014) paper on instrumental leadership, which added behaviors beyond transformational and transactional leadership (calling it a ‘fuller full-range style’), arguing that new behaviors beyond quid pro quo and motivational factors are needed. These new behaviors, such as environmental monitoring, strategy formulation, path–goal facilitation, and outcome monitoring, are in effect the behaviors of pragmatic leaders (Antonakis and House 2014). Naturally, if future research can identify a new distinct leader behavior, it can be added to the ‘full-range’ style.

We should emphasize that boiling down the extensive assortment of leadership styles into what is truly distinct is not a means of limiting leader behaviors. Leaders engage in complex behaviors and

can exercise a range of these distinct leadership behaviors, depending on the context. For example, the path–goal theory of leadership suggests that leaders choose behaviors that best suit their followers (Northouse 2010). Hooijberg *et al.* (1997) suggest that effective leaders possess both cognitive and behavioral complexities, and are able to differentiate and integrate multiple dimensions of their social and physical environments. A study by Hannah and colleagues approaches leader behavioral complexity through a socio-cognitive approach, suggesting that leaders can possess multiple self-identities (Hannah *et al.* 2009). Such an approach has been used to understand the socio-psychological motivation of servant leaders (Sun 2013).

We believe that a socio-cognitive approach provides an underlying theory that explains leader behavioral complexity, and how leaders can exercise many types of behaviors (from a new ‘full-range’ style) depending on the context and situation. This approach nullifies the distinction between ‘types of leaders’ vs ‘types of behaviors’ (Hannah *et al.* 2014). Leaders can possess multiple self-identities relevant for leadership, and a particular self-identity can be primed, depending on the context or the situation, resulting in specific leadership behaviors being enacted (Sun 2013). As a preliminary guide for future research, from our analysis of the major leadership styles found in current literature, we suggest that these leadership behaviors arise from five distinct self-identities: visionary, relational, creative, manager and community-oriented.

Leaders with a ‘visionary’ self-identity consider themselves as futurists with an ability to appeal to and create a desired future. As opposed to the arguments in ideological leadership studies, we suggest that such a future-oriented vision can simultaneously emphasize the maintenance of important personal values and standards.

Leaders with a ‘relational self-identity’ see themselves as relational beings, where the emphasis is to create positive relationships with others. Such a relational self-identity necessitates the leader to possess the attributes of authenticity, transparency, being ethical and having an ‘other-orientation’ (i.e. an orientation toward meeting the legitimate needs of others), all necessary to create follower commitment and stronger LMX relationships. The relational self-identity is complex, and it is not the intention of this paper to present a comprehensive understanding of this construct. It suffices to say that leaders could have different relational orientations.



Some may value interpersonal orientation and view themselves in terms of role relationships with others (a relationist orientation), while others value groups and identify with group membership (a collectivist orientation) (Cooper and Thatcher 2010). Depending on the type of orientation, leaders would have different motivations to associate themselves with their organization, workgroup and co-workers (Cooper and Thatcher 2010).

Leaders with a ‘creative self-identity’ see themselves as creative individuals. They engage in creative problem-solving, approaching old situations in new ways, and are intellectually stimulating. Leaders with a ‘manager self-identity’ see themselves as effective managers, possessing the attributes of good organizers, having a task orientation, and having the ability to effectively control work and outcomes. Leaders with such a manager self-identity will engage in explicit contingent reward behavior, and emphasize the importance of structures, systems and processes to aid and control outcomes. Leaders with a ‘community orientation’ self-identity see themselves as part of the community and see the need to contribute to the greater public good (Sun and Anderson 2012).

The above multiple self-identities can be present in a single leader, possibly arranged in a hierarchy of salience depending on the context/situation. An event can trigger or prime a particular leader self-identity (Hannah *et al.* 2009), and we refer to these triggering events as points of interaction. For example, when dealing with a product quality issue within the organization, the leader might enact the creative self-identity to find new solutions to the quality problem. In another point of interaction, in order to ensure that the quality problem does not repeat, the leader might enact the manager self-identity to ensure revised systems and processes are put in place. At every point of interaction where a self-identity is primed, the leader will engage in cognitive processing of the context/situation by using a particular set of attributes that define that self-identity, and engage in a particular set of leadership behaviors.

Although a leader can possess multiple self-identities, we argue that the development of these multiple self-identities is linked to their ego development. Leaders’ ego development undergoes three development stages: dependent stage, independent stage and inter-independent stage (McCauley *et al.* 2006). At the dependent stage, the leader possesses a simple view of the world, suffering from attribution biases such as assigning failures to the effort of their followers. Such leaders would, we argue, develop the

self-identity of a manager and institute controlling mechanisms. However, as leaders advance in their ego development stages, they will add on increasingly complex self-identities, taking into account more factors when analyzing problems and engaging in post-conventional moral reasoning. Self-identities such as relational and community orientations are more likely to develop at these advanced ego development stages.

What we have described above is an underlying theory that can be used to approach the study of leader behavioral complexity. It is a theory that explains how leaders can choose to enact a particular set of leadership behaviors (drawn from the ‘full-range’ style) depending on which self-identities the situation/context primes. However, as the first step, we need a large-scale and large-sample empirical study, similar in scope to the GLOBE study⁵ of leadership and culture (House *et al.* 2004), that measures all these overlapping styles and identifies those leadership dimensions that are empirically distinct. It is worth noting that the majority of leadership studies are survey-based and use follower assessments of leader behaviors. Although this methodological approach has weaknesses such as follower bias when rating the leader behaviors, we believe a survey-based empirical study, using the instruments that measure the different leadership styles, is a good first step. Once a set of distinct leadership behaviors is identified, further research (perhaps using multiple research methodologies) can categorize and relate these distinct behaviors to particular leader self-identities as suggested above.

We expect that such an effort to identify distinct leadership dimensions would show that transformational and transactional leadership do not adequately capture the totality of leadership behaviors relevant to organizational phenomena. It appears that at a minimum, an instrumental (or pragmatic) dimension needs to be added (as per Antonakis and House 2014), but we argue that further additions are probably needed. For example, the community orientation that figures prominently in servant leadership (Liden *et al.* 2008) and more recently in ethical leadership

⁵The GLOBE study identified six ‘global leadership styles’, which (according to its authors) are (1) charismatic/value-based leadership, (2) team-oriented leadership, (3) participative leadership, (4) humane-oriented leadership, (5) autonomous leadership, and (6) self-protective leadership. These styles have many overlaps with the work we reviewed in our paper, and add to the conceptual confusion regarding leadership styles that our paper highlights.

(Eisenbeiss 2012), can be used to augment transformational leadership (i.e. transformational leadership as conceptualized by Bass and colleagues, 2003), as Sun and Anderson (2012) recently argued. An orientation toward sustainability is another dimension that has been recently argued to constitute ethical leadership (Kalshoven *et al.* 2011) and is not present in other leadership styles. But we also expect that many dimensions purported to be novel will collapse with related dimensions. Following this approach will yield a new ‘full-range’ leadership model that will enable future research to build a more coherent understanding of the fascinating topic of leadership.

It is important to stress that our claim is not that these many recent leadership styles add nothing new. Instead, our argument is that the overlaps are sufficiently worrisome that concerted empirical efforts are needed to identify what the essential differences are. Empirically determining a more refined set of leadership styles will greatly enable future research on this fundamental topic better to cumulate and perhaps reorient the field of leadership studies.

References

- Algera, P.M. and Lips-Wiersma, M. (2012). Radical authentic leadership: co-creating the conditions under which all members of the organization can be authentic. *Leadership Quarterly*, **23**, pp. 118–131.
- Antonakis, J. and House, R.J. (2014). Instrumental leadership: measurement and extension of transformational-transactional leadership theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, **25**, pp. 746–771.
- Arnold, J.A., Arad, S., Rhoades, J.A. and Drasgow, F. (2000). The empowering leadership questionnaire: the construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behaviours. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, **21**, pp. 249–69.
- Ashforth, B.E. and Pratt, M.G. (2003). Institutionalized spirituality: an oxymoron? In Giacalone, R.A. and Jurkiewicz, C.L. (eds), *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 93–107.
- Avolio, B.J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychologist*, **62**, pp. 25–33.
- Avolio, B.J. and Gardner, W.L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, **16**, pp. 315–338.
- Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Walumbwa, F.O., Luthans, F. and May, D.R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: a look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, **15**, pp. 801–823.
- Barbuto, J.E. and Wheeler, D.W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group and Organization Management*, **31**, pp. 300–326.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational Leadership: Industry, Military, and Educational Impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B.M. and Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, **10**, pp. 181–217.
- Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., Jung, D.I. and Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **88**, pp. 207–218.
- Bedell-Avers, K., Hunter, S.T., Angie, A.D., Eubanks, D.L. and Mumford, M.D. (2009). Charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders: an examination of leader-leader interactions. *Leadership Quarterly*, **20**, pp. 299–315.
- Begley, P.T. (2001). In pursuit of authentic school leadership practices. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, **4**, pp. 353–365.
- Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: a review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, **13**, pp. 251–269.
- Brown, M.E. and Treviño, L.K. (2006). Socialized charismatic leadership, values congruence, and deviance in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **91**, pp. 954–962.
- Brown, M.E. and Treviño, L.K. (2009). Leader-follower values congruence: are socialized charismatic leaders better able to achieve it? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **94**, pp. 478–490.
- Brown, M.E., Treviño, L.K. and Harrison, D.A. (2005). Ethical leadership: a social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, **97**, pp. 117–134.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Burns, J.M. (2003). *Transforming Leadership*. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Carson, J.B., Tesluk, P.E. and Marrone, J.A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: an investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, **50**, pp. 1217–1234.
- Chen, C. and Yang, C. (2012). The impact of spiritual leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour: a multi-sample analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **105**, pp. 107–114.
- Conchie, S.M., Taylor, P.J. and Donald, I.J. (2012). Promoting safety voice with safety-specific transformational leadership: the mediating role of two dimensions of trust. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, **17**, pp. 105–115.
- Conger, J.A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: an insider’s perspective on these developing streams of research. *Leadership Quarterly*, **10**, pp. 145–179.

- Conger, J.A. and Kanungo, R. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **15**, pp. 439–452.
- Cooper, C.D., Scandura, T.A. and Schriesheim, C.A. (2005). Looking forward but learning from our past: potential challenges to developing authentic leadership theory and authentic leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, **16**, pp. 475–493.
- Cooper, D. and Thatcher, S.M.B. (2010). Identification in organizations: the role of self-concept orientations and identification motives. *Academy of Management Review*, **35**, pp. 516–538.
- Crosby, B.C. and Bryson, J.M. (2010). Special issue on public integrative leadership: multiple turns of the kaleidoscope. *Leadership Quarterly*, **21**, pp. 205–208.
- DeGroot, T., Kiker, D.S. and Cross, T.C. (2000). A meta-analysis to review organizational outcomes related to charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, **17**, pp. 356–371.
- Dennis, R.S. and Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of a servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, **26**, pp. 600–615.
- DeRue, D.S., Nahrgang, J.D., Wellman, N. and Humphrey, S.E. (2011). Trait and behavioural theories of leadership: an integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, **64**, pp. 7–52.
- Donaldson, T. and Dunfee, T.W. (1994). Toward a unified conception of business ethics: integrative social contracts theory. *Academy of Management Review*, **19**, pp. 252–284.
- Druskat, V.U. and Wheeler, J.V. (2003). Managing from the boundary: the effective leadership of self-managing work teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, **46**, pp. 435–457.
- Dust, S.B., Resick, C.J. and Mawritz, M.B. (2013). Transformational leadership, psychological empowerment, and the moderating role of mechanistic–organic contexts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **35**, pp. 413–433.
- Eagly, A.H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C. and van Engen, M.L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: a meta-analysis comparing men and women. *Psychological Bulletin*, **129**, pp. 569–591.
- Eisenbeiss, S.A. (2012). Rethinking ethical leadership: an interdisciplinary integrative approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, **23**, pp. 791–808.
- Ensley, M.D., Hmieleski, K.M. and Pearce, C.L. (2006). The importance of vertical and shared leadership within new venture top management teams: implications for the performance of start-ups. *Leadership Quarterly*, **17**, pp. 217–231.
- Fairholm, G. (1997). *Capturing the Heart of Leadership: Spirituality and Community in the New American Workplace*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Ferguson, J. and Milliman, J. (2008). Creating effective core organizational values: a spiritual leadership approach. *International Journal of Public Administration*, **31**, pp. 439–459.
- Fiol, C.M., Harris, D. and House, R. (1999). Charismatic leadership: strategies for effecting social change. *Leadership Quarterly*, **10**, pp. 449–482.
- Fry, L.W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, **14**, pp. 693–727.
- Fry, L.W., Vitucci, S. and Cedillo, M. (2005). Spiritual leadership and army transformation: theory, measurement, and establishing a baseline. *Leadership Quarterly*, **16**, pp. 835–862.
- Fuller, J.B., Patterson, C.E.P., Hester, K. and Stringer, D.Y. (1996). A quantitative review of research on charismatic leadership. *Psychological Reports*, **78**, pp. 271–287.
- Gardner, W.L. and Avolio, B.J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: a dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, **23**, pp. 32–58.
- Gardner, W.L., Cogliser, C.C., Davis, K.M. and Dickens, M.P. (2011). Authentic leadership: a review of the literature and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, **22**, pp. 1120–1145.
- Gill, C. and Caza, A. (2015). An investigation of authentic leadership's individual and group influences on follower responses. *Journal of Management*, doi:10.1177/0149206314566461.
- Goodwin, V.L., Wofford, J. and Whittington, J.L. (2001). A theoretical and empirical extension to the transformational leadership construct. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **22**, pp. 759–774.
- Graham, J.W. (1991). Servant leadership in organizations: inspirational and moral. *Leadership Quarterly*, **2**, pp. 105–119.
- Grant, A.M. (2012). Leading with meaning: beneficiary contact, prosocial impact, and the performance effects of transformational leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, **55**, pp. 458–476.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1970). *The Servant as a Leader*. Indianapolis, IN: Greenleaf Center.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). *Servant Leadership: A Journey Into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Halverson, S.K., Holladay, C.L., Kazama, S.M. and Quiñones, M.A. (2004). Self-sacrificial behavior in crisis situations: the competing roles of behavioral and situational factors. *Leadership Quarterly*, **15**, pp. 263–275.
- Hannah, S.T., Sumanth, J.J., Lester, P. and Cavaretta, F. (2014). Debunking the false dichotomy of leadership idealism and pragmatism: critical evaluation and support of newer genre leadership theories. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **35**, pp. 598–621.
- Hannah, S.T., Woolfolk, R.L. and Lord, R.G. (2009). Leader self-structure: a framework for positive leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **30**, pp. 269–290.
- Herold, D.M., Fedor, D.B. and Caldwell, S. (2008). The effects of transformational and change leadership on employees' commitment to a change: a multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **93**, pp. 346–357.

- Herrmann, D. and Felfe, J. (2014). Effects of leadership style, creativity technique and personal initiative on employee creativity. *British Journal of Management*, **25**, pp. 209–227.
- Hinkin, T.R. and Schriesheim, C.A. (2008). A theoretical and empirical examination of the transactional and non-leadership dimensions of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). *Leadership Quarterly*, **19**, pp. 501–513.
- Hmieleski, K.M., Cole, M.S. and Baron, R.A. (2012). Shared authentic leadership and new venture performance. *Journal of Management*, **38**, pp. 1476–1499.
- Hooijberg, R., Hunt, J.G. and Dodge, G.E. (1997). Leadership complexity and development of the leaderplex model. *Journal of Management*, **23**, pp. 375–408.
- House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In Hunt, J.G. and Larson, L.L. (eds), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, pp. 189–207.
- House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W. and Gupta, V. (2004). *Leadership, Culture, and Organizations: The Globe Study of 62 Societies*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- House, R.J. and Podsakoff, P.M. (1994). Leadership effectiveness: past perspectives and future research. In Greenberg, J. (ed.), *Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 45–82.
- Howell, J.M. and Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, **30**, pp. 96–112.
- Hu, J. and Liden, R.C. (2011). Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: an examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **96**, pp. 851–862.
- Hunter, S.T., Bedell-Avers, K.E. and Mumford, M.D. (2009). Impact of situational framing and complexity on charismatic, ideological and pragmatic leaders: investigation using a computer simulation. *Leadership Quarterly*, **20**, pp. 383–404.
- Irving, J.A. and Longbotham, G.J. (2007). Team effectiveness and six essential servant leadership themes: a regression model based on the items in the Organizational Leadership Assessment. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, **2**, pp. 98–113.
- Jensen, S.M. and Luthans, F. (2006). Relationship between entrepreneurs' psychological capital and their authentic leadership. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, **18**, pp. 254–273.
- Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.F. and Ilies, R. (2004a). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **89**, pp. 36–51.
- Judge, T.A., Colbert, A.E. and Ilies, R. (2004b). Intelligence and leadership: a quantitative review and test of theoretical propositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **89**, pp. 542–552.
- Judge, T.A. and Piccolo, R.F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **89**, pp. 755–768.
- Judge, T.A., Woolf, E.F., Hurst, C. and Livingston, B. (2008). Leadership. In Barling, J. and Cooper, C.L. (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Behavior: Volume 1, Micro Approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage, pp. 334–352.
- Jung, D.I. and Sosik, J. (2002). Transformational leadership in work groups: the role of empowerment, cohesiveness, and collective-efficacy on perceived group performance. *Small Group Research*, **33**, pp. 313–336.
- Kacmar, K.M., Bachrach, D.G., Harris, K.J. and Zivunski, S. (2011). Fostering good citizenship through ethical leadership: exploring the moderating role of gender and organizational politics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **96**, pp. 633–642.
- Kalshoven, K., Hartog, D.N.D. and De Hoogh, A.H.B. (2011). Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Leadership Quarterly*, **22**, pp. 51–69.
- Keller, R.T. (2006). Transformational leadership, initiating structure, and substitutes for leadership: a longitudinal study of research and development project team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **91**, pp. 202–210.
- Khurana, R. (2002). The curse of the superstar CEO. *Harvard Business Review*, **80**, pp. 60–66.
- Kool, M. and van Dierendonck, D. (2012). Servant leadership and commitment to change, the mediating role of justice and optimism. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **25**, pp. 422–433.
- Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., Zhao, H. and Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly*, **19**, pp. 161–177.
- Liden, R.C., Liao, C. and Meuser, J.D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, **57**, pp. 1434–1452.
- Ligon, G.S., Hunter, S.T. and Mumford, M.D. (2008). Development of outstanding leadership: a life narrative approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, **19**, pp. 312–334.
- Mayer, D.M., Bardes, M. and Piccolo, R.F. (2008). Do servant-leaders help satisfy follower needs? An organizational justice perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, **17**, pp. 180–197.
- Mayer, D.M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M. and Salvador, R. (2009). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, **108**, pp. 1–13.
- Mayer, D.M., Aquino, K., Greenbaum, R.L. and Kuenzi, M. (2012). Who displays ethical leadership, and why does it matter? An examination of antecedents and consequences of ethical leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, **55**, pp. 151–171.

- McCauley, C.D., Drath, W.H., Palus, C.J., O'Connor, P.M.G. and Baker, B.A. (2006). The use of constructive-developmental theory to advance the understanding of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, **17**, pp. 634–653.
- Mitroff, I.I. and Denton, E.A. (1999). *A Spiritual Audit of Corporate America*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Morrow, P.C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: the case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, **8**, pp. 486–500.
- Morse, R.S. (2010). Integrative public leadership: catalyzing collaboration to create public value. *Leadership Quarterly*, **21**, pp. 231–245.
- Mumford, M.D. (2006). *Pathways to Outstanding Leadership: A Comparative Analysis of Charismatic, Ideological, and Pragmatic Leaders*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mumford, M.D., Antes, A.L., Caughron, J.J. and Friedrich, T.L. (2008). Charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leadership: multi-level influences on emergence and performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, **19**, pp. 144–160.
- Mumford, M.D. and Van Doorn, J.R. (2001). The leadership of pragmatism: reconsidering Franklin in the age of charisma. *Leadership Quarterly*, **12**, pp. 279–309.
- Neider, L.L. and Schriesheim, C.A. (2011). The Authentic Leadership Inventory (ALI): development and empirical tests. *Leadership Quarterly*, **22**, pp. 1146–1164.
- Neubert, M.J., Kacmar, K.M., Carlson, D.S., Chonko, L.B. and Roberts, J.A. (2008). Regulatory focus as a mediator of the influence of initiating structure and servant leadership on employee behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **93**, pp. 1220–1233.
- Northouse, P.G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ospina, S. and Foldy, E. (2010). Building bridges from the margins: the work of leadership in social change organizations. *Leadership Quarterly*, **21**, pp. 292–307.
- Pasternack, B.A. and O'Toole, J. (2002). Yellow-light leadership: how the world's best companies manage uncertainty. *Strategy and Business*, **27**, pp. 1–10.
- Pekerti, A.A. and Sendjaya, S. (2010). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: comparative study in Australia and Indonesia. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **21**, pp. 754–780.
- Peterson, S.J., Galvin, B.M. and Lange, D. (2012). CEO servant leadership: exploring executive characteristics and firm performance. *Personnel Psychology*, **65**, pp. 565–596.
- Peterson, S.J., Walumbwa, F.O., Byron, K. and Myrowitz, J. (2009). CEO positive psychological traits, transformational leadership, and firm performance in high-technology start-up and established firms. *Journal of Management*, **35**, pp. 348–368.
- Phipps, K.A. (2012). Spirituality and strategic leadership: the influence of spiritual beliefs in strategic decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **106**, pp. 177–189.
- Piccolo, R.F., Bono, J.E., Heintz, K., Rowold, J., Duehr, E. and Judge, T.A. (2012). The relative impact of complementary leader behaviors: Which matter most? *Leadership Quarterly*, **23**, pp. 567–581.
- Piccolo, R.E., Greenbaum, R., De Hartog, D.N. and Folger, R. (2010). The relationship between ethical leadership and core job characteristics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **31**, pp. 259–278.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Bommer, W.H., Podsakoff, N.P. and MacKenzie, S.B. (2006). Relationships between leader reward and punishment behavior and subordinate attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors: a meta-analytic review of existing and new research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, **99**, pp. 113–142.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. and Bommer, W.H. (1996). Meta-analysis of the relationships between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **81**, pp. 380–399.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R. and Fetter, R. (1990). The impact of transformational leader behaviors on employee trust, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, **1**, pp. 107–142.
- Rafferty, A.E. and Griffin, M.A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: conceptual and empirical issues. *Leadership Quarterly*, **15**, pp. 329–354.
- Reave, L. (2005). Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, **16**, pp. 655–687.
- Rowold, J. and Heintz, K. (2007). Transformational and charismatic leadership: assessing the convergent, divergent and criterion validity of the MLQ and CKS. *Leadership Quarterly*, **18**, pp. 121–133.
- Russell, R. and Stone, G.A. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, **23**, pp. 145–157.
- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S.S.K. and Peng, A.C. (2011). Cognition-based and affective-based trust as mediators of leader behavior influence on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **96**, pp. 863–871.
- Seltzer, J. and Bass, B.M. (1990). Transformational leadership: beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of Management*, **16**, pp. 693–703.
- Sendjaya, S. and Pekerti, A.A. (2010). Servant leadership as antecedent of trust in organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, **31**, pp. 643–663.
- Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J.C. and Santora, J.C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, **45**, pp. 402–424.
- Shamir, B. and Eilam, G. (2005). 'What's your story?' A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *Leadership Quarterly*, **16**, pp. 395–417.
- Shamir, B., House, R.J. and Arthur, M.B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: a self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, **4**, pp. 577–594.
- Sharma, P.N. and Kirkman, B.L. (2015). Leveraging leaders: a literature review and future lines of inquiry for empowering leadership research. *Group & Organization Management*, **40**, pp. 193–237.

- Simola, S.K., Barling, J. and Turner, N. (2010). Transformational leadership and leader moral orientation: contrasting an ethic of justice and an ethic of care. *Leadership Quarterly*, **21**, pp. 179–188.
- Sosik, J.J. (2005). The role of personal values in the charismatic leadership of corporate managers: a model and preliminary field study. *Leadership Quarterly*, **16**, pp. 221–244.
- Sosik, J.J., Zhu, W. and Blair, A.L. (2011). Felt-authenticity and demonstrating transformational leadership in faith communities. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, **12**, pp. 179–199.
- Sparrowe, R.T. (2005). Authentic leadership and the narrative self. *Leadership Quarterly*, **16**, pp. 419–439.
- Spears, L.C. (2002). Introduction: tracing the past, present and future of servant-leadership. In Spears, L.C. (ed.), *Focus on Leadership*. New York, NY: John Wiley, pp. 1–18.
- Stewart, G.L., Courtright, S.H. and Manz, C.C. (2011). Self-leadership: a multilevel review. *Journal of Management*, **37**, pp. 185–222.
- Stone, A.G., Russell, R.F. and Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: a difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, **25**, pp. 349–361.
- Strange, J.M. and Mumford, M.D. (2002). The origins of vision: charismatic versus ideological leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, **13**, pp. 343–377.
- Suddaby, R. (2010). Editor's comments: construct clarity in theories of management and organization. *Academy of Management Review*, **35**, pp. 346–357.
- Sun, P.Y.T. (2013). The servant identity: influences on the cognition and behavior of servant leaders, *Leadership Quarterly*, **24**, pp. 544–557.
- Sun, P.Y.T. and Anderson, M.H. (2012). Civic capacity: building on transformational leadership to explain successful integrative public leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, **23**, pp. 309–323.
- Tang, G., Kwan, H.K., Zhang, D. and Zhu, Z. (2015). Work-family effects of servant leadership: the roles of emotional exhaustion and personal learning. *Journal of Business Ethics*, doi: 10.1007/s10551-015-2559-7.
- Thomas, T., Schermerhorn, J.R. and Dienhart, J.W. (2004). Strategic leadership of ethical behavior in business. *Academy of Management Executive*, **18**, pp. 56–66.
- Thorpe, R., Gold, J. and Lawler, J. (2011). Locating distributed leadership. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, **13**, pp. 239–250.
- Turner, N., Barling, J., Epitropaki, O., Butcher, V. and Milner, C. (2002). Transformational leadership and moral reasoning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **87**, pp. 304–311.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: a review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, **37**, pp. 1228–1261.
- Van Dierendonck, D. and Nuitjen, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: development and validation of a multi-dimensional measure. *Journal of Business Psychology*, **26**, pp. 249–267.
- Van Dierendonck, D., Stam, D., Boersma, P., de Windt, N. and Alkema, J. (2014). Same difference? Exploring the differential mechanisms linking servant leadership and transformational leadership to follower outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, **25**, pp. 544–562.
- van Knippenberg, D. and Sitkin, S.B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic-transformational leadership research: back to the drawing board? *Academy of Management Annals*, **7**, pp. 1–60.
- Waldman, D.A. and Balven, R.M. (2014). Responsible leadership: theoretical issues and research directions. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, **28**, pp. 224–234.
- Walter, F. and Bruch, H. (2009). An affective events model of charismatic leadership behavior: a review, theoretical integration, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, **35**, pp. 1428–1452.
- Walumbwa, F.O. and Lawler, J.J. (2003). Building effective organizations Transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes, and withdrawal behaviors in three emerging economies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **14**, pp. 1083–1101.
- Walumbwa, F.O. and Schaubroeck, J. (2009). Leader personality traits and employee voice behavior: mediating roles of ethical leadership and work group psychological safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **94**, pp. 1275–1286.
- Walumbwa, F.O., Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Wernsing, T.S. and Peterson, S.J. (2008). Authentic leadership: development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, **34**, pp. 89–126.
- Wang, G., Oh, I.S., Courtright, S.H. and Colbert, A.E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group and Organization Management*, **36**, pp. 223–270.
- Wang, H., Sui, Y., Luthans, F., Wang, D. and Wu, Y. (2013). Impact of authentic leadership on performance: role of followers' positive psychological capital and relational processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **35**, pp. 5–21.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: a review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, **15**, pp. 251–289.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, **10**, pp. 285–305.
- Zhu, Y. and Akhtar, S. (2014). How transformational leadership influences follower helping behavior: the role of trust and prosocial motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **35**, pp. 373–392.