LEADERSHIP AS A SOURCE OF INSPIRATION

Bibliographical Data

Library of Congress Classification (LCC)	5001-6182 : Business 5201-5982 : Business Science 5546-5548.6 : Office Organization and Management 5548.7-5548.85 : Industrial Psychology HD 57.7 Leadership, Industrial management
Journal of Economic Literature (JEL)	M : Business Administration and Business Economics M 10 : Business Administration: general L 2 : Firm Objectives, Organization and Behaviour
European Business Schools Library Group (EBSLG)	85 A : Business General 100 B: Organization Theory (general) 240 B : Information Systems Management 90 D: Leadership

Gemeenschappelijke Onderwerpsontsluiting (GOO)

Classification GOO	85.00 : Bedrijfskunde, Organisatiekunde: algemeen 85.05 : Management organisatie: algemeen 85.08 : Organisatiesociologie, organisatiepsychologie
Keywords GOO	Bedrijfskunde / Bedrijfseconomie Organisatieleer, informatietechnologie, prestatiebeoordeling Leiderschap, organisatiecultuur
Free keywords	Inspirational leadership, transformational leadership, vision and charisma, followers, national cultures, Shackleton, motivation and emotions, commitment, trust, performance and success

Erasmus Research Institute of Management (ERIM)
Erasmus University Rotterdam
Internet: http://www.erim.eur.nl

ERIM Inaugural Addresses Research in Management Series

Reference number ERIM: EIA-2002-05-ORG

ISBN 90 – 5892 – 015 – 1

LEADERSHIP AS A SOURCE OF INSPIRATION

Inaugural Address

Address given in shortened form at the occasion of accepting the appointment as Full Professor of organizational psychology at the Faculty of Economics, Erasmus University Rotterdam on Friday, October 5th, 2001

by

Prof. Dr. Deanne N. Den Hartog

Erasmus University Rotterdam
Rotterdam School of Economics
PoBox1738
NL-3000 DR Rotterdam
denhartog@few.eur.n

Mijnheer de Rector Magnificus,
Geacht College van Decanen,
Distinguished Colleagues,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is with honour and pleasure that I accept the appointment as Full Professor of Organizational Psychology at the Faculty of Economics at the Erasmus University Rotterdam by giving this inaugural address.

A very basic definition of employment would be the exchange of work and effort for compensation. However, work means much more than that to most people. Also, many of us spend a great deal of their time working – often we spend more time working than with family or friends. As such, insight in well-being at work, in what people do and do not enjoy, and in when people feel committed to and energized by work rather than drained by it, is highly relevant. Such insights are obviously also of value to organizations. For instance, knowing more about what commits or motivates people or how to create conditions that elicit optimal job performance is of great interest to managers. Increasingly, understanding the 'human side of the enterprise' or its 'social capital' seems valued by organizations. The HR literature holds that, when managed well, people can be a source of competitive advantage (Verburg & Den Hartog, 2001). Thus, knowledge rendered by studying work and organizational psychology could be of value to both individuals and organizations.

Many of the processes studied in work and organizational psychology imply an important role for leaders. In popular opinion polls, for instance, having a bad relationship with one's supervisor is often mentioned as a source of stress. Also, in the media, top managers are often blamed for failure and hailed for success of organizations. Such attention for leaders is not new. Legends and myths about what distinguishes 'great leaders' from 'commoners' seem to have always attracted people. As Bernard Bass writes: 'The study of leadership rivals in age the emergence of civilization, which shaped its leaders as much as it was shaped by them. From its infancy, the study of history has been the study of leaders - what they did and why they did it' (1990a:3). Leadership still fascinates many of us. How is it that some are able to inspire their followers to come together to accomplish great deeds and others demotivate people working for them? What makes leaders effective? Over the years, this last question has been answered in different ways. Over the last two decades, this answer seems to have pointed towards inspirational leadership. The media describe the need for visionary leaders and in their job advertisements organizations urge charismatic 'people managers' to apply for management positions.

This increased attention for inspiration, vision and charisma as core components of leadership gives rise to several questions, a few of which I have selected to go into here. The first issue I will discuss is the nature of inspirational leadership. What is inspirational leadership? Which traits and behaviors are relevant to this type of

leadership? Which other aspects do we need to study? Given that most theory on leadership originates in the US, an interesting question is whether characteristics associated with inspirational leadership are also valued positively in other cultures. Some results of a large scale international study are presented to address this topic. If inspirational leadership is indeed positively valued, the next question becomes what its effects are and how it compares to other leadership styles. Does this style of leadership indeed lead to more success in terms of organizational and individual performance as well as well-being? Although inspirational leadership may lead to success, many people in popular opinion polls indicate that their leaders are far from inspirational. In some cases the behavior of leaders can even be seen as destructive, and may lead to very negative outcomes. Some ideas on destructive leadership will also be presented. Finally, given the changing context of organizations, one can ask whether the individual leadership role has a future in tomorrow's organization. I will conclude with some remarks on the possible future of inspirational leadership.

Transformational leadership

Studying leadership performance traditionally focused on how leaders can facilitate group maintenance and what they must do to ensure task accomplishment. However, a very important leadership function was not studied as often, namely providing a vision or overarching goal. However, for leaders, this sense of direction, of knowing where one is going, is crucial to integrate and align followers' efforts. As the Cheshire cat advised Alice in Lewis Carroll's Alice's Adventures in Wonderland: 'If you don't know where you're going, any road will take you there'. For followers, such sense of vision can act as a compass, guiding them in the daily decisions they make. The sense of purpose that an attractive vision of the future inspires acts as a powerful motivating force for those who share the vision.

This attention for vision as a central component of leadership gained more prominence from the mid 1980s onwards. One of the most influential models in this area compares so-called transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership was one of the perspectives distinguished by Burns (1978) in his seminal work on leadership. Transactional leadership views leader-follower interactions from an exchange perspective. According to Burns this exchange can be economic, political or psychological in nature. Following Burns, Bass (1985) notes that until the 1980s, leadership in (organizational) research had often been conceptualized as such a transactional cost-benefit exchange process. Many theories were founded on the basic premise that leader-follower relationships are based on series of exchanges or implicit bargains between leaders and followers. A transactional leader recognizes what followers want to get from their work and tries to see that they get what they desire if their performance warrants it. Such a leader exchanges (promises of) rewards for appropriate levels of effort and responds to followers' self-interests as long as they are getting the job done (Bass, 1985). The leader clarifies the performance criteria, in other words what he expects from subordinates, and what they receive in return. The general notion in transactional views of leadership is that when the job and the

environment of the follower fail to provide the necessary motivation, direction and satisfaction, the leader, through his or her behavior, will be effective by compensating for the deficiencies (House, Woycke & Fodor, 1988). Several transactional theories have been tested extensively and some have received empirical support. Examples are Path-Goal Theory and Vertical Dyad Theory (see e.g. Yukl, 1998).

Transformational leadership goes beyond the cost-benefit exchange of transactional leadership by motivating and inspiring followers to perform beyond expectations (Bass, 1985). Transformational leaders broaden and elevate the interests of followers, generate awareness and acceptance among the followers of the purposes and mission of the group and motivate followers to go beyond their self-interests for the good of the group. According to Bass (1985) such a transformation of followers can be achieved by raising the awareness of the importance and value of outcomes, getting followers to transcend their own self-interests and altering or expanding followers' needs. The dynamics of transformational leadership involve strong personal identification with the leader, joining in a shared vision of the future, and going beyond the self-interest exchange of rewards for compliance (Hater & Bass, 1988).

A core element of this type of leadership is articulating an attractive vision of a possible future (e.g. Sashkin, 1988). The vision describes a better future in ideological terms and is congruent with the dearly held values of followers. Through articulating such a vision inspirational leaders are instill pride, gain respect and trust, and increase a sense of optimism and hope (Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993). The leader communicates this vision through words and deeds. A leader's personal example serves as a model of the kind of behavior required to attain the vision. In other words, leaders act as role models. Modeling desired behaviors is important as the leader provides an ideal, a point of reference and focus for followers' emulation and vicarious learning. Through demonstrating their courage and their moral conviction leaders earn credibility and serve as a role model of the values inherent in the vision (e.g. House & Podsakoff, 1994).

However, inspirational leadership has several other components. One is displaying charisma and self-confidence. Besides providing sense of mission, such a leader instills pride, gains respect and trust, and increases optimism (Bass, 1985). While a leader's charisma may attract subordinates to a vision or mission, the leader's individualized consideration and support also significantly contributes to individual subordinates achieving their fullest potential (Yammarino & Bass, 1990). This behavior implies treating each individual as valuable and unique, not just as a member of the group and aiming to aid their personal development. It is in part coaching and mentoring, it provides for continuous feedback and links the individual's current needs to the organization's mission (Bass, 1985). Also important in that respect is expressing trust and confidence in followers (House, 1977). In this vein, House (1977) emphasizes the importance of confidence building and expressing confidence in followers. Some feel that individualized consideration is similar to older notions of 'consideration' in

leadership research (e.g. Bryman, 1992). However, individualized consideration builds on two aspects of behavior, i.e. individualization and development of followers, where as earlier scales measuring consideration were primarily concerned with whether a leader was seen a 'good guy or gal' (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Finally, intellectual stimulation is also important. An intellectually stimulating leader provides subordinates with a flow of challenging new ideas to stimulate rethinking of old ways of doing things (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1990). It arouses an awareness of problems, of subordinates' own thoughts and imagination, and a recognition of their beliefs and values. Intellectual stimulation is evidenced by subordinates' conceptualization, comprehension, and analysis of the problems they face and the solutions generated (Yammarino & Bass, 1990).

Transformational leadership theories predict followers' emotional attachment to the organization as well as emotional and motivational arousal of followers as a consequence of the leader's behavior (House et al., 1988). Tichy and Devanna (1990) highlight the transforming effect these leaders can have on organizations as well as on individuals. By defining the need for change, creating new visions, mobilizing commitment to these visions, leaders can ultimately transform the organization.

Charisma

A second influential perspective in this area has been the work on charismatic leadership. As Jacobsen and House (2001) note, the process of charismatic leadership involves the leader, the constituency from which followers respond to the leader, and the social structure wherein the leader and followers interact. Most work on charisma is based on Max Weber's ideas. Charisma appears in his work on the origins of authority. Weber's charisma concept consists of five related elements: an exceptional leader, a situation of social crisis, the leader's vision or mission presenting a solution to this crisis, followers who are attracted to the leader and the vision, and validation of the charismatic qualities of the leader through repeated success (Trice & Beyer, 1986). These five components are present to some extent in any theory on charisma. Theories differ, however, in how the components are operationalized and in which component is seen as the most important (Den Hartog, Koopman & Van Muijen, 1995).

One of the most common views is that charisma is something that people 'have' or 'do not have', a trait standpoint. And indeed there is an undeniable personal factor in charismatic leadership. Charismatic leaders are viewed by their followers as being special. Rather than treating charisma itself as a personality trait, most authors try to distinguish personal factors associated with charismatic leadership. Examples of characteristics that have been named as potentially important in acquiring and maintaining charisma are:

1. Physical characteristics, such as a handsome appearance, piercing eyes and a distinct voice (e.g. Bryman, 1992).

2. Psychological characteristics, such as high energy, self-confidence, dominance and a strong need for power, a strong conviction in their own beliefs and ideals and audacity and determination (e.g. House, 1977; Turner, 1993).
3. Abilities and skills, such as intelligence, problem solving and interpersonal skills as well as eloquence or rhetorical skills (e.g. Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs & Fleishman, 2000).

As expected, research shows positive relationships between charismatic or transformational leadership and personal characteristics. For instance, a study by Judge and Bono (2000) shows that such leadership is related to the personality dimensions extraversion, agreeableness and openness to experience. More research is needed and we are currently undertaking such studies. Personality and leadership is a central topic of the PhD project of Annebel de Hoogh. Also, a new PhD project investigates how the relationships between leadership, personality, learning styles and performance unfold over time. However, exclusively defining charisma as a personal attribute or skill does not do justice to reciprocity of the relationship between leader and follower. Weber conceptualized charisma as a naturally fragile and unstable social relationship between leader and follower, in constant need of validation. As Weber's writes, leader characteristics, leader behavior and the mission, followers' attribution of charisma, the situation and the validation of charisma all play a role in this complex social relationship.

Although this type of leadership is mostly referred to as charismatic or transformational, other terms, such as 'leaders' (as opposed to managers), transforming, inspirational, visionary or value-based are also used. Although there are some marked differences between these perspectives, overall these theories describe similar views of the phenomenon of leadership (see e.g. Fiol, Harris & House, 1999). Jointly, these leadership theories attempt to explain how certain leaders are able to achieve extraordinary levels of follower motivation, admiration, commitment, respect, trust, dedication, loyalty, and performance. They also try to explain how some of these leaders succeed to lead their organizations or units to attain outstanding accomplishments, such as the founding and growing of successful entrepreneurial firms or corporate turnarounds (House, Delbecq & Taris, 1998). How are these theories different from those that came before? For instance, comparing House's well-known path-goal theory with his 1976 charismatic theory one could say that path-goal theory focuses on how follower needs and conditions determine leader behavior, whereas charismatic theory is about how leaders change people rather than respond to them (House, 1996). Another difference is that where in path-goal theory leaders are effective when they complement the environment, inspirational or transformational leadership focuses more on changing and creating their desired environment.

An example of inspirational leadership: Sir Ernest Shackleton

Many people nowadays feel cynical about leadership. However, dramatic examples of leadership are found throughout history. Before going into more details of scientific models and studies, I would like to take you back almost a century and share a remarkable story of inspirational leadership with you, namely the story of expedition leader Sir Ernest Shackleton. He was described in the media as charismatic, a great leader and born to rule. His story also draws attention to some things we do not yet know about but may deserve our attention to further understand leadership and its effects. The expeditions were relatively well-documented by Shackleton and his men in their diaries, books and letters to friends and family. Information from these sources has been summarized in several books and a documentary[1]. To gain more insight in Shackleton's leadership, the words of the men he led are very interesting. They state: 'He was a tower of strength and endurance and he never panicked in any emergency' (Walter How, seaman and sail maker, Endurance expedition), 'To serve such a leader, is one of the greatest pleasures of the trip' (Thomas Orde-Lees, storekeeper and motor expert, Endurance) and 'He led, he did not drive' (G. Vibert-Douglas, geologist, Quest expedition). Many other statements by the men he led praise his leadership. His indeed story seems to justify the positive qualifications.

The beginning of the 20th century was an age of exploration. One of the remote areas the explorers set out to conquer was the remote, frozen world of Antartica. An important goal was to be the first to reach the South pole. Expeditions were a popular, expensive and competitive business. The heroic and also somewhat egotistical honor of leading the expedition that would 'get there first' was important for individuals, as polar explorers were celebrities in those days. The expeditions were also a matter of national pride. The British, Japanese, Norwegians, Australians and Germans were all trying to beat each other to destinations such as the Poles. Many, including Shackleton, did share ideas and experiences to learn from eachother. Besides reaching certain landmarks such as the North and South Pole and the charting of unknown territory, another goal (or sometimes pretense to gain financing) of such expeditions was to gather scientific information. The Antarctic expedition that Shackleton is most famous for started in 1914. He failed miserably at the goal of the expedition, losing his ship before they even set foot on the Antarctic coast. However, the trip is legendary for another reason. Shackleton led each and every one of his crew members home safely after their ship stranded and ultimately sank in a remote, frozen sea. Before describing that trip, I will provide some more background.

Shackleton was born in 1874 in Ireland. He was from a comfortable middle-class background as the son of a physician. He had 8 sisters and 1 brother. His mother was an unconventional Irishwoman, described as 'warmhearted and altogether happy-go-

[1] I used the following books as sources for this example: Alexander (2001); Bickel (2001); Huntford (1985); Morrell and Capparelli (2001); and Shackleton (1919).

lucky'. In contrast, his father is described as 'a grave, cautious, solid Yorkshire Quaker'. When he was 10, the family moved to London. Shackleton was bright, interested in poetry, but did not do well at school, complaining they did not make things interesting. At 15 he decided to leave home for a life on the seas and joined the merchant marine. He was an apprentice at sea for 4 years. After that he took exams every 2 years in order to advance to higher posts. At 24 he was qualified to serve as captain of any ship in the merchant marine.

In 1901, Shackleton's was appointed junior officer on the Discovery, an Antarctic expedition ship to be led by the legendary explorer Robert F. Scott. Scott, a former naval officer, was known as a rigid and formal leader. To him the prize was paramount and his military training would have dictated that sometimes some loss of life was inevitable. Scott is described as bullying and controlling and was unable to adapt his formal naval training to the harsh environment. For instance, he insisted the crew would swab the deck, even though water froze as soon as it hit the boards. In contrast, the crew members were very taken with Shackleton, describing him as 'the life and soul of the ship'. Scott chose Shackleton and a physician to attempt the 1600 mile trek to the Pole and back. These men were among the first to venture inland from the Antarctic coast. Although nourishment was badly needed, Scott skimped on the rations to lighten the load on the sledges. After several weeks all three men showed sighs of scurvy. They were forced to turn back 460 miles from the South Pole. Being the largest of the three men, Shackleton in particular was very weak and ill by then. They barely made it back. Scott blamed Shackleton's illness for not making the Pole and sent him back to England in 1903, long before the expedition was over. Shackleton was bitterly disappointed about being sent home. However, being the first from the famous expedition to return got him more exposure and publicity than he would otherwise have gotten, which helped his reputation.

Shackleton held different jobs on land and got married in 1904. However, the pull of exploration proved irresistible. In 1907, Shackleton started planning an Antarctic expedition. It would be the first he led. Major goal of this expedition (Nimrod) was to be the first to reach the South pole. The Nimrod crew referred to him as 'The Boss' a nickname that stuck with him in later years. Shackleton became known as a leader who respected each individual and put his men and their safety first. In the men he led, this inspired strong loyalty and an unshakable confidence in his decisions. Nimrod's engineer Harry Dunlop wrote in a letter to a friend: 'He is a marvelous man and I would follow him anywhere'. In November 1908, four crewmembers, including Shackleton, set out to reach the Pole. Shackleton decided to turn back only 97 miles from the Pole, knowing he would risk the lives of those in his party if they didn't turn. Although this seems like common sense, many explorers died pushing themselves or others beyond their limits. The group indeed only barely survived the journey back to their ship. Having eaten spoilt meat they fell ill, which slowed them down. This was problematic, as the captain had orders to sail if they didn't make it back by the end of February. Shackleton and Frank Wild, one of the men who undertook the march for

the Pole with him, went ahead to stop the ship as the others were too weak to move fast. Although they got there on time, the ship had left. Fortunately, their signals were seen and the ship returned to pick up the four men. Frank Wild did not take to Shackleton at first. He recorded an incident in his diary that changed his opinion forever. The four men had only very little food left and lived on small daily rations that were insufficient to sustain them. Wild was severely ill with dysentery, which drained his last strength on the return from the pole. Shackleton privately forced part of his ration on Wild, insisting he needed it more. Wild never forgot the gesture. He also accompanied Shackleton on his next expedition. Although they had not reached the Pole, the overall accomplishments of the expedition were impressive. Back home, Shackleton was hailed as a leader, adventurer and national hero.

In 1910 the British explorer Scott set out on another attempt to reach the South Pole. He indeed succeeded to reach the pole, only to find that the famous Norwegian explorer Amundsen had made it there just a few weeks earlier (December 14, 1911). Amundsen had turned south successfully after having been beaten to the North pole by another explorer some time before. Bitterly disappointed Scott and his men tried to return to their ship. Having pushed too hard on their attempt, Scott and his men perished on the return from the pole. Sources record that the British explorers were relatively inexperienced at skiing and driving dogsleds, which made their progress across the ice much slower than that of the Norwegians. When the news of Amundsen's success and Scott's death reached the world, Shackleton let go of his driving ambition to be the first to reach the South Pole. However, within months, he had conceived another daring and perilous adventure to focus on. His vision was to undertake what he himself described with promotional flair as 'the last great journey'. With Amundsen's success, Shackleton held that only one great object of Antarctic journeying remained, namely the crossing of the South Polar continent from sea to sea, an 1800 mile crossing of a frozen and uncharted continent on foot. With this vision in mind he set out to convince investors to back this idea. As stated, expeditions were an expensive business. After the Nimrod expedition, Shackleton had written a book and hit the lecture trail to pay off debts. For his new adventure, Shackleton raised the necessary funds using rather innovative techniques for those days. For instance, he took the innovative step to pre-sell the rights to the story. Still, like with his earlier expedition, some financial loose ends remained when they left.

To find crew members, the story goes that Shackleton put out an advertisement that read 'Men wanted for Hazardous Journey. Small wages, bitter cold, long months of complete darkness, constant danger, safe return doubtful. Honour and recognition in case of success.' Although a good example of a realistic job preview, it is probably not true. There was, however, ample attention for the plan. Although not everyone shared the enthusiasm for exploration (among the sceptics was Winston Churchill), the idea was generally greeted with enthusiasm in the media. The Times, for instance, held that Shackleton was to 're-establish the prestige of Great Britain in … polar exploration'. Due to the popularity of the expeditions, it was not hard to attract

prospective crew members. Many applied. Shackleton took great care in assembling his crew. He assessed whether the men were physically fit and ensured he had the required mix of skills needed in the team (e.g. doctors, carpenters, scientists, sailors). He also paid attention to the character of the men he selected. He was especially careful to look for signs of pessimism, a state of mind he wanted to avoid on board. Also, he took into account how he thought the men would interact in the group. One of the questions the men recall him asking during the selection interview was whether they could sing. On board, he indeed emphasized sing-a-longs and other playful interactions in order to build camaraderie among the men and keep spirits high.

In August 1914, Shackleton and his expedition set out on a ship he renamed Endurance (after the family motto By Endurance We Conquer – Fortitudine Vincimus). Well-stocked with supplies and 69 Canadian sledging dogs they sailed south. The crew was a mix of officers and scientists along with a group of seamen. Under Scott's command, separation between the two classes was strict, in Naval fashion. However, under Shackleton far less attention was paid to such class differences. Throughout the journey, Shackleton would judge his men's performance on two levels: doing the job well and loyalty. He placed most emphasis on the latter. They stopped at several ports as they made their way south and several seamen who had shown insubordinate or disloyal behavior were replaced. Their last port of call before the Antarctic coast was the remote whaling station of South Georgia, East of the Falklands. Shackleton quickly established a routine for the chores that needed to be done on board, knowing that keeping everyone busy would combat boredom. Orde-Lees states 'everything works like clockwork and one knows just where one is'. Endurance Captain Frank Worsley notes 'The regular daily task and matter-of-fact groove into which everything settles inspires confidence in itself, and the leader's state of mind is naturally reflected in the whole party'. Shackleton always gave his men responsibility and conveyed trust in them, but when something did go wrong he was careful not to criticize his men in public. The men mostly regarded Shackleton as just and ethical. "His method of discipline was very fair. He did not believe in unnecessary discipline." (William Bakewell, seaman). Shackleton also avoided any appearance of favoritism. He felt this was extremely important to avert resentment and fragmentation into cliques. As Macklin, put it, he 'did not have any cronies'.

Unfortunately, after that, the Endurance expedition was over before it truly got started. In December of 1914, Shackleton and his 27 crew members left South Georgia. Shackleton decided to go ahead even though the whalers had warned that the ice conditions were the worst in anyone's memory. However, they had already waited a month for conditions to improve and left. Given the start of World War I and their weak financial position, postponing any further was likely to mean he would not get the chance to achieve his vision. En route to Vashel Bay on the Antarctic coast, the Endurance plowed through a thousand miles of ice-encrusted waters. It got harder and harder to get through the ice, and after a little over a month, almost at its destination (the Antarctic coast) the ship got stuck in the polar ice of the Weddell Sea, frozen

solid in place. In vain, the crew tried to cut a path in the ice towards the land, which by then was so close it was actually in sight (only 40 miles away). However, the attempts were unsuccessful and the drifting ice pack was moving them away from the land. Soon they no longer saw land. The Falklands had the nearest transmitting stations and they tried to contact them using the wireless, without avail. Not only was the ship out of sight of land, no one in the world knew where it was.

In March, realistically, they could no longer expect the ice to melt until October at the earliest, some seven months away. The birds and seals were leaving, indicating the approach of winter. There would be no choice for the crew but to spend the entire Southern winter on the ice floe, some 1200 miles from the farthest outposts of civilization. Shackleton realized this most likely meant they were not going to reach their goal. At age forty, and considering both the war and the financial burdens that would face him back home, this was probably to be his one and only chance to attempt the crossing he had envisioned. Although this must have been a bitter personal disappointment for him, he did not show this to his men. As Alexander Macklin (surgeon) describes it: 'It was more than tantalizing it was maddening. Shackleton at this time showed one of his sparks of real greatness. He did not rage at all, or show outwardly any the slightest sign of disappointment; he told us simply and calmly we that we must winter in the Pack, explained its dangers and possibilities, never lost his optimism, and prepared for Winter'. From personal experience, Shackleton knew that the dark and bitter cold Antarctic winter would bring with it a peculiar psychological strain. He enforced a strict winter discipline to keep everyone busy and guard against tedium. To boost morale and combat the cold, he issued everyone winter clothing originally meant for the shore party that was to attempt the crossing. He moved the men's quarters to the warmest part of the ship. Exercising and caring for the dogs took up a lot of the men's time. Whenever possible, Shackleton would talk individually to the men, asking them how they were getting along. This personal attention was greatly appreciated. He tried to assign the men meaningful tasks matching their interests and character and had a keen eye for group processes. When assembling teams for lengthy or hard assignments, he was careful about team composition, matching people in terms of personalities and actual friendships.

In May the sun disappeared for several months, restricting the men's movements even more. The diaries of the men continue to reflect a generally contented company. They played games, sang, read and discussed books and after moonlit sledge rides would continue to comment on the eerie beauty of the ice. Thus, even though the situation was dire, the men were not despondent. They counted on 'the Boss' to get them out. Shortly after the start of the drift, Orde-Lees recorded: 'We seem to be a wonderfully happy family, but I think sir Ernest is the real secret of our unanimity. Considering our divergent aims and difference of station it is surprising how few differences of opinion occur'. As a result of the emphasis Shackleton placed on interaction, the atmosphere remained very positive. They joked, played games and had a gathering after every meal. The Endurance was not the first ship to get stuck in the Polar ice.

Three months after being stuck in the ice, Dr. Frederick Cook, crew member of the Belgica, a Belgian Antarctic expedition, wrote in his diary (June 1989): 'Most of us in the cabin have grown decidedly grey within two months, though few are over thirty. Our faces are drawn, and there is an absence of jest and cheer and hope in our makeup, which in itself is one of the saddest incidents of our existence'. The records of how the Endurance crew fared, for a stark contrast. As photographer Frank Hurley describes, five months after they got stuck in the ice: 'The Billabong [cabin] has an atmosphere poetic. Macklin in his bunk is writing poetic verses, and I am doing the same. McIllroy is arranging a décolleté dancing rig, whilst Uncle Hussey is being beset by applicants to rehearse accompaniments on his banjo'.

The drifting floe which had carried them miles away from shore and at the close of winter the situation got worse. In October, the Endurance was crushed by the pressure of the ice blown up against the ship. Watching their beloved ship on her maiden voyage lose the battle with the ice was an emotional time for the men. As Shackleton wrote 'It is hard to describe what I feel. To a sailor his ship is more than a floating home… Now, straining and groaning her timbers cracking and her wounds gaping, she is slowly giving up her sentient life at the very outset of her career'. Eventually she sank. Shackleton summoned his men to inform them of the new situation and plans. Macklin wrote: 'As always with him what had happened, had happened. It was in the past and he looked to the future... [W]ithout emotion, melodrama or excitement he said 'ship and stores have gone, so now we'll go home". After they had salvaged what stores they could, the men now had camped on the ice floe. Everyone was issued new winter gear and was allowed two pounds of personal possessions. An exception was made for Hussey's banjo, which Shackleton held would provide the men with 'vital mental tonic'. All non-essential personal items needed to be left and Shackleton set the example by discarding his own personal items on the ice.

Their ship gone, only three small life boats remained to get them off the ice. The plan was to march across the ice towards open water, while dragging the boats on the sledges. However, they were to heavy and the terrain to rough. They had to endure several more months, waiting for the ice to break up in summer. They called their camp 'Patience camp'. They lived mostly on small rations of seal and penguin meat by now, with only little food they had originally brought left. They used the blubber as fuel. Shackleton was very careful about the group composition in the tents, keeping those he felt might be pessimistic or who might not get along with the others close to him in his own tent. The difference between classes was reduced even further on the ice. Shackleton was also adamant about not taking any unnecessary risks that could lead to personal injury. The plan was to launch the life boats when the ice would start breaking up and sail their way to one of the Islands. Finally, the ice started to crack. Deciding on the exact moment to leave was a crucial decision. If they left too soon the boats were likely to be frozen in again or crushed by the shifting ice, which would mean they would lose their only chance to get off the floe. Leaving too late would mean they would have drifted past the last island they could reach on to the open

ocean. In April, after having been stuck on the ice for fifteen months, they took to the life boats. Again, Shackleton had very carefully composed the three crews, again trying to keep the men he deemed problematic or inexperienced on his own boat. A harrowing journey in the three little boats of over a week followed. Bad weather, icy temperatures, and a lack of fresh water made the journey very difficult. Their small boats were in constant danger of being crushed by the ice. Precious gear was lost in the bad weather. When they were finally able to land safely on Elephant Island, it was their first time back on solid land since they had left South Georgia 497 days before. They were exhausted and several men were incapacitated with frostbite or other problems. After the landing, Shackleton was described by Wordie (Geologist) as follows: 'The Boss is wonderful, cheering everyone and far more active than any other person in camp'.

At first everyone was ecstatic to finally have solid ground underneath their feet. However, quickly the realization started to set in that even if people tried to search for them, no one would ever think to look on remote and uninhabited Elephant Island. As Shackleton describes 'some of the men were showing signs of demoralization'. Hurley describes the behavior of some of the men as 'unworthy of gentlemen and British sailors'. Those men were described as careless with the equipment and shirking duties. What happened to get those men back on track is not clear – one diary mentions in passing that 'dejected men were dragged from their bags and set to work'. Shackleton realized something needed to be done. The next day (april 20th) he announced to the men his daring and desperate plan to get rescue. He would take a small party in one of the tiny life boats and sail 800 miles across open ocean to South Georgia to get help. The carpenter strengthened one life boat (James Caird). Sailing The party of six was again carefully chosen. He took Worsley, a gifted navigator. They desperately needed such high quality navigational talents, as being only very slightly off would mean they would go right passed South Georgia, their only possible landfall. This would surely mean their demise. He also took Tom Crean, a strong man whom Shackleton was convinced would persevere to the bitter end. He also took the men whom he felt were most problematic. Second in command Wild, who was also very popular with the men, was left in command on Elephant Island. He left him a letter stating among other things: 'In the event of my not surviving the Boat Journey to South Georgia you will do your best for the rescue of the party. You are in full command from the time the boat leaves this island, and all hands are under your orders. …I have all confidence in you and always have had. … You can convey my love to my people and say I tried my best'.

The small team set sail to South Georgia. 'The tale of the next sixteen days is one of supreme strife amid heavy waters' Shackleton wrote. The men got wet and consequently frostbitten. As Worsley states that at least two of the men were close to death, and he describes how Shackleton 'kept a finger on each man's pulse. Whenever he noticed that a man seemed extra cold and shivered, he would immediately order another hot drink of milk to be prepared and served to all. He

never let the man know that it was on his account, lest he become nervous about himself'. Misty weather made navigation extremely hard. Some of their water supply had gone brackish, and the men were thirsty. Even under these conditions, Shackleton kept his optimistic outlook and joked with the men. When they finally made land, they were on the wrong side of the Island. Their tiny boat was damaged severely in a rough storm of hurricane force that tortured them the night before landing on the shore, which meant they could not attempt to sail around the island any time soon.

Shackleton decided to attempt an overland crossing, taking two of the men (Crean and Worsley). The three men started on a journey to cross the uncharted glaciers and mountains of the interior, in order to reach the whaling station on the other side of the island. The carpenter had fastened some nails to the bottom of their boots and with little more than some food and a length of rope they set out. They slogged through deep snow, climbed mountains and carefully crossed glaciers. The marched almost continuously, taking a one-minute break every quarter of an hour. With night coming in, they were at high altitude. Not having sleeping bags, they could not halt for night and needed to get down from the top of the mountain they were on. At first they tried to climb down through the snow, which went too slow. Shackleton thought it through and proposed to slide. They sat on the rope holding each other and slid. Worsley reports feeling like they were flying and truly enjoying it. At the bottom they went on. At 5 a.m. they took a rest. Crean and Worsley fell asleep. Shackleton writes 'I realized it would be disastrous if we all slumbered together. For sleep under such conditions merges into death. After five minutes shook them into consciousness again, told them they had slept for half an hour, and gave the word for a fresh start'. Hearing the steam whistle of the whaling station at 7 a.m. meant they were getting close. They had to make a steep descent on an icy slope, a dangerous undertaking which took them three hours. They stumbled on following a stream which ended in a waterfall. They used the rope to climb down and finally at three pm they arrived at the station, completely exhausted. As Shackleton later writes: 'It might have been different if we'd only had ourselves to think about. You can get so tired in the snow, particularly if you're hungry, that sleep just seems the best thing life has to give. And to sleep out there is to die, to die without any pain at all, like Keats's ideal of death But if you're a leader, a fellow that other fellows look to, you've got to keep going. That was the thought, which sailed us through the hurricane and tugged us up those mountains'.

The three men had made the crossing in only 36 hours. An amazing accomplishment. Attesting to this, in a recent documentary made about the expedition, a group of experienced mountaineers were followed who tried to retrace Shackleton's steps. It took them 3 days to complete their trek. Upon reaching the whaling station, Shackleton's primary thought is about the rescue of his men. He felt very responsible for their safety. He organized a vessel and had to wait out the worst of winter before he could finally rescue his men. On August 30th he reached Elephant Island to find them all well. He also had to go on to rescue the small group of men from the Ross

sea. This team of men had been hired to lay supplies for the transatlantic crossing. Like the Endurance, their ship (Aurora) had also gotten stuck in the ice on the other side of the continent. Their ship had survived and after being trapped in the drifting pack ice for ten months they had sailed the damaged ship to New Zealand where they awaited a relief ship. The party of ten had lost three men during the ordeal.

It would take several more years before the crossing of the Antarctic continent as envisioned by Shackleton would be completed. Shackleton died of heart failure at age 47 at the start of yet another Antarctic expedition (Quest). He had invited some of the men that were with him on the Endurance expedition to come along on the Quest expedition and several of them indeed did so. On Shackleton's last expedition, Quest, the boy scout James Marr voices his appreciation for his bosses tutelage. After Shackleton had taken the time to educate Marr about something, he states: 'With all the weight of responsibility he carried on his shoulders, and with all his worries –for he had many- he still found time to interest himself in an obscure Scout. But he was like that, I think that was one of the qualities that made him great'.

Behaviors and skills

Shackleton's story highlights several behaviors, traits and skills that characterize inspirational leaders. Inspirational behaviors and skills he showed include individualized consideration and support as well as demonstrating trust in subordinates, team-building, self-sacrificial behavior, articulation of a vision, and role-modeling. A transactional behavior he shows was performance monitoring. Below I will give a few examples for several of these behaviors. For instance, his men recorded many instances of Shackleton's individualized consideration and support. The Boss made sure to develop a personal relationship with each crew member. Especially after they were frozen in place, he put effort into this. Dr. Macklin gives one of many examples of how Shackleton practices such individualized consideration. Shackleton, when he came across a crewmember alone, 'would get into a conversation and talk to you in an intimate sort of way, asking you little things about yourself – how you were getting on, how you liked it, what particular side of the work you were enjoying most – all that sort of thing…. This communicativeness in Shackleton was one of the things his men valued in him; it was also, of course, a most effective way of establishing good relations with a very mixed company'.

Also interesting is Shackleton's self-sacrificing behavior. As his men note, he would not let them go without a comfort he was able to give, even if it meant he had to give up something of his own. For instance, when the gloves of one of his men got wet, he gave them his own, suffering frostbite of his fingers as a result. Some writers on charisma hold that such self-sacrifice is part of inspirational leadership. Self-sacrifice on part of the leader may demonstrate the leader's loyalty or model their dedication to the cause or help build trust. Self-sacrificial behaviors in a business setting include denying oneself privileges, giving up resources, refraining from using position power, sharing hardships with followers, volunteering for the most arduous tasks, assuming

blame for failures, giving up or sharing rewards (e.g. taking a temporary salary cut). In a study by Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999), self-sacrificial leader behaviors were shown to have strong effects on followers. Followers attributed charisma and legitimacy to a self-sacrificial leader and they intended to reciprocate such behavior.

Shackleton is also described as having many of the skills commonly associated with leadership (e.g. Mumford et al., 2000). He was intelligent, and being an experienced sailor and expedition leader, he was expert at the task at hand. He was good at problem solving and had strong social skills. He was also a skilled orator. Shackleton was very good at adapting his vision and the ways in which to reach his goals to the circumstances and persuading his men that his views were right. After they got stuck and lost the ship, Shackleton's one and only mission became to get his men home safely. He felt truly responsible for their fate, to an extent that one of his men describes as somewhat 'patriarchic'. He regularly got his men together to inform them about the plans and state of affairs and to tell them to keep their hopes up. James describes his speech after the Endurance sank 'He spoke to us as a group, telling us that he intended to march the party across the [ice] to the west… that he thought we ought to manage five miles a day, and that if we all worked together it could be done. The necessity seemed obvious. … I can't remember the matter being discussed or argued in any way. We were in a mess and the Boss was the man who could get us out. It is a measure of his leadership that seemed almost axiomatic'. Hussey describes the same speech as 'a characteristic speech – simple, moving, optimistic and highly effective. It brought us to our doldrums, our spirits rose, and we had our supper'.

Different authors have noted the emotional influence that leaders' visionary speeches may have (e.g. Den Hartog & Verburg, 1997). However, visions also affect what followers are thinking. One such cognitive aspect that leaders may affect is hope. Napoleon once said 'Leaders are dealers in hope'. In early work, hope was defined uni-dimensionally as an overall perception that goals can be met. More recently, it has been suggested that such goal directed thinking is made up of two components. Hope is then defined as a cognitive set based on a reciprocally derived sense of successful goal directed determination (agency) and planning of ways to meet goals (pathways) (Snyder et al., 1991). In other words, hope implies both seeing ways in which a goal might be reached and feeling motivated and able to try to pursue these routes. Hope may have important positive effects on performance. For instance, hope positively affected athletic and academic performance of student athletes (Curry, Snyder, Cook, Ruby & Rehm, 1997). Visions may be more effective when they tap into the two aforementioned aspects of hope, rather than neither or only one of these. A study to test this is being prepared. Although developing and presenting an attractive vision of the future is an important aspect of inspirational leadership, the planning, timing, and preparation involved in implementing such visions are also in need of more research. An interesting question is whether the traits, skills and behaviors involved in this phase are the same as those in the stage of arriving at a vision and if not what the consequences of this are.

Shackleton's behavior points towards several other issues in need of further research. One of these is how (inspirational) leaders deal with uncooperative or otherwise problematic subordinates. For instance, subordinates may not buy into the vision or they may not get along with the leader or others in the team. As described in the example, Shackleton kept those he deemed problematic or pessimistic close. One reason to do so was that he felt that pessimistic crew members or those that did not get along with others might create a bad atmosphere or have negative influences on others. Obviously, such interpersonal problems also exist in organizations. How do (effective) leaders in organizations deal with this issue and how do different ways of dealing with this affect the rest of the team?

Another issue is the role of 'executive constellations'. Shackleton had a trusted and loyal second in command in Frank Wild. The men also greatly respected him. Worsley notes 'Any and every duty is undertaken cheerfully and willingly and no complaint or whining is heard no matter what hardships or inconvenience may be encountered. The principal credit of this is due to the tact and leadership of the head of the expedition [Shackleton] and the cheery happiness and bonhomie of Wild [second in command]. They both command respect, confidence and affection'. Similarly, Macklin wrote 'Shackleton leant upon Frank Wild, and I have always regarded.. Wild as a sort of foreman.. Wild was a sort of intermediary too. Very often when we wanted things, instead of going to Shackleton, we went to Wild – it was a sort of instinctive thing you did. Wild was a tremendously approachable fellow, and always so outstandingly ready to help in every possible way'. In Gronn's (1999) terms the two can be seen as a 'leadership couple'. Such couples may emerge over time out of close, task-oriented working relationships between superiors and subordinates that both regard as deeply satisfying and rewarding. The existence and effectiveness of such couples is hardly studied. Gronn states that for 'a leadership coupling or dyad to be productive the duo might best comprise an "odd couple" rather than a cloned or carbon copy pair of duplicate operational styles and evenly matched psychological temperaments' (1999, p 47). Research on the role of such 'executive constellations' in leadership seems an interesting area to explore.

Traits: Optimism

Regarding his traits and other characteristics, Shackleton was first and foremost seen as an optimist. He was also very decisive and seen as a fighter. He was determined, had enormous stamina, was very cheerful, active and full of energy. He had a sense of humor. He was also called very affectionate, loyal, kind, nurturing, and caring. He demonstrated self-confidence and was willing to take risks when needed. In Shackleton's words 'optimism is true moral courage'. Almost everyone who knew him describes him as being a true optimist. As Orde-Lees wrote: 'He is always able to keep his troubles under and show a bold front. His unfailing cheeriness means a lot to a band of disappointed explorers like ourselves. In spite of his own great disappointment, and we all know that is disastrous enough, he never appears to be anything but the acme of good humour and hopefulness. He is one of the greatest

optimists living… [He] enters the lists every time with the spirit that every prize fighter enters the ring with'. Shackleton was not only seen as optimistic, he also valued optimism in his men and kept those who lost hope close so they wouldn't be able to have undue negative influence on others. Shackleton felt that optimism was important for loyalty. As he remarked to Endurance meteorologist Hussey 'Loyalty comes easier to a cheerful person than to one who carries a heavy countenance'.

Is there any scientific evidence regarding the role of optimism in leadership processes? Optimists have a favorable outlook on life, believe that good rather than bad things will happen to them, and thus are more likely than pessimists to face adversity with continued effort (e.g. Carver & Scheier, 1982; Olason & Roger, 2001). Research shows that optimism and pessimism should be seen as separate predictors of subjective well-being. For instance, optimism was found to be related to life satisfaction, but not to depression and the reverse was true for pessimism (Chang, Maydeu-Olivares & Zurilla, 1997). Research on optimism and pessimism in the leadership field is scarce. A study among 48 male business leaders and their reports by Wunderley, Reddy and Dember (1998) shows that the leaders and their direct reports were lower on pessimism than the norm group, but did not differ in optimism. The pattern of correlations between five perceived inspirational leader behaviors (LPI measure) and the leaders' optimism and pessimism scores were in the predicted direction (i.e. positive for optimism and negative for pessimism). However, the correlations were all relatively low and only two were significant (namely of leader optimism with 'inspiring a shared vision' and 'encouraging the heart', both .27). Does this mean optimism is less relevant than the Shackleton example suggests? Some recent research shows it may be to soon to draw that conclusion.

Past studies had already related optimism to positive affect and pessimism to negative affect, however, a recent study by Olason and Roger (2001) suggests the Optimism/Positive Affect – Pessimism/Negative Affect domain contains a third factor, which they label 'Fighting Spirit'. In a factor analysis all items measuring negative affect and pessimism merge in the first factor. Examples of items were 'It doesn't take much to stress me out' and 'I often imagine that the worst possible thing is about to happen'. The items referring to expectation for success, determination and endurance cluster in the second factor labeled 'Fighting Spirit'. For example 'I am a strong person' and 'I am a determined person'. Finally, all items measuring general happiness, contentment and optimism load on the third factor (Positive Affect / Optimism). For instance, 'I am a fortunate person' and 'I am easily pleased'. Returning to what is mentioned about Shackleton's character, he indeed seems to be low on Pessimism/ Negative Affect, higher on Positive Affect/Optimism and especially high on 'Fighting Spirit'. As Shackleton himself wrote in his diary: 'Difficulties are just things to overcome after all'. A crew member remarks in a dire moment, Shackleton 'was the last to admit defeat but what use is it to continue fighting against such overwhelming odds... It was enough to drive any leader to despair but Sir Ernest keeps his spirits up, outwardly at least'. In line with this, a

hypothesis that I will test is that inspirational leadership is positively related to such a fighting spirit, (rather than optimism) and negatively related to pessimism. These relationships also suggest a link between leader behavior and emotions.

Expressing emotion

Emotions are obviously important role in leader – follower relationships. Transformational leaders use the expression of emotions in order to motivate and inspire and motivate followers. These leaders are proposed to affect followers' emotional arousal (House et al., 1988). Also, the spellbinding oratory of a charismatic speaker can elicit strong emotional responses in an audience (Den Hartog & Verburg, 1997). From a trait standpoint, emotional balance and control are proposed to contribute to leader effectiveness (Bass, 1990a). Leadership also plays a role affect in groups. George (1996) holds that in line with positive and negative affect in individuals, many groups can be described as having a positive or negative affective tone (defined as a homogeneous affective reaction within the group). Leader affect can have a powerful influence on the group affective tone. This was indeed the case in the group led by expedition leader of our example, Ernest Shackleton. In the words of Endurance Captain Worsley, 'the leader's state of mind is naturally reflected in the whole party'. Leaders who themselves feel excited, energetic and enthusiastic may be more likely to positively energize their group of followers, whereas leaders feeling negative and hostile seem more likely to have a negative impact on the team (George, 1996; George & Brief, 1992). Although the idea that emotion plays an important part in leader – follower interactions seems widely shared, emotions and their causes and consequences have so far received only limited attention in leadership research.

Regarding emotions within organizations, one can distinguish between 'feeling rules' (defining what we should feel in different situations) and 'display rules' (norms guiding which emotions may or should be expressed) (e.g. Glomb & Hulin, 1998). Similarly, for both leaders and followers, one can distinguish between emotions they feel and emotions they express. These may or may not overlap. Both leaders and followers may have reasons to hide certain emotions they feel. Shackleton, for instance, in his writings clearly expresses his fear on certain instances. However, he does not share his fears or other negative emotions with his crew in order not to adversely affect his men. In turn, followers may also choose to avoid expressing certain emotions, for instance, in fear of negative evaluation. Emotions can have powerful effects on behavior, judgment, and attitudes. For instance, Lerner and Keltner (2001) found that fear and anger had opposite effects on risk perception. Fearful people expressed pessimistic risk estimates and risk-averse choices, whereas angry people (as well as happy people) expressed optimistic risk estimates and risk-seeking choices.

Feelings often result from different kinds of cognitive processing (e.g. Lazarus, 1991). For instance, many of us will feel more fear than usual on our next flight, due to the recent terrorist attacks involving hijacked planes. However, such cognitive

processes are not the only source of feelings. From a leadership perspective, an interesting issue is whether and how observing someone else's emotional expression influences a person's feelings (emotion or mood)[2]. Vocal expression of an emotion was indeed found to be able to induce the corresponding feeling in others (e.g. Hatfield, Hsee, Costello & Weisman, 1995). Neumann and Strack (2000) go one step further. They show that just being exposed to someone's voice can have similar effects. They asked participants to listen to a speech that was affectively neutral in content, but spoken in a slightly happy or sad voice. The emotional expression was found to induce a congruent mood state in listeners. They refer to this process of transferring affective feelings between persons as 'mood contagion'. Similar effects on observer mood seem likely when they are observing emotional expression in others' posture or face. Emotional expressiveness also has cognitive effects on observers. For instance, in a study assessing outcomes of trainer expressiveness, people were asked to listen to trainers' lectures varying in expressiveness. People who had heard expressive lectures were later able recall more of the lecture content than those who had heard the same lecture delivered in a non-expressive manner (Towler & Dipboye, 2001). Thus, when a leader expresses emotion (e.g. in a speech), this may help recall of the message as well as affect followers' moods or emotions.

To date, only few studies assess how a leader's emotional display affects his or her audience. Emotions can vary from negative to positive and from active to passive (Larsen & Diener, 1992). In experimental study, Lewis (2000) found that negative emotional display by leaders had a significantly negative effect on participant assessments of leader effectiveness as compared to a more neutral emotional display. Her study also suggests some interesting relationships between the emotion leaders display and follower arousal. In her study, expression of sadness (a passive emotion) by leaders seemed to lower follower arousal, whereas their anger (an active emotion) seemed to increase arousal. When expressed by a leader, anger may increase an active motivation to work hard to improve the situation, whereas sadness may lead to passive acceptance. Lewis suggests that attribution plays a role. Expressing sadness may suggest a stable cause of failure, with consequent low expectations that effort will improve the situation. Whereas anger may facilitate the attribution of blame for failure to an external, unstable cause against which timely, forceful action might be effective. Lewis also suggests that pre-existing attitudes towards leaders (such as high trust in or identification with the leader) may magnify the effects of the emotion, due to higher levels of empathy for the leader. In line with the distinctive effects that the expression of active and passive negative emotions had on others, it seems likely that expressing active positive emotions or affective states (e.g. enthusiastic, energetic) should activate followers more than expressing passive positive feelings (e.g.

[2] One view on the differentiation between emotion and mood is that emotions presuppose that a person knows the origin of the feeling, whereas moods do not depend on such knowledge (e.g. Neumann & Strack, 2000)

satisfied, content). Displaying active emotions should also lead to higher ratings of leader effectiveness. These ideas are tested in a study on leadership and emotions that I am currently undertaking.

Other effects of inspirational leadership
The effects of inspirational leaders on followers proposed by researchers in this field include: high attachment to and trust in the leader, willing obedience to the leader, heightened performance and motivation, greater group cohesion in terms of shared beliefs and low intra-group conflict and a sense of empowerment. Other outcomes that are mentioned often are commitment to the organization's goals, perceived leader effectiveness and follower's satisfaction with the leader (Den Hartog et al., 1995). The behavior of the leader in my example, Shackleton, elicited strong loyalty in his crew. As Hussey, one of Shackleton's men put it: "There was nothing petty in his [Shackleton's] own nature. The one thing he demanded was cheerfulness from us all; and what he received from each man serving under him was absolute loyalty" (Hussey, meteorologist, Endurance). Shackleton was able to create a cohesive, cooperative group out of a very diverse set of men and both he and his second in command Frank Wild commanded respect, trust, and admiration. Are these effects also found in research in organizations?

In general, charismatic/transformational leadership is expected to lead to more positive effects on subordinates than transactional leadership. Are such positive effects indeed found in organizations? Indeed, most researchers find a consistent pattern of relationships between his leadership measures and the outcome and performance measures, with transformational leadership and the outcomes being highly positively correlated and transactional leadership and the outcomes less so (Bass, 1997). Self-reports of extra effort, satisfaction with the leader and perceived leader effectiveness were often used as dependent variables in early studies. However, positive relationships with many other outcomes have also been found, including: trust in the leader; trust in management; organizational commitment; leader performance, business unit performance, subordinate/work group performance and organizational citizenship behaviors (see e.g. Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001).

A meta-analysis by Lowe, Kroeck and Sivasubramaniam (1996) shows that transformational leadership scales reliably predict work unit effectiveness, for both subordinate perceptions (.80) and (objective) organizational measures of effectiveness (.35). These relationships with effectiveness than those of transactional leadership. According to Lowe et al subordinate ratings of effectiveness may be inflated as raters would probably strive for consistency across independent and dependent variables. Indeed, logical distance is questionable. On the other hand, organizational measures are likely to be attenuated as they narrow the perspective of performance to a single measured criterion (financial indicators, percentage of goals met), rather than include the constellation of outcomes that would contribute to subordinate perceptions of

leader effectiveness (e.g. individual development, organizational learning, more ethical principles). They found that transformational leadership

In a series of projects with Lex van den Bosch, I am currently studying the impact of such leadership on stress and well-being. Again, beneficial effects of inspirational leadership are found. In a study with Marise Born and Annemarie Arensen, we found a positive relationship of such leadership with achievement motivation. Also, in her PhD project, Brigitte Ten Brink studies employee exchange relationships with the organization and also assesses the role of leadership. In the project we extend my previous research on the relationship inspirational leadership and trust and commitment by adding the role of the psychological contract into the equation (e.g. Ten Brink, Den Hartog, Koopman & Van Muijen, 1999). Leadership is also a variable in the PhD project of Michaèla Schippers in inspirational leadership as well as other variables are linked to team reflexivity and effectiveness (Schippers, Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001).

Are the effects of inspirational leadership always positive? This is not necessarily the case. Although myself and others have found a positive relationship between inspirational leadership and organizational commitment, Shamir et al. (1993) point out that this relationship is a 'double edged sword'. To the extent that the leader's values and goals are congruent with those of the organization, inspirational of leadership is likely to create a strong link between organizational goals and members' commitment to those goals. However, when leaders challenge such organizational goals, or go against them, they may well induce a negative attitude towards the organization and its goals. Similarly, the relationship with trust in management may also been characterized as a double edged sword. To the extent that inspirational leaders are seen as representatives of 'management', they should enhance trust in management. However, when these leaders are themselves going against 'management', this is not the case (Den Hartog, 1997; 2001).

Also, although transformational leaders are able to empower and develop followers, De Vries, Roe and Thailleu (1999) found a positive relationship between charismatic leadership and the need for leadership. This suggests that subordinates are more rather than less 'dependent' when a charismatic leader is present. Such increased dependency on leaders may not always be beneficial to organizations. Furthermore, inspirational leaders usually communicate high performance expectations. Such demands may lead to increased stress and burn out risks. This may especially hold for followers who are high on perfectionism. This is one of the hypotheses that will be tested in a project on perfectionism that I am currently undertaking with Jaap van Muijen. Also, charismatic leadership, by reducing in-group criticism and increasing unquestioning obedience may also have negative effects on group decision making (groupthink, Janis, 1982). Other possible negative effects in organizations include negative consequences of the impulsive, unconventional behavior, negative consequences of impression management, poor administrative practices, negative

consequences of excessive self-confidence, and failure to plan for succession (Conger, 1990; Yukl, 1998). Some writers suggest 'moral' and 'immoral' charismatic leaders exist, and that most negative effects are due to the latter. I will return to this later.

When are inspirational leaders effective?
Research assesses the effect of leader behavior on follower attitudes and performance. However, characteristics of followers may influence their perceptions and evaluations of leader behavior (and vice versa). Do subordinates prefer their leaders to be similar or different? If different, on which dimensions? And, similarly, what do leaders prefer? On some dimensions, we might expect that 'opposites attract'. For instance, more insecure subordinates may prefer self-confident leaders and dominant leaders may prefer submissive subordinates. In other cases, such relationships are less clear cut. Some traits may lead people to perceive others' behavior differently or for the same behavior to have different effect. For instance, introverted followers may interpret or evaluate the same leader behavior in a different manner than extroverted followers. The aspects that followers admire and respect are likely to reflect the leader's characteristics and behavior. For instance, in student groups, extraversion was found to predict social status (Anderson, John, Keltner & Kring, 2001). However, they are also likely to reflect their own personality and strengths and weaknesses. For instance, such a relationship between perceived social status in a group and extraversion may be stronger for those who are insecure about their social skills. As they themselves may have trouble in situations that the more extroverted people thrive in, they may admire such a quality even more and attribute them more status. Similarly, as no one is perfect, assessing which faults leaders are 'allowed' to have by followers without hampering their effectiveness (and how this relates to follower characteristics) seems interesting. Meindl (1990) has also suggested that some people are more 'prone' to attributing charisma to leaders than others.

These remarks on the interplay between leader and follower characteristics show that inspirational leader behavior is not expected to be equally successful in different situations. For instance, the Shackleton example mostly describes leadership in a crisis situation. 'I always found him rising to his best and inspiring confidence when things were at their blackest' Frank Hurley (Photographer, Endurance) states. According to Macklin, Shackleton was on the bridge 'always .. especially when things were difficult or dangerous'. Crisis or environmental uncertainty is indeed seen by many as one of the conditions under which inspirational leadership can have its far reaching effects. This also holds in organizations. A recent study compared the effects of transactional and charismatic CEO leadership on financial performance of organizations over time. This study shows that charismatic (but not transactional) leadership of CEOs significantly affects objectively measured financial performance of 48 Fortune 500 firms over a four year time period. However, this only held under conditions of environmental uncertainty, not under conditions of certainty (Waldman, Ramirez, House & Puranam, 2001).

Beyond follower characteristics and crisis or environmental uncertainty, other conditions under which people or organizations are more receptive to inspirational leadership and/or such leadership is more effective have also been suggested. Examples include organic and flexible organizational structures, conditions of clan control, supportive and innovative organizational cultures, weak psychological conditions (e.g. when performance goals cannot easily be set and measured, means to achieve goals are unclear and extrinsic rewards are not easily linked to individual performance), unstructured and non-routine tasks (e.g. Bass, 1985; Den Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1996; Pawar & Eastman, 1997; Shamir et al., 1993). The criterion used to assess effectiveness and the hierarchical level of the leader may also make a difference in this respect. In other words, inspirational leadership may have a positive impact on attitudes in almost all situations. However, the impact on hard measures of performance may be limited to situations in which there is sufficient room for the leader's behavior to make a difference. Differences in national culture may also impact leader behavior and its effectiveness.

Cross-cultural perspectives: leadership around the world

We are confronted with leadership almost daily, either in our job context or through the media. As a result, we all have (often implicit) ideas about what kind of characteristics leaders should have or should not have and what leaders should or should not do. Such so-called implicit leadership theories refer to beliefs held about how leaders behave in general and what is expected of them (Eden & Leviatan, 1975). Being perceived as a leader acts as a prerequisite for being able to go beyond a formal role in influencing others (Lord & Maher, 1991). But when is one seen as a leader? Or as an effective or ineffective leader? Different cultural groups may have a different ideas regarding what leaders 'look like' and what they should or should not do. Also, the evaluation and meaning of many leader behaviors and characteristics may vary across cultures. For instance, in a culture which endorses an authoritarian style of leadership, leader sensitivity might be interpreted as weak, whereas in cultures endorsing a more nurturing style sensitivity may be a prerequisite to be seen as a leader (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, Dorfman and co-authors, 1999). This has implications for inspirational leadership and its effectiveness. Are characteristics associated with this type of leadership perhaps only typical of 'Western' countries?

There is a strong North American bias in leadership research. Research conducted elsewhere often directly applies leadership models and measures developed in the US. These are often translated and used abroad without much adaptation. For example, Bass and Avolio's famous MLQ measure, tapping transactional and transformational leadership, has been used in many different countries (Bass, 1997). Among these the Netherlands (Den Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997). However, the applicability of concepts and their measurement in a non-US context should not be taken for granted (e.g. Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991). 'In a Global perspective, US management theories contain a number of idiosyncrasies not necessarily shared by management

elsewhere. Three such idiosyncrasies are mentioned: A stress on market processes, a stress on the individual and a focus on managers rather than workers' (Hofstede, 1993, p.81). Many cultures do not share these assumptions. There is a need for a better understanding of the way in which leadership is enacted in various cultures and for an empirically grounded theory to explain differential leader behavior and effectiveness across cultures (House, 1995). In research on inspirational leadership, for instance, I found that in the Netherlands different transformational leader behaviors are highly correlated with a measure of participation in decision making (Den Hartog, 1997). Ashkenasy and Falkus (2002) suggest this also holds in Australia, due to the ubiquitous value Australians place on egalitarianism. Bass (1990b), however, holds that transformational leadership can take more as well as less participative forms. An explanation may lie in the difference in culture. In highly egalitarian societies, to be seen as transformational, leaders may need to be more participative than in high power distance societies (Den Hartog et al, 1999).

Several studies have focused on culture-based differences in leadership prototypes or implicit theories of leadership. In other words, what do effective leaders 'look like' outside the US? Can we distinguish leader behaviors and characteristics that are universally accepted and effective across cultures as well as behaviors and characteristics that are differentially accepted and effective across cultures? In many countries a preference for transformational rather than transactional leadership has been found (Bass, 1997). Thus, an interesting issue is whether characteristics associated with inspirational leadership are seen as effective across cultures. This is one of the questions studied in the on-going GLOBE research program. GLOBE is a long-term study directed toward the development of systematic knowledge concerning how societal and organizational cultures affect leadership and organizational practices (House et al., 1999). Approximately 60 countries from all major regions of the world participate in GLOBE, making it the most extensive investigation of cross-cultural aspects of leadership to date. The project was originated by Robert House who has led 'the coordinating team' based in the United States. Besides the coordinating team approximately 150 social scientists from around the world are responsible for managing the project and collecting data in their respective countries[3].

After developing valid measures, data was collected on leadership, organizational and societal culture. Over 15.000 middle managers from approximately 800 organizations in the financial, food and/or telecommunications industries in 60 countries were asked to describe leader attributes and behavior that they perceived to enhance or impede outstanding leadership. Some first results of the GLOBE study report which leadership attributes are universally endorsed as contributing to outstanding leadership, which are universally seen as undesirable and which are culturally contingent (Den Hartog et al.,

[3] The Dutch team for this phase of the research was composed of Deanne Den Hartog, Paul Koopman, Henk Thierry and Celeste Wilderom..

1999). Contributing to outstanding leadership in all cultures were several attributes reflecting integrity, (i.e. trustworthy, just and honest) contributes to outstanding leadership in all participating countries. Also, an outstanding leader shows many attributes reflecting charismatic, inspirational and visionary leadership, (i.e. an outstanding leader is encouraging, positive, motivational, a confidence builder, dynamic, and having foresight). Team oriented leadership is also universally seen as important (i.e. such a leader is effective in team building, communicating and coordinating). Finally, other items that are universally endorsed include excellence oriented, decisive, intelligent and win-win problem solver (Den Hartog et al., 1999). The GLOBE study also shows that several attributes are universally viewed as ineffective or in other words as impediments to outstanding leadership. These include being a loner, being non-cooperative, ruthless, non-explicit, irritable, and dictatorial. Finally, many leadership attributes were found to be culturally contingent, i.e. a high positive rating was obtained in some and a low or even negative rating in other cultures. For instance, country means for the attribute enthusiastic range from 3.72 to 6.44 on a seven point scale. Country means for risk taking range from 2.14 to 5.96, for sensitive from 1.96 to 6.35, for class-conscious from 2.53-6.09 and for autonomous from 1.63-5.17 (see Den Hartog et al., 1999, 241, for the complete list).

Besides testing the overall 'global' hypotheses, the GLOBE data are also suited to look at regional differences. Studies by Brodbeck, Frese et al (2000) and Koopman, Den Hartog, Konrad et al (1999), for instance, focus on the European results. On most culture dimensions there is considerable variance within Europe, in other words there is no typical 'European culture'. Generally speaking, two broad clusters of cultures are found in Europe, namely a North/Western cluster and a South/Eastern cluster. The North/West scored significantly higher on culture dimensions such as Achievement Orientation, Future Orientation and Uncertainty Avoidance. The South/East scored significantly higher on Assertiveness and Power Distance. Interesting differences between the North/West and the South/East were also found on leadership profiles. South/Eastern Europe places higher value on: Administrative Competence, Autocratic, Conflict Inducing, Diplomatic, Face Saving, Non-Participative, Procedural, Self-Oriented, and Status-Conscious. In the North/West characteristics such as Inspiring and Integrity are seen as more important. Following the distinction between personal and position power (Bass, 1960), one might conclude that in the South/East of Europe the importance of position power is emphasized, whereas in the North/West there is a stronger emphasis on the (use of) personal power. GLOBE data are also used for in-depth comparisons between countries. Such comparison of leader attributes in The Netherlands and Poland shows that, in line with the European results, the Dutch value attributes associated with integrity and inspirational leader behavior more than the Polish respondents. Visionary qualities score high in both countries. Diplomacy and administrative skills (i.e. being orderly, well-organized and a good administrator) are considered more important in Poland. The Polish managers also have a less negative attitude towards autocratic leader behavior and status consciousness than the Dutch managers (Den Hartog, Koopman, Thierry, Wilderom, Maczynski & Jarmuz, 1997).

The GLOBE results show a 'universal' preference for certain leadership attributes. However, this does not mean such attributes will necessarily be enacted in the same way across cultures. For example, Bass (1997, 132) states that 'Indonesian inspirational leaders need to persuade their followers about the leaders' own competence, a behavior that would appear unseemly in Japan'. However, he goes on to state that, not withstanding the fact that it can be expressed in different ways, the concept of inspiration appears 'to be as universal as the concept of leadership itself'. Similar examples of enacting positively valued attributes in a different manner across cultures were found in the qualitative part of the GLOBE research (media analyses, interviews and focus groups). For instance, Martinez and Dorfman (1998) performed the study in Mexico. An example of behavior that was highly valued by the Mexicans, but might not be appropriate in other contexts was the high degree of involvement of leaders in the private lives of their employees. An example from their interviews is a leader calling the doctor when the husband of an employee was in hospital to make sure an operation was legitimate. Such a behavior might be seen as an invasion of privacy in other countries. Such examples clearly show that even though 'consideration' or 'compassion' may be evaluated positively in many cultures, the behaviors that are 'appropriate' and will be seen as indicative of such consideration or compassion may vary strongly across cultures (Den Hartog et al., 1999). More research on these culture specific enactments of more general principles is needed. Future research that will ensue from the GLOBE project includes a cross-cultural comparison of CEO leader behavior and motive profiles in approximately 25 countries. We are currently gathering the data for this study[4]. Another interesting question that remains is whether in order to be effective and to elicit attributions of charisma, leaders need to act in accordance with the culturally endorsed implicit theory of leadership. When may leaders deviate from such norms and still be seen as effective? Such questions on cross-cultural differences in leadership offer interesting avenues for future research.

Destructive leadership

Scott Adams (1999), the creator of Dilbert, states we should all be thankful for the lack of leadership in the world, as 'the only reason for leadership is to convince people to do things that are either dangerous (like invading another country) or stupid (working extra hard without extra pay)'. He goes on to state that 'you don't need much leadership to lead you to, for example, eat a warm cookie. ... Generally speaking, whenever there is leadership, there is lots of hollering and few warm cookies'. Literature on interactional justice, stress, trust, employee deviance, and the violation of psychological contracts also suggest that leader behavior is not only a powerful source of positive effects, but that leaders may also have detrimental effects.

[4] Besides Deanne Den Hartog, Paul Koopman, Henk Thierry and Celeste Wilderom, the extended team for the CEO study also includes Annebel de Hoogh, Peter van den Bergh and Joost van der Weide.

As stated, transactional and transformational leadership behaviors cover three domains: the proposed change, purpose or mission, the maintenance of relationships and development of others and task accomplishment (e.g. Yukl, 1998). One way in which leaders can be ineffective is by not taking any of the responsibilities that come with their leadership role. In research, active leader behaviors such as transactional and transformational behaviors, are often contrasted with passive or laissez faire leadership. Passive leaders are inactive rather than proactive or reactive. They shirk responsibility and avoid decision making. Even small problems may develop into chronic issues. Such passive leadership correlates negatively with the more active forms of leadership (both transactional and transformational) and also correlates negatively with many positive effects on follower attitudes, such as commitment and trust and performance (e.g. Den Hartog, 1997). In contrast, passive leadership does correlate positively with worrying (Den Hartog & Van Den Bosch, 2001).

Much of what I presented reflects a very positive view of inspirational leadership and its effects. However, a danger of inspirational leadership lies in its possible misuse to work towards immoral ends. As archbishop Thomas Becket, the protagonist of 'Murder in the Cathedral' by poet T.S. Eliot, declares: "The last temptation is the greatest treason: to do the right deed for the wrong reason… For those who serve the greatest cause may make the cause serve them" (Eliot, 1964, p.30). Leader's acts that on the surface appear selfless and transformational, may actually serve a fundamentally selfish and manipulative purpose. As such, transformational leader behaviors may result in exploitation and oppression rather than the empowerment of others (Carey, 1992). Although some describe this type of leadership as value neutral, others hold it is essentially moral. Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) distinguish between authentic and pseudo transformational leadership on the basis of the moral character of the leaders and their concern for self and others; the ethical values embedded in the leaders' vision and the morality of the social programs and actions collectively pursued by leader and followers. In a similar vein, House and Howell (1992) contrast socialized and personalized charismatic leadership and Conger (1990) between positive and negative charismatic leadership. Such distinctions are made to account for the fact that there are many leaders of religious sects and political leaders who are seen by their followers as charismatic, but who ultimately had immoral goals or means. When contrasting such 'types' based on such a moral dimension, one must be careful not to assign all the 'good' or pleasant traits and behaviors to the positive and 'bad' or undesirable traits to the negative leaders (see also Den Hartog, 1997). The morality dimension is mostly linked to the change, purpose or mission of the leader.

In the relationship or person domain, destructive behavior mostly seems to take the form of unfair treatment and manipulation of subordinates. Taking credit for subordinates' work, blaming them for failures, favoritism, teasing or publicly criticizing them and treating people unfairly or with disrespect are examples. In the task related domain, such destructive behaviors are mostly related to incompetence.

Not knowing the subject matter, being overly focused on details and losing sight of the big picture, giving wrong directives.

Briefly returning to the issue of emotions, one aspect that stands out and is the intense and often enduring negative emotional experience of being treated badly by others and especially superiors at work. Being treated badly leads to experiencing feelings such as shame, powerlessness, distress, embarrassment, and especially anger. Such emotions will likely influence subsequent behaviors. Only few studies explicitly address this issue.

Fitness (2000) studied anger eliciting events in the workplace. She asked 175 participants to describe workplace anger experiences involving superiors, co-workers, and subordinates. She reports that the largest overall category (44%) was being directly and unjustly treated by the other person. Examples were being falsely accused of lying or poor performance, being unjustly criticized, having a reasonable request denied or being given an onerous workload. Thus, perceived unfairness and injustice of how one is treated by someone else seems the most common experience that elicits anger in the workplace. The second largest category (23%) were morally reprehensive behaviors such as the observed person being dishonest, in terms of telling lies, stealing or cheating (for instance, on expenses or regarding hours worked), being lazy or being late frequently, or taking advantage of others. Although some of these behaviors invoke anger because they directly affect the respondent (e.g. a co-workers laziness meaning they have to work harder), others invoked anger even though they did not directly affect the respondent. Such incidents involved a general sense of fairness and morals ('it is wrong to do that'). The third category (15%) involved job incompetence, for instance, mistakes or behavior hampering respondents' ability to get their work done or that cost the company money or goodwill. Even when mistakes were not intentional, they can anger others, especially when the offender fails to perceive how serious the situation is. The fourth category (11%) describes perceptions that the other acted in an arrogant or disrespectful manner. Demeaning, rude or condescending remarks ('be a good little girl') elicit anger. One did not personally have to be on the receiving end, observing an offender treat others (especially subordinates) dismissively or rudely also enraged respondents. The final, smallest category (7%) involves incidents were the respondent was publicly humiliated by the offending person. Examples were joking about someone's ability or appearance and public criticism, especially in front of customers or subordinates.

Fitness also found that various features of the anger episodes differed according to the power and status of the respondent, with superiors being angered more often by morally reprehensible behaviors and job incompetence, co-workers being angered more often by morally reprehensible behaviors and public humiliation, and subordinates mostly being angered by unjust treatment. Subordinates were less likely than superiors to confront the anger target and the majority reported they feared the consequences of expressing their feelings to a more powerful offender. In contrast,

respondents having been angered by their subordinate usually reported confronting the subordinate in order to 'sort things out' or even intimidate them (let them know who's in charge). Subordinates were also more likely to consider the incident unresolved.

Fitness went on to categorize respondents' behavior occurring after the anger eliciting events. Reported behaviors were coded into five categories: constructive behaviors (accepting apologies, negotiating a resolution), emotional withdrawal (ignoring, staying cold, 'silent treatment'), quitting as a result of the event, 'legitimate' punishment (involving unions, organizing dismissal or transfer), and revenge or illegitimate punishment (spreading gossip, assigning people to undesirable tasks, sabotage such as hiding documents, working slowly on urgent matters, or deliberately lowering quality of output). Again, some significant status differences were found in these behavior types. For instance, those angered by their subordinates more often reported they took constructive action. No such status differences were found for seeking revenge. One reason for this may be that there is a dispositional factor involved in the extent to which people seek revenge after being the victim of an offense. In a study among undergraduate students, measures of the Big Five personality factors explained 30% of the variance in vengefulness (the disposition to seek revenge following interpersonal offenses). Vengefulness was positively associate with neuroticism and negatively with agreeableness. Vengefulness was also negatively correlated with less forgiving (both cross-sectionally and over time), greater rumination about the offense, higher negative affectivity, and lower life satisfaction (McCullough, Bellah, Kilpatrick & Johnson, 2001). A study by Aquino, Tripp and Bies (2001) in the workplace shows that the attribution of blame was positively associated with revenge behavior and negatively with seeking reconciliation. More research on such processes in the workplace is needed.

Finally, Fitness also categorized the anger eliciting experiences that respondents reported in humiliating and non-humiliating events. To be coded as humiliating, respondents had to have mentioned feeling ashamed, humiliated or embarrassed, feeling 'put down', diminished or ridiculed, wanting to hide or feeling uncomfortable about others knowing about the events. Overall 38% of the events were coded as humiliating and again a status effect was found, where offences committed by superiors or co-workers more often being humiliating in nature than those committed by a subordinate. Although anger intensity did not differ for the two categories, respondents did report more feelings of hate in response to humiliating events. Reported hatred intensity (but not anger intensity) was negatively associated with feelings of resolution of the incident.

Thus, leader behavior can clearly elicit anger and other negative feelings and behaviors. This is likely to hold true for different categories of leader behavior. First and likely to lead to most intense negative and emotional effects is personally being mistreated by one's leader, especially when the leader's behavior is felt to be

humiliating. However, negative reactions – although perhaps less intense - can also result from other situations. Observing the leader treat others badly, seeing the leader act incompetently or unethically, and the leader not taking action when co-workers commit offences will likely also invoke negative emotions in subordinates. Especially when such behaviors occur more frequently. Being publicly criticized for a mistake, for instance, may result in a feelings of shame. Anger will likely result if one is unjustly treated or one's peers are unfairly treated by the leader. Similarly being the target of the leader's jokes may lead to intense embarrassment and to hurt feelings. Over time, superiors' behaviors that are felt to be humiliating or extremely unfair to the employees personally are expected to lead to intense feelings of dislike and even hate towards their superiors. These effects should be most intense when subordinates attribute malicious intent to the leader. Such hatred is likely to result in increased dysfunctional or vengeful behavior or quitting on part of employees. Although non-humiliating behaviors may have less effect on feelings of hatred, such events may have other negative effects. Subordinates are less likely to trust leaders who frequently act incompetently, unethically or do not deal with problems. In the long run, such non-humiliating anger eliciting events may lead to cynicism towards the offending leader. Such a cynical attitude may generalize to organizational cynicism (e.g. Dean, Brandes & Dharwadkar, 1988). This is most likely when employees perceive that management does not do anything about the problematic behavior of supervisor (especially when subordinates have called attention to the problems through legitimate channels or this information is obviously known to higher levels through other channels). Organizational cynicism has, for instance, been shown to be related to negative intentions on part of employees to perform citizenship behaviors (Andersson & Bateman, 1997).

The consequences (especially the long term ones) of eliciting such negative emotions in hierarchical relationships have not yet received sufficient attention. However, as interactions between leaders and followers occur over time and are not single events, knowing about which behaviors elicit which emotions and what the long term effects are, is important. Also, the literature on psychological contract and trust violation shows that such violations often have serious consequences. Once broken, rebuilding trust is very difficult. Given the central role trust in the leader is proposed to play for (inspirational) leadership to have positive effects on subordinates, this is an important issue that needs to be explored in leadership research.

So far in this address, I have tried to describe the nature of inspirational leadership in terms of behaviors, traits, skills as well as its effects and the role of culture. I have also tried to illustrate several of the things we need to learn more about. Finally, I outlined some ideas on destructive leadership. Although it is impossible to be comprehensive on inspirational leadership in a short paper, one question remains. Is there a future for such leadership within our changing world of organizations?

Is there a future for (inspirational) leadership?

The developing information technology, increasing globalization and other currents of change are influencing work and organizations as we know them in a pervasive and long-lasting manner (e.g. Howard, 1995; Davis, 1995). Among the fundamental changes in organizations is the increasing use of teams to make decisions and more generally the increased importance of teams and other lateral organizing mechanisms (Guzzo, 1995; Mohrman & Cohen, 1995). To meet increased customer demands and growing competition, organizations need to become more and more flexible. As a result, boundaries between units within the organization and between the organization and elements in its external environment decrease (Davis, 1995; Shamir, 1999). Increasingly, organizations are comprised of temporary systems whose elements (people as well as technology) are assembled and disassembled according to the shifting needs of specific projects. People shift from team to team or work in multiple teams at the same time. In such situations, organizations can no longer rely on the traditional hierarchy, which makes managing and coordinating the efforts of employees harder. Leaders do not have the same level of formal power they derived from their position in the former strict hierarchies (Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001). Also, the content of work itself is changing. As House (1995) notes, much 21st century work will be intellectual rather than physical. Observing, monitoring and controlling, in other words direct supervision of such tasks will be very difficult.

Will such developments lead to a less pronounced role for leaders in future organizations as some predict? If organizations become increasingly flexible, will a single person taking on the 'leadership role' become obsolete? Shamir (1999) describes several possible scenarios implying a reduced importance of the role of leadership in the 21st century. One such scenario is 'disposable leadership'. As organizations increasingly rely on temporary arrangements (e.g. project teams), leadership itself will become such a temporary arrangement, and will as such be limited in scope and duration. The group member with the most relevant task related knowledge would then be the leader in carrying out that specific task. People may work in multiple teams simultaneously, taking a leadership role in one and a member role in another. A similar scenario is the idea of shared, distributed, peer or collective leadership. The common element in these ideas about how leadership will look in the future is that leadership will not be concentrated in the hands of one single 'heroic' leader or a limited small group, but that it will be divided and performed by many or all team members simultaneously or sequentially (Shamir, 1999). The idea behind 'self-managed teams' also implies such a transfer of the leadership responsibility from an individual to the team as a whole (e.g. Barker, 1993). A third scenario implying a reduction of the importance of leadership is what Shamir and Ben-Ari (1999) refer to as 'teleleadership'. The increasing use of computer mediated technologies and group decision support systems may enhance the importance of leadership functions that relate to the transmission of information between leader and group members. It may also reduce the distance between top- and lower levels in the organization and enable more effective communication between those parties.

However, the role of leaders is obviously reduced to more cognitive elements (managing information flow) rather than the social, human and emotional elements of leadership. Whether it is possible to identify with or trust leaders with whom one only communicates electronically is yet unclear (Shamir, 1999).

There are some problems with these scenarios. For instance, in practice, self-management does not always yield the positive results. Also, identifying with a professional group, organization or team increases commitment to that group and its goals and implies adherence to a pattern of values shared within such a group. Belonging to multiple groups with unclear boundaries may lead to identity problems (Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001). House (1995) notes that the non-routine tasks of the future will require problem solving, individual initiative, innovative behavior and motivation as well as a willingness to take on personal responsibility for getting the task done on part of employees. The increased uncertainty and pace of change may be accompanied with increased feelings of uncertainty and anxiety on part of organization members. A sense of psychological safety is essential for showing innovative behavior (West & Altink, 1996). Creating such a sense of safety and clarity and increasing motivation, identification and commitment seem likely to remain important leadership functions in tomorrow's organizations.

As Shamir summarizes, 'boundaryless, flattened, flexible, project-based and team-based organizations that employ temporary, externalized and remote workers, whose tasks are more intellectual and less routine and cannot be controlled and coordinated by structure or direct supervision, need mechanisms of coordination through shared meaning systems, a shared sense of purpose, and high member commitment to shared values' (1999, p 59). Therefore, boundaryless organizations are likely to need strong leadership to perform integrative functions. Such integrative functions are less likely to be performed by movable or disposable leaders. Leaders have played an important role in promoting change and innovation and challenging the status quo in stable environments. In contrast, it may well be that in tomorrow's unstable environments the role of leaders is different. In such an environment leaders may have to balance the emphasis on change with providing (a sense of) stability and continuity. They may need to (more actively) establish and maintain collective identities in the absence of traditional identity forming boundaries (Shamir, 1999). Lissack and Roos (2001) hold that when one's world is unstable and unpredictable, being coherent is more important than being visionary. Personally, I feel that is too strong a statement. Although the content of effective visions in the future may emphasizing stability as well as change, the potentially positive role of well thought out, well articulated and well implemented ideological visions for organizational effectiveness remains. Our future research will tell.

Concluding remarks

Being appointed to this position at my age is special and one does not get there alone. I would like to thank all those who have now or in the past contributed to my ability to be here.

First of all, I am grateful to the Distinguished Board of Erasmus University Rotterdam (College van Bestuur) for the confidence and opportunity they have given me to work as a professor at the Erasmus University and I am looking forward to fulfilling my duties here. I am also grateful to the selection committee for their confidence in me.

I would like to thank the NWO who are financing the first four years of this chair from their van der Leeuw program. The NWO Van der Leeuw program gives the younger generation a chance to learn and develop into their new role under the guidance of those who are more experienced. Over the past year prof.dr. Jaap Paauwe and prof.dr. Roger Williams have played such a role. They are always available to answer question, but don't interfere with my choices. Both this and the wonderful way in which they help me to start feeling 'at home' at the Erasmus University are greatly appreciated. I look forward to working with you in the future.

Both the current Dean of the Faculty of Economics prof.dr. Ed Vosselman, and the former Dean prof.dr. Harm Bart have made me feel very welcome in my new role. I am grateful for that. I would also like to thank all of my colleagues in the department of Marketing and Organization. You make the department a fun place to work, that I look forward to going to. You have all made me feel very welcome and I appreciate this very much. I look forward to working together on projects as well as the many social times that I am sure will follow in the future.

A special word of thanks for the colleagues in the unit of organizational psychology, Roger Williams, Norman Schreiner and Ludwig Hoeksema. Working with you to create an interesting organizational psychology program is a wonderful experience. I also want to thank the EUR students in our program, your interest in and enthusiasm for the psychological processes in organizations makes me realize even more how special and important both my job and the field I study really are.

A special word of thanks also to my promotors prof.dr. Pieter Drenth and prof.dr. Paul Koopman, as well as co-promotor prof.dr. Jaap van Muijen. You have played a significant role in my development over the years. I hope to be able to continue to work with you in the future.

My colleagues and former colleagues at the Free University are special people, who continue to support me and challenge me. I have always felt very much at home among them. I also thoroughly enjoy working with my PhD students Brigitte Ten Brink, Michaèla Schippers and Annebel de Hoogh at the Free University and hope we will

continue to do so for many years to come. I also look forward to the new PhD project that is about to start here at the Erasmus.

Many colleagues in the field both in The Netherlands and beyond have made this work even more interesting and enjoyable. I thank you all for the interesting discussions as well as the social time we spend together. A special word of thanks in this respect for the GLOBE team.

Friends make me realize that there is indeed a time to work and a time to play. I thank you for understanding that my personal work-life balance has not always favored play. My family is very dear to me. I thank you for your continued love and support. Also, Roberts family I thank for the warm way in which they have always treated me. Finally, Robert I cannot thank enough for all his support and enthusiasm. Having someone believe in you even when at times you doubt yourself is a very special gift. Fortunately, we still work together as colleagues on several research projects and publications, so I can make this a mostly professional word of appreciation and save the more personal words for later.

Ik heb gezegd, thank you very much.

REFERENCES

Alexander, C. (2001). *The Endurance: Shackleton's legendary Antarctic expedition*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Anderson, C. Oliver, P.J., Keltner, D. & Kring, A.M. (2001). Who attains social status? Effects of personality and fysical attractiveness in social groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81,* 116-132.

Andersson, L.M. & Bateman, T.S. (1997). Cynicism in the workplace: some causes and consequences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18,* 449-469.

Aquino, K., Tripp, T.M. & Bies, R.J. (2001). How employees respond to personal offense: The effects of blame attribution, victim status and offender status on revenge and reconciliation in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 52-59.

Ashkenasy, N.M. & Falkus, S. (2002) . The Australian enigma. In: R.J. House & J.Chhokkar (eds). Cultures of the world: A GLOBE anthology of in-depth descriptions of cultures, in progress.

Barker, J.R. (1993) Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 38: 408-437.

Bass, B.M. (1960) *Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior.* New York: Free Press.

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

Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial applications*, *3rd edn*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1990b). Editorial: toward a meeting of minds. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*.

Bass, B.M. (1997). Does the transactional - transformational paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist, 52(2)*: 130-139.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1989). Potential biases in leadership measures: how prototypes, leniency and general satisfaction relate to ratings and rankings of transformational and transactional leadership constructs. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 49:* 509-527.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development, 4:* 231-272.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership a response to critiques. In: M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman (eds.) *Leadership theory and research.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J. & Atwater, L. (1996). The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women. *Applied Psychology: An international Review, 45 (1):* 5-34.

Bass, B.M. & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leader behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 10,* 181-218.

Bickel, L. (2001). *Shackleton's forgotten men.* New York: Thunder's Mouth Press

and Balliett & Fitzgerald. An Adrenaline Classics Book.
Boyacigiller, N. and Adler, N. (1991). The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context. *Academy of Management Review, 16:* 262-290.
Brodbeck, F.C., Frese, M., …Den Hartog, D., et al. (2000). Cultural variation of Leadership prototypes across 22 European countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, 1-29.
Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and Leadership in organizations***.** London: Sage.
Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
Carey, M.R. (1992). Transformational and the fundamental option for self-transcendence. *Leadership Quarterly, 3,* 217-236.
Carver, C.S. & Scheier, M.F. (1982). Control theory: a useful conceptual framework for personality, social, clinical and health psychology. *Psychological Bulletin, 92,* 111-135.
Chang, E.Z. Maydeu-Olivares, A. & Zurilla, T.J.D.(1997). Optimism and pessimism as partially independent constructs: relationship to positive and negative affectivity and psychological well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 23,* 433-440.
Choi, Y & Mai-Dalton, R.R. (1999). The model of followers'responses to self-sacrificial leadership: An empirical test. *Leadership Quarerly, 10*, 397-421.
Conger, J.A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 1990,* 44-55.
Conger, J.A. & Kanungo, R.N. (1988). Behavioral dimensions of charismatic leadership. In: J.A.Conger & R.N.Kanungo (eds). *Charismatic Leadership: the Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Curry, L.A., Snyder, C.R., Cook, D.L. Ruby, B.C. & Rehm, M. (1997). Role of hope in academic and sport achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psyhology, 73,* 1257- 1267.
Davis, D.D. (1995) Form, function and strategy in boundaryless organizations. In: A.Howard (ed.) *The changing nature of work.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
Dean, J.W., Brandes, P. & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *Academy of Management Review, 23,* 341-352.
Den Hartog, D.N. (1997) *Inspirational leadership*. VU doctoral dissertation. KLI-dissertation series,1997-nr 2. Enschede: Ipskamp.
Den Hartog, D.N., House, R.J., Hanges, P., Dorfman, P., Ruiz-Quintanilla, A., and 159 co-authors (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally endorsed implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *LeadershipQuarterly*, 10(2): 219-256.
Den Hartog, D.N. & Koopman, P.L. (2001). Leadership in organizations. In: Anderson, N., Ones, D.S., Kepir – Sinangil, H. & Viswesvaran, C. (eds.). *International handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology, volume 2*. London: Sage.

Den Hartog D.N., P.L. Koopman & J.J. Van Muijen (1997). *Inspirerend leiderschap inorganisaties.* Schoonhoven: Academic Service.

Den Hartog, D.N., Koopman, P.L., Thierry, Hk., Wilderom, C.P.M., Maczynski, J. & Jarmuz, S. (1997). Dutch and Polish perceptions of leadership and national culture: The GLOBE project. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology,6(4),* 389-415,.

Den Hartog, D.N., Koopman, P.L. & Van Muijen, J.J. (1995). Charismatic leadership; A State of the Art. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 2(4):* 35-50.

Den Hartog, D.N. & Van den Bosch, A.M. (2001). A healthy style of leadership? Relating transformational and transactional leadership to stress and well-being. *Working paper*.

Den Hartog, D.N., Van Muijen, J.J. & Koopman, P.L. (1996). Linking transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 3(4),* 68-83.

Den Hartog, D.N., Van Muijen, J.J. & Koopman, P.L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70(1):* 19-34.

Den Hartog D.N. & Verburg, R.M. (1997). Charisma and Rhetoric: The communicative techniques of international business leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, *8(4):* 355-391.

Deluga, R.J. (1997). Relationship among American presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism and rated performance. *Leadership Quarterly, 8,* 49-65.

De Vries, R.E., Roe, R.A. & Taillieu, T.C.B. (1999). On charisma and need for leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology,* 8, 109-127.

Eden, D. & Leviatan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60:* 736-741.

Fiol, C.M., Harris, D. & House, R.J. (1999). Charismatic leadership: Strategies for effecting social change. *Leadership Quarterly, 10,* 449-482.

Fitness, J. (2000). Anger in the workplace: an emotion script approach to anger episodes between workers and their supervisors, co-workers and subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21,* 147-162.

George, J. M. (1996). Group affective tone. In: M. West (ed.) *Handbook of work group psychology*. Chichester: Wiley.

George, J.M. & Brief, A. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: a conceptual analysis of the mood at work-spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 310-329.

Glomb, T. M. & Hulin, C.L. (1997). Anger and gender effects in observed supervisor-subordinate dyadic interactions, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 72,* 281-307.

Gronn, P. (1999). Substituting for leadership: The neglected role of the leadership couple. *Leadership QuarterLy, 10*, 63-113.

Guzzo, R.A. (1995) Introduction: At the intersection of team effectiveness and

decision making. In: R.A. Guzzo and E. Salas (eds.). *Team effectiveness and decision making in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
Hater, J.J. & Bass, B.M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73:* 695-702.
Hatfield, E., Hsee, C., Costello, J. & Weisman, M.S. (1995). The impact of vocal feedback on emotional experience and expression. *Journal of Social Bevahior and Personality, 10*, 293-312.
Hofstede G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive, 7,* 81-94.
House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In: J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (eds), *Leadership: the Cutting Edge:* 189-204. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
House, R.J. (1995). Leadership in the 21st century: A speculative enquiry. In: Howard, A. (ed.) *The changing nature of work*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
House, R.J. (1996). Path-Goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly, 7(3):*323-352.
House, R.J., Delbecq, A. & Taris, T.W. (1998). Value based leadership: An integrated theory and an empirical test. *Internal publication*.
House, R. J., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P.W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M.W., Gupta, V., …. Den Hartog, D.N., et al. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. In W. H. Mobley, M. J. Gessner, & V. Arnold. (Eds.). *Advances in Global Leadership* (pp. 171-233). Stamford, CN: JAI Press.
House, R.J. & Howell, J.M. (1992). Personality and Charismatic Leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 3,* 81-108.
House, R.J. & Podsakoff, P.M. (1994). Leadership Effectiveness: Past perspectives and future directions for research. In: J. Greenberg (ed*.). Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science,* 45-82.
House, R.J., Woycke, J. & Fodor, E.M. (1988). Charismatic and non-charismatic leaders: differences in behavior and effectiveness. In: J.A. Conger & R.N. Kanungo (eds). Charismatic Leadership: the Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Huntford, R. (1985). *Shackleton.* New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers.
Jacobsen, C. & House, R.J. (2001). Dynamics of charismatic leadership: A process theory, simulation model and tests. *Leadership Quarterly, 12*, 75-112.
Janis, I.L (1982*). Groupthink. (2nd edn.)* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
Judge, T. A. & Bono, J.E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 751-765.
Koopman, P.L., Den Hartog, D.N., Konrad, E., and 44 co-authors (1999). National culture and leadership profiles in Europe: Some results from the GLOBE study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8(4*), 503-520.
Larson, R.J. & Diener, E. (1992). Promises and problems with the circumplex

model of emotion. In: M. S. Clark (ed). *Review of personality and social psychology (vol. 13, 25-59).* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Lerner, J.S. & Keltner, D. (2001). Fear, Anger & Risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81,* 146-159.
Lewis, K.M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: how followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 221-234.
Lissack, M. R Roos, J. (2001). Be coherent, not visionary. *Long Range Planning, 34*, 53-70.
Lord R.G. & Maher, K.J. (1991). *Leadership & Information Processing.* London: Routledge.
Lowe, K.B. Galen Kroek, K. & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic review. *Leadership Quarterly, 7:* 385-425.
Martinez, S. & Dorfman (1998) The Mexican Entrepreneur: An ethnographic study of the Mexican Empressario. *International Studies of Management and Organizations, 28:* 97-123.
McCullough, M.E., Bellah, C.G., Kilpatrick, S.D. & Johnson, J.L. (2001). Vengefulness: Relationships with forgiveness, rumination, well-being and the Big Five. Personality and Social psychology, 27, 601-610.
Meindl, J.R. (1990). On leadership : An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In: B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (eds), *Research in organizational behavior, 12:* 159-203.
Mohrman, S.A. & Cohen, S.G. (1995). When people get out of the box: New relationships, new systems.In: Howard, A. (ed.) *The changing nature of work*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
Morrell, M. & Capparelli, S. (2001). *Shackleton's way*. New York: Penguin.
Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Harding, F.D., Jacobs, T.O. & Fleishman, E.A. (2000). Development of leadership skills: experience and training. *Leadership Quarterly, 11,* 11-35.
Neumann, R. & Strack, F. (2000). "Mood Contagion": the automatic transfer of mood between persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 211-253.
Olason, D.T. & Roger, D. (2001).Optimism, pessimism and "fighting spirit": a new approach to assessing expectancy and adaptation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 31*, 755-768.
Pawar, B.S. & Eastman, K.E. (2001) The nature and implications of contextual influences on transformational leadership: A conceptual examination. *Academy of Management Review, 22,* 80-109.
Sashkin, M. (1988). The Visionary Leader. In: J.A. Conger & R.N. Kanungo (eds), *Charismatic Leadership: the Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*, 122-160. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Schippers, M.C.,Den Hartog, D.N. & Koopman, P.L.(2001). *Reflexivity in teams:*

The relationship with trust, group potency, team leadership, and performance of work teams. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meetings, August 2001, Washington DC.

Shackleton, E. (1919). *South: the Endurance expedition*. Originally published by: William Heinemann, London, currently by Penguin Books, Middlesex, UK (Paperback version: 1999).

Shamir, B. (1999). Leadership in boundaryless organizations: Disposable or indispensable? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8(1*), 49-71.

Shamir, B. & Ben-Ari, E. (1999) Leadership in an open army? Civilian connections, interorganizational frameworks, and changes in military leadership.In: J.G. Hunt, G.E. Dodge & L.Wong (eds). *Out-of-the- box leadership: transforming the 21st century army and other top performing organizations.* Stanford, CT: JAI Press.

Shamir, B., House, R.J. & Arthur, M.B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, *4,* 1-17.

Snyder, C.R., Harris, C. and 8 co-authors (1991). The will and the ways: Development and valitation of an individual differences measure of hope. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 570-585.

Ten Brink, B.E.H., Den Hartog, D.N., Koopman, P.L. & Van Muijen, J.J. (1999). De bindende kracht van inspirerend leiderschap: leiderschap, psychologisch contract, vertrouwen en betrokkenheid*. Gedrag en Organisatie*, 12, 242-255.

Tichy, N.M. & Devanna, M.A.(1990). *The Transformational Leader (2nd edn.)* NewYork: Wiley.

Towler, A.J. & Dipboye, R.L. (2001). Effects of trainer expressiveness, organization, and training goal orientation on training outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 664-673.

Trice, H.M. & Beyer, J.M. (1986). Charisma and its routinization in two social movement organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 8:*113-164.

Turner, S. (1993). Charisma and obedience, a risk cognition approach. *Leadership Quarterly, 4*, 235-256.

Verburg, R.M. & Den Hartog, D.N. (2001). *Human Resource Management in Nederland.* Amsterdam: SWP.

Waldman, D.A. Ramirez, G.G., House, R.J. & Puranam, P. (2001). Does leadership matter? CEO leadership attributes and profitability under conditions of perceived environmental uncertainty. *Academy of Management Journal, in press*.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (A.N. Henderson & T. Parsons, eds &trans). Glencoe, IL: Free Press

West, M.A. & Altink, W.M.M. (1996). Innovation at work: Individual, Group, Organizational, and Socio- historical perspectives*. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(1): 3-11.

Wunderley, L.J., Reddy, W.B. & Dember, W.N. (1998). Optimism and Pessimism in Business Leaders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28,* 751-760.
Yammarino, F.J. & Bass, B.M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers: some preliminary findings. In: K.E. Clark & M.B. Clark (eds), *Measures of Leadership:* 151-170. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in Organizations.* (4th edn). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Erasmus Research Institute of Management
Inaugural Addresses Research in Management Series
http://www.erim.eur.nl

Triple inaugural address for the Rotating Chair for Research in Organisation and Management

Quality Management Research: Standing the Test of Time,
Prof. dr. B.G. Dale
Performance Related Pay - Another Management Fad?,
Prof.dr. R.Richardson
From Downsize to Enterprise: Management Buyouts and Restructuring Industry
Prof. dr. D.M.Wright

Reference number erim: EIA-2001-01-ORG
ISBN 90-5892-006-2
URL: http://www.eur.nl/WebDOC/doc/iarm/erimia20010405124454.pdf

Financial Regulation; Emerging from the Shadows
Prof. dr. Harald. A. Benink
Reference number ERIM: EIA-2001-02-ORG
ISBN 90-5892-007-0
URL: http://www.eur.nl/WebDOC/doc/iarm/erimia20010628134057.pdf

Opsporen van sneller en beter. Modelling through…
Prof. dr. L.G. Kroon
Reference number ERIM: EIA-2001-03-LIS
ISBN 90-5892-010-0

East, West, Best: Cross cultural encounters and measures
Prof. Dr. Slawomir Jan Magala
Reference number ERIM: EIA-2001-04-ORG
ISBN 90-5892-013-5