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Abstract:
In recent decades, there has been an intense debate regarding the role of leadership in managerial work (Bass, 1985; House et al., 2007; Mintzberg, 2004; Watson, 1994). The background to the debate is the transparency of the global economy, the deregulation of the financial markets, a steady increase in the competitive environment and a ceaseless call for creative innovations (Castells, 1998). While leadership most often is depicted as setting goals, formulating strategies, providing guidelines, and/or incorporating values (Yukl, 1989), this Special Issue is the result of the inaugural summit hosted by the Gallup Leadership Institute at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in 2004 on Authentic Leadership Development (ALD). We describe in this introduction to the special issue current thinking in this emerging field of research as well as questions and concerns. We begin by considering some of the environmental and organizational forces that may have triggered interest in describing and studying authentic leadership and its development. We then provide an overview of its contents, including the diverse theoretical and methodological perspectives presented, followed by a discussion of alternative conceptual foundations and definitions for the constructs of authenticity, authentic leaders, authentic leadership, and authentic leadership development. A detailed description of the components of authentic leadership theory is provided next. The similarities and defining features of authentic leadership theory in comparison to transformational, charismatic, servant and spiritual leadership perspectives are subsequently examined. We conclude by discussing the status of authentic leadership theory with respect to its purpose, construct definitions, historical foundations, consideration of context, relational/processual focus, attention to levels of analysis and temporality, along with a discussion of promising directions for future research.
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Introduction:
Leadership has always been more difficult in challenging times, but the unique stressors facing organizations throughout the world today call for a renewed focus on what constitutes genuine leadership. Public, private and even volunteer organizations are addressing challenges that run the gamut from ethical meltdowns to terrorism and SARS. What constitutes the normal range of functioning in these conditions is constantly shifting upwards as new challenges, technologies, market demands, and competition emerge. We suggest that such challenges have precipitated a renewed focus on restoring confidence, hope, and optimism; being able to rapidly bounce back from catastrophic events and display resiliency; helping people in their search for meaning and connection by fostering a new self-awareness; and genuinely relating to all stakeholders (associates, customers, suppliers, owners, and communities). As former head of Medtronic, Bill George (2003), succinctly states: we need leaders who lead with purpose, values, and integrity; leaders who build enduring organizations, motivate their employees to provide superior customer service, and create long-term value for shareholdersQ (p. 9). We suggest a need to concentrate on the root construct underlying all positive forms of leadership and its development, which we label authentic leadership development or ALD. Leadership is defined as the process of
having dominance on group activities in order to realize the objectives. To execute the leadership task, managers try to have influence the people under their supervision and motivate and direct them to achieve the organizational objectives. Creating motivation in staff in such a way that they do their activity and work in the organization with enthusiasm and reach the goals is very important. This problem with transnational managers who have to create motivation in the individuals with different cultures is more significant. Type’s of the behaviors which results in success of the leader depends on the definition of success and is conditions. There are considerable numbers of different leadership styles in different countries and various cultures, and many researches have done many surveys in the field of leadership in which the relation of leadership style with situations conditions has been emphasized. Leadership styles and management methods across the world are diverse and are influenced by specifications dominant in the environment. Different studies and researches in different countries have emphasized compliance of leadership style in terms of success conditions. The relationship between managers and culture, and leaders and culture is different. Managers tend to be the people who get things done, and the corporate culture is the mechanism they use to understand how to communicate, how to work and what to expect on a day to day basis. The managerial staff knows what the current culture expects, how to feed and nurture the existing culture and how strong or weak the culture is. Managers of transnational organizations should necessarily show flexibility proportional to culture differences, respect to the differences, recognize motivates of the people, and select a suitable style of leadership in accord to situations and then take action with regard to the individuals under their supervision to realize defined objectives. Purpose of this research is to achieve relationship between cultures and leadership styles. Specifications of leadership

In these challenging and turbulent times, there is a growing recognition among scholars (Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Seligman, 2002) and practitioners (George, 2003) alike that a more authentic leadership development strategy becomes relevant and urgently needed for desirable outcomes. Such recognition provided the impetus for the inaugural Gallup Leadership Institute Summit held in Omaha, Nebraska in June 2004, and this Special Issue on Authentic Leadership Development. The purpose of the GLI Summit was to promote a dialogue among scholars and practitioners from diverse domains with leaders from the business, political, educational, and military arenas to stimulate original insights and basic theory regarding the emergence and development of authentic leadership and followership. Over 80 manuscripts were presented at the Summit in response to this charge, of which, a subset were invited for submission to this special issue and evaluated through The Leadership Quarterly’s standard review process. Due to the large number of high quality articles submitted, we were faced with many difficult decisions in selecting a set of seven for inclusion. Ultimately, we chose articles that offered original, diverse, provocative and complementary perspectives that could contribute to building a theory of authentic leadership development. Other high quality manuscripts from the GLI Summit will appear in a forthcoming volume of Elsevier’s Monographs in Leadership and Management series. In comparison to this special issue, this edited volume will include a broader range of topics, such as positive organizational behavior, transparency, authentic leadership measurement, and leadership development initiatives. Much of the research on team leadership has focused on the contribution made by a single leader. However, leadership can also be provided by one or more individuals who are either formally appointed to the role or emerge from within the team. Leadership is important even in self-managed teams, affecting both organizational factors, such as acquiring resources for the team, and team member behavior, such as encouraging the team to take
control of its own activities (Nygren & Levine, 1996). Indeed, research on self managed cross-functional project teams shows that they are less likely to be successful if they do not have a leader (Cohen & Bailey, 1997) One of the most important characteristics of leaders is to have an insight with which they can see what occurs in the group, organization or society and diagnose the way it could be resolved. Such an insight gives leaders energy and power to work. This energy and power can be created in them by inspiring their followers and motivating them. This inspiration defines their beliefs and converts them to reality.

Leaders inspire their followers to recognize desirable ways and ask them to recognize their leader and to reach to the desirable state that he has specified (Zahedi, 1999). leader as being inauthentic when he or she is overly compliant with stereotypes and demands related to the leader role.

In contrast to this early focus on inauthenticity, current conceptions of authentic leadership reflect their conceptual roots in positive psychology and adopt a more positive focus on what constitutes authentic leadership development (Luthans & Avolio, 2003). An examination of the articles appearing in this special issue indicates there is some disagreement about how to best define the constructs of authentic leader, authentic leadership, and authentic leadership development.

Avolio, Luthans, and Walumbwa (2004, p. 4) define authentic leaders as bthose who are deeply aware of how they think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own and others’ values/moral perspectives, knowledge, and strengths; aware of the context in which they operate; and who are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and of high moral characterQ (as cited in Avolio, Gardner et al., 2004). The related construct of authentic leadership in organizations is defined by Luthans and Avolio (2003, p. 243) bas a process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of leaders and associates, fostering positive self-development.Q As the contributors to this special issue worked to refine theory, several took issue with the breadth of these definitions. For instance, Cooper et al. (2005) point out that our binitial conceptualization is obviously multi-dimensional. It contains elements from diverse domains—traits, states, behaviors, contexts, and attributions. Moreover, the observers or perspectives involved vary from the leader, to followers (at various distancesT), to possibly additional observers.Q They also express concern that authentic leadership is posited to operate at the individual, team, and organizational levels, among others. Cooper et al. point out a number of measurement difficulties that may arise from the adoption of such broad definitions. These authors are absolutely correct that challenging measurement issues lie ahead, but in our view that is the nature of what is required to fully understand what constitutes authentic leadership development.

Specifications of task oriented leadership
1. It informs staff of the plans and tasks.
2. It directs and instructs them.
3. It determines accurate and clear timeline for performing the works.
4. It is fully aware of work devices and equipments available to the staff.
5. It wants staff to report their work progress.
6. It leads the staff to work in specified time limit.
7. It doesn’t allow waste of time due to unsuitable planning.
8. It tries to lead the staff to work in their maximum capacity and ability.

Specifications of People Oriented Leadership
1. It improves working facilities of the staff.
2. It understands attitudes of the people.
3. It wants to know beliefs of the staff.
4. It behaves staff justly.
5. The staffs are available to communicate.
6. It deals with personal problems.
7. It trusts in staff.
8. It is interested in the work future of the staff.
9. It recognizes their good performance.
10. It supports staff.

On the basis of findings of Teib, both two types of leadership are available in all cultures; however the way staffs perceive the distinction between two styles depends on their cultural field. Results of this research show that while a special behavior is regarded task oriented in some culture, it might be considered people oriented in another culture.

People of different cultures have different expectations from their managers and leaders; origin and cultural records of people have effect on formation of their expectations (Mandanghal, 1995). In a research done by Andre Loran, in response to this question that “Is it important that manager accurately knows the answer to questions of his staff which may be related to their work?”, different individuals of various cultures have given different answers. In Swedish management viewpoint, this requirement is not available, while Japanese management has emphasized this necessity. Most of the American managers believe that the role of a manager is to help solve problems, meaning he can help staff detect the ways for solving problems by their own, not he just answers all their questions. The reason is giving solution to all problems causes staff lose their own motivation for innovation and creativity, and finally their productivity decreases. On the other hand, most of French managers believe that manager should give his staff accurate and clear answers so that he can preserve his credit among them.

**Intercultural leadership contingency model**

Combining direction-goal model of Robert House and dividing cultural dimensions in studies done by Geert Hofstede, a model is prepared and the most suitable cultural behavior pattern in 18 countries on this basis is constructed. In this model, leadership is classified into 4 categories: directional leadership (preparing guides for staff about what they should do and how to perform it, work planning, and functional standards), supportive leadership (attention to welfare of the staff and their requirements, establishment of friendly relationships with staff and equal behaviors toward all staff), participatory leadership (consulting with staff and serious attention to their attitudes during decision making), and success oriented leadership (encouraging staff to perform works to the highest levels, determining the goals to such an extent that they can be realized with challenges, expression of trust in high abilities of the staff). On the basis of the findings of this model, participatory leadership is recognized suitable for all studied cultures.

This doesn’t mean that participatory leadership is the best leadership style in intercultural management; it refers only to its vast application in the world (Mayntz, 1997). However it is not suitable in North Europe, Australia, and New Zealand.

In some regions and countries such as Philippines and Hong Kong, there is high diversity in leadership style. Generally, leadership style should be adapted with cultural environment and space dominant in the organizations (Wiley, 1996). In business leadership, there also is a diversity of models: In America, with its longstanding experience with professional business leadership, the most readily available role model for the head of a company is the corporate CEO. In China and Chinese-related businesses it is the head of the family. In France it remains the military general. In Japan it is the consensus builder. In Germany today it is the coalition builder.
Managerial work and leadership

Since the literature on managerial work and leadership is extensive, a theoretical framing focus is needed for more explicit study of these topics in everyday settings. A seminal and well-known study of managerial work, particularly of managers’ activity patterns from the early 1950s revealed that managers have a heavy workload with many issues to attend to. In addition, this study revealed that the time spent on each of these issues was less than 10 minutes (Carlson, 1951).

Carlson’s pioneering work in the field has been validated by almost every later study of managerial work where the focus is on activity patterns and work content (e.g., Burns, 1957; Hales, 1986; Holmberg, 1986; Kotter, 1982; Mintzberg, 1973; Stewart, 1976, 1982; Tengblad, 2002, 2003, 2006; Tyrstrup, 1993). The main conclusion of these studies, including Carlson’s, is that managerial work is highly fragmented, and managers would be better-off if they managed their time so that they could devote more time to strategic thinking.

In one of the most quoted sections from his study, Carlson portrays his assumptions about the managing director as an orchestra conductor who can and should supervise both operations and the organization at the same time. Although this image starkly contrasts with his findings, that is, the manager as a puppet, controlled by people ‘pulling the strings’, the conductor image of the strategic manager has endured among both managers and academics (Collins, 2001a, 2001b; House et al., 2007; Yukl, 1989).

Although most studies that take the management behavioural approach have argued against detached conceptualizations – for example, Gulick and Urwick’s (1937/1987) famous POSDCORB (planning, organizing, staffing, directing, co-ordinating, reporting and budgeting) – the fragmentation of managerial work remains a major concern. While challenging the depiction of management as the rational, reflective, systematic accomplishment of predetermined objectives, the understanding of the highly reactive work pattern of managers is still in dispute. Snyder and Glueck (1980) claimed that the methods used in studies of managerial work themselves produced what looked like fragmentation. They argued that managerial tasks, such as problem-solving, often consist of several, sometimes seemingly disparate activities, which may seem ‘fragmented’ if aims and purposes are not related to each other on an overall level. Tengblad (2006), in his replication of Mintzberg’s (1973) study of managerial work, concludes that measuring the amount of time spent on activities, as opposed to measuring the frequency of activities, provides a different view of the fragmented pattern of managerial work. Thus the appreciation of the fragmentation of work as a problem may be due to a lack of understanding of how managerial work relates to the overall working processes of organizations (Hales, 1986). Mintzberg (1994: 11) expresses a similar idea in his argument that researchers have been ‘so intent on breaking the job into pieces that we never came to grips with the whole thing. It is time, therefore, to consider the integrated job of managing’. Noordegraaf and Stewart (2000) also support this conclusion with their claim that the majority of research studies try to understand the more or less objective facts of managerial work and the causally determined situational factors. With a few exceptions (e.g., Watson, 1994, 1996), the study of processes and sense-making, and thus the creation of meaning related to organizational activity, is severely neglected. Evidently there seems to be a growing understanding among leading scholars, who have researched managerial work for decades, that for a deeper understanding of the role of managerial work and leadership, studies are needed that more explicitly take everyday work, the process perspective and ‘sense-making’ as points of departure (e.g., Barley and Kunda, 1992; Knights and Wilmott, 1992; Weick, 1995).
In his explicit focus on the interplay between individuals’ actions and how they reach understandings in organizations, Weick (1967/1979, 1995) has convincingly shown that individuals act first and understand the significance of their actions afterwards. Based on this research, Weick also claimed that in an organized context there is a constant need for interpretation and sense-making. Since actions precede their interpretation, the time perspective is crucial in understanding how things are done in organizations and, thus, in understanding how managerial leadership functions in everyday settings. Even though the sense-making processes tend to filter away information that does not fit in or contribute to the process of making sense of problems, situations or events (Knorr Cetina, 1981), the output of sense-making processes is by no means self-evident: actors create their environment and the environment creates the actors (Weick, 1995; see also Berger and Luckmann, 1966; Giddens, 1984).

Returning to Carlson’s pioneering work, there is no reason to believe that today’s managers work less hard than in previous years or that the number of issues they attend to has diminished. On the contrary, recent studies show that the intensity of work is increasing, the mode of work is now based on co-ordination of activities in both time and space, and there is a constant need for change and adjustment (Mintzberg and Westley, 2001; Tengblad, 2006).

However, in recent decades, the focus on managerial work has been replaced by studies emphasizing the leadership dimension. In contrast to managerial work, leadership is defined as the ability to present compelling visions and goals that are grounded in a company’s value system (Bass, 1985; Bryman, 1992; Conger, 1989; Conger and Kanungo, 1998; Holmberg and A˚kerblom, 2001, 2006, 2007; Yukl, 1989). When scholars distinguish leadership from managerial work in the fragmentation of day-to-day work, they imply a certain sense of timing – partly reflecting the different tasks that should be completed and partly reflecting who is responsible for them (Kotter, 1990; Zaleznick, 1977). Expressed differently, the concept of leadership is closely connected to a perception of the ordering of things that is quite different from Weick’s ideas on sensemaking and action: in the present certain people (the leaders) take actions that have consequences for the future because others (the followers) perform activities as a consequence of these actions. Thus leadership becomes a question of relationships between activities that occur today and those that are expected to occur in the future. This view of managers as strategic actors with a mission, clearly places the manager at the centre stage of the sense-making processes (Bass, 1985; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Collins, 2001a, 2001b; House et al., 2007; Nanus, 1992; Selznick, 1957). Based on our studies of everyday work and leadership, we argue that there is a far more complicated interplay between current activities, historical events, expectations and the perceived need to exercise leadership.

6. Conclusion and discussion

In summary, if it is unclear what a number of people are doing, if people’s demands and expectations seem conflicting, and if the person who provides input to the team seems confused, there will be uncertainties whose resolution will take the highest priority in the manager’s schedule. That is the lesson of these three narratives – at least for managers in similar circumstances. They have to direct their energy towards trying to bring order to what has become unclear or chaotic. Only then are people prepared to get on with their own work. It is thus quite clear that everyday leadership is concerned with situations that call for an answer to the question ‘Well then – what now?’

There are nine key qualities people seek in a successful leader:

- Passion
- Decisiveness
- Conviction
Two ideas appear to overshadow all others in the consideration of everyday leadership. The first idea is that the manager is pressured to interpret the problem situation (i.e., to make sense of what is happening). The manager has to understand the situation, as well as what has caused it. The questions requiring answers are: What are the possible implications of the situation for the working group, the unit, the project, the organization, and the future? The second idea concerns the importance of the manager’s ability to take impromptu action, to act in the here and now, and, at least, to identify the next step in the process. These ideas are very closely connected. If, for example, the interpretation of a situation is that a ‘task is Leadership could be defined as influencing teamwork with the aim of securing certain goals. Managers endeavor to carry out leadership tasks in a way to affect the employees whom they are in charge of and to orient their endeavors in the direction of predefined organizational goals. These managers should motivate their employees in such a way that they voluntarily try to accomplish organizational goals.

With regard to what was mentioned, leadership styles and management methods have abundant variety and diversity and are influenced by cultural specifications dominant in the environment. Certainly due to cultural differences, one cannot talk about special leadership style for the managers of transnational organizations to behave like it. Such style which has been applied in all cultures and gives the same answer is not found and it is necessary for leadership behavior to conform to native and local parameters.

In different researches on test of theories of motivation in international level, this issue is confirmed and one cannot generalize a theory to the entire world and in many countries these theories are not applicable. For example, some researchers from different countries in the world have introduced the theory of hierarchy of Abraham Maslow’s requirements. In some countries it has been confirmed and in some other countries, it is rejected. The requirements which have been introduced in this hierarchy are available everywhere but their precedence and subsequences are different in the five orders considered by Maslow. Regarding to numerous differences in understandings, needs and demands of the staff in international dimensions which are the origins of styles, methods and many diverse achievements in the field of management and leadership in the world’s countries, difficulty and importance of effort taken by the managers of transnational organizations becomes undeniable in finding suitable ways to create motivation in the staff. In this regard, art of transnational managers is that they show required flexibility to cultural differences, know the staff well, are aware of their needs and respect for the differences, recognize the motivations of the individuals and select a suitable leadership style to an appropriate level and take action to realize predefined goals.

In sum, we believe that the emerging literature in this area, including the articles appearing in this special issue, has considerable potential for explaining leader effectiveness. We also believe that the articles in this special issue highlight important new themes for future research that may further help to advance our knowledge of leadership, self, and identity. Our hope is that this special issue may serve as an inspiration for the future undertakings of both researchers and practitioners.
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