

A Comparison of Leadership Literature:
The Twenty-First Century's Trend Toward Integration

Shelley Garrett

Texas A&M University-Commerce

TCPEA Conference

Dallas, Texas

September 2007

Abstract

This comparative study looks at what is being done in the literature on leadership now, particularly what has been changing and what is considered progressive now compared to 20 years ago. Even with decades of research on the topic of leadership, academia and corporate America alike are still no closer to consensus on what distinguishes leaders from non-leaders. From Argyris to Ziglar, hundreds of authors, educators, researchers, and businessmen have weighed in on leadership with regard to organizational theory, philosophical and historical contexts, and the theoretical versus the practical. Leadership qualities have been classified, enumerated, rated, and grouped. Over the decades, there have been paradigm shifts – from servant leadership to transformational to contingency to facilitative and back again. Leadership theories have come in and out of fashion, but most leaders will agree that no single style of leading works all the time. School leaders must employ any number of leadership paradigms, characteristics, and practices on a daily basis to cover the gamut of situations that arise. In navigating the course for preparing educational leaders, reviewing the theories and literature on leadership is paramount. Changes in the 21st century leadership literature lean toward an integrative, multi-dimensional approach – one in which a leader must not rely solely on “situational theory” or “servanthood” but rather use a multitude of styles and theories in his toolkit. In order for educational leaders to have a meaningful and useful array in their school improvement “arsenal,” the literature must be discussed at the university level by the professors of educational leadership. When professors of education implore better leadership practices and small numbers of people start behaving differently, that behavior can ripple out until a “tipping point” is reached, changing the educational landscape and producing better-prepared leaders.

A Comparison of Leadership Literature:
The Twenty-First Century's Trend Toward Integration

Introduction

Hundreds if not thousands of pages have been dedicated to the topic of leadership. An intangible concept, challenging to classify and difficult to describe, most people cannot define it but know leadership when they see it. Even with decades of research on the topic, academia and corporate America alike are still no closer to consensus on what distinguishes leaders from non-leaders (Buffie, 1989). From Argyris to Ziglar, hundreds of authors, educators, researchers, and businessmen have weighed in on leadership with regard to organizational theory, philosophical and historical contexts, and the theoretical versus the practical. For this comparative study, 60 books were studied: 32 from the 20th century and 28 from the 21st century.

Leadership qualities have been classified, enumerated, rated, and grouped. Over the decades, there have been paradigm shifts – from servant leadership to transformational to contingency to facilitative and back again. On a timeline (see Figure 1) of seminal leadership literature, we see that what comes around goes around. Leadership theories have come in and out of fashion, but most leaders will agree that no single style of leading works all the time. And there is a name for that too – contingency theory, or multi-dimensional leadership, which simply means, Use what works best in the situation in which you find yourself.

To make sense of the many different examinations of leadership, attempts have been made to sort and consolidate leadership by every imaginable configuration: by theory, decade, philosophy, model, and strategy. Lashway (1997) narrowed styles of leadership to four groups: Hierarchical Strategies, Transformational Strategies, Facilitative Strategies, and Multidimensional Strategies. The leadership literature has also been categorized by theories:

Great Man Theory, Trait Theory, Situational Theory, Personal-Situational Theory, Psychoanalysis Theory, Humanistic Theory, Leader-Role Theory, Path-Goal Theory, Contingency Theory, Cognitive Leadership Theory, Behavior Theory, Power-Influence Theory, Open Systems Theory, Transformational Theory, Charismatic Leadership Theory, Competency-Based Leadership Theory, Visionary Leadership Theory, Managerial & Strategic Leadership Theory, Results-Based Theory, Leader-As-Teacher Theory, Holistic Theory, Servant Leadership Theory, and Spiritual Leadership (Covey, 2004).

Most authors, practitioners, and researchers agree that school leaders must employ any number of leadership paradigms, characteristics, and practices on a daily basis to cover the gamut of situations that arise. Most of the 21st century authors also agree that there is no one right way to integrate leadership styles. In navigating the course for preparing educational leaders, reviewing the theories and literature on leadership is paramount. Changes in the 21st century leadership literature lean toward an integrative, multi-dimensional approach – one in which a leader must not rely solely on “situational theory” or “servanthood” but rather use a multitude of styles and theories in his toolkit. In order for these educational leaders to have a meaningful and useful array in their school improvement “arsenal,” the literature must be discussed at the university level by the professors of educational leadership. When professors of education implore better leadership practices and small numbers of people start behaving differently, that behavior can ripple out until a “tipping point” is reached, changing the educational landscape and producing better-prepared leaders.

Figure 1. An Abbreviated Timeline of Leadership Literature

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>BOOK AND AUTHOR</u>
1948	<i>Organizations and Management</i> Barnard <i>Power and Personality</i> Lasswell
1953	<i>Executive Leadership</i> Argyris
1961	<i>Excellence</i> Gardner
1977	<i>Servant Leadership: A Journey Into the Nature Of Legitimate Power and Greatness</i> Greenleaf
1978	<i>Leadership</i> Burns <i>Educational Administration</i> Hoy & Miskel
1980	<i>The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration</i> Sergiovanni
1981	<i>Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership</i> Bass
1984	<i>The Skills of Leadership</i> Adair
1985	<i>Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge</i> Bennis & Nanus
1986	<i>The Nature of Leadership</i> Gardner
1989	<i>On Becoming a Leader</i> Bennis <i>The Principal and Leadership</i> Buffie
1990	<i>Improving Schools from Within: Teachers, Parents, and Principals Can Make the Difference</i> Barth <i>Principle-Centered Leadership</i> Covey <i>On Leadership</i> Gardner <i>The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization</i> Senge
1991	<i>Leadership for the 21st Century</i> Rost
1992	<i>Facilitative Leadership: The Imperative for Change</i> Hord <i>Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Improvement</i> Sergiovanni
1994	<i>The Leadership Paradox</i> Deal & Peterson
1995	<i>Leading with Soul: An Uncommon Journey of Spirit</i> Bolman & Deal
1996	<i>Leadership: A Relevant and Realistic Role for Principals</i> Crow & McCleary <i>Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Improvement</i> Sergiovanni

- 1997** *Multidimensional School Leadership* Lashway
Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant-Leadership Spears
- 1998** *The Power of Servant Leadership* Greenleaf, Vaill, & Spears
The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership Maxwell
- 1999** *Building Community in Schools* Sergiovanni
Leadership and the New Science Wheatley
- 2000** *Profiles of Leadership in Education* Goldberg
Leadership for the Schoolhouse: How Is It Different? Why Is It Important? Sergiovanni
Leadership for Differentiating Schools & Classrooms Tomlinson & Allan
- 2001** *Leading with Soul: An Uncommon Journey of Spirit* Bolman & Deal
Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap...and Others Don't Collins
Leading in a Culture of Change Fullan
- 2002** *Leadership in Education: Organizational Theory for the Practitioner* Marion
The New School Leader for the 21st Century: The Principal Seifert & Vornberg
- 2003** *Servant Leader* Blanchard
Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership Bolman & Deal
The Servant-Leader Within Greenleaf
Ten Traits of Highly Effective Principals: From Good to Great Performance McEwan
Caring Enough to Lead Pellicer
What Great Principals Do Differently: Fifteen Things that Matter Most Whitaker
- 2004** *The 8th Habit: From Effectiveness to Greatness* Covey
The Lifeworld of Leadership: Creating Culture, Community, and Personal Meaning in Our Schools Sergiovanni
Trust Matters: Leadership for Successful Schools Tschannen-Moran
- 2005** *Good To Great and The Social Sectors (monograph)* Collins
Blink: The Power of Thinking without Thinking Gladwell
The Art of School Leadership Hoerr & Barth

School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results Marzano, Waters, & McNulty

The Principalsip: A Reflective Practice Perspective Sergiovanni

2006

Cultivating Leadership in Schools: Connecting People, Purpose, & Practice Donaldson & Fullan

The Learning Leader: How to Focus School Improvement for Better Results Reeves

The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization Senge

Supervision: A Redefinition Sergiovanni & Starratt

2007

Engaging EVERY Learner: The Soul of Educational Leadership Series Blankenstein, Cole, & Houston

Case Studies in 21st Century School Administration: Addressing Challenges for Educational Leadership Gray & Smith

Leadership Defined

Examining the hundreds of volumes of leadership literature will garner list after list of leadership traits, leadership skills, and leadership competencies but will not produce a single, comprehensive definition of leadership. Bennis and Nanus (1985) agreed that decades of analysis of the literature and thousands of empirical investigations have given us at least 350 differing definitions of leadership – still with no clear view of what distinguishes an effective leader from an ineffective leader. One of their definitions was: “...the capacity to translate intention into reality and sustain it” (p. 17). They went on to say what leadership can do – transform organizations from a current state to a future state, and instill new cultures, strategies, and changes. Stogdill (1974) defined leadership like this: “Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal setting and goal achievement.” In his exhaustive review of leadership literature up to 1990, Rost (1991) seemed almost enraged at the lack of clarity employed by researchers and authors in defining leadership in journal articles, textbooks, and bestsellers. His final assessment was this: “Leadership is an influence relationship among

leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes” (p. 102).

Merriam-Webster defines leadership as “the capacity to lead,” with *lead* having more than 20 definitions itself, many involving the guiding of a situation from where it currently is to where it needs to be. Although not a definition, Collins (2005) gave a powerful description of leadership when he said, “True leadership only exists if people follow when they have the freedom not to” (p. 13).

When speaking of educational leadership, the word *improvement* must replace the word *change*. Rost’s definition will be used here with one adjustment – substitute the word *improve* for *change*: Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real *improvements* that reflect their mutual purposes.

Leadership Versus Management

There is much debate about leadership versus management. In fact, there is some outright indignation about discussing the two in the same conversation (Rost, 1991). And there is no shortage of catch phrases to distinguish the two: “Leaders are people who do the right thing; managers are people who do things right” (Bennis, 1993). While leadership has been equated to vision, mission, culture, capacity, and service, and management has been associated with boards, beams, and buses, for the sake of educational leadership, we will assume that a good leader knows how to manage and delegate the minutiae of the school organization and makes it his mission to focus on leadership and learning.

Leadership Theories

Great-man theories ruled discussions of leadership in the early 1900s. Dowd (1936) wrote about extraordinary individuals who were born possessing the traits that would inherently cause them to become great leaders. These superior few were born with advanced intelligence, energy, moral fiber, and determination. In *The 8th Habit*, Covey (2004) conducted a brief literature review of leadership material, grouping leadership styles by theory (see Figure 2) and stating that most 20th century leadership theories fall into one of five approaches – trait, behavioral, power-influence, situational, and integrative. Great-man theories gave rise to trait theories, leading to situational theories, which shaped the literature of the time. Behavioral approaches to leadership, such as psychoanalysis and humanistic theories, were prompted by scientists such as Erikson, Freud, Fromm, Likert, and Maslow. Power-influence approaches, such as leader-role and path-goal theories, were defined and characterized by researchers such as Kahn & Quinn, Mintzberg, and House. Situational approaches, such as contingency and power-influence theories, were explicated by Fiedler, Gardner, Collins, and Vroom & Yetton. The integrative approach was discussed in the literature as early as the '80s by Bass, Bennis, Burns, and more. In the 21st century, it is nearly impossible to find a leadership book that does not acknowledge the requisite importance of leaders being able to integrate and switch from one leadership style to another, post haste.

*Figure 2. Leadership Theories: Review of Literature [Covey, S.R. (2004). *The 8th Habit: From effectiveness to greatness*. New York: Free Press.]*

Theory	Representative Authors/Year	Summary
Great-Man Theories	Dowd (1936)	"...in whatever direction the masses may be influenced to go, they are always led by the superior few."
Trait Theories	L. L. Barnard (1926); Bingham (1927);	Leader is endowed with superior traits

	Tead (1929); Kilbourne (1935); Kirkpatrick & Locke (1991); Kohs & Irle (1920); Page (1935); Tead (1929)	& characteristics that set him apart from his followers.
Situational Theories	Bagardus (1918); Hersey & Blanchard (1972); Hocking (1924); Person (1928); H. Spencer	Emergence of a great leader is the result of time, place, and circumstance.
Personal-Situational Theories	Barnard (1938); Bass (1960); J. F. Brown (1936); Case (1933); C. A. Gibb (1947, 1954); Jenkins (1947); Lapiere (1938); Murphy (1941); Westburgh (1931)	Combination of the aforementioned: traits, nature of the group, and events confronting the group.
Psychoanalysis Theories	Erikson (1964); Frank (1939); Freud (1913, 1922); Fromm (1941); H. Levison (1970); Wolman (1971)	Leader functions as father figure: source of fear or love.
Humanistic Theories	Argyris (1957, 1962, 1964); Blake & Mouton (1964, 1965); Hersey & Blanchard (1969, 1972); Likert (1961, 1967); Maslow (1965); McGregor (1960, 1966)	Leadership provides freedom for individuals to live up to capacity.
Leader-Role Theory	Homans (1950); Kahn & Quinn (1970); Kerr & Jermier (1978); Mintzberg (1973); Osborn & Hunt (1975)	Leaders behave according to how they perceive their role & what others expect them to do.
Path-Goal Theory	M. G. Evans (1970); Georgopoulos, Mahoney, & Jones (1957); House (1971); House & Dessler (1974)	Leaders improve the behavior in followers by showing them to path to rewards.
Contingency Theory	Fiedler (1967); Fiedler, Chemers, & Mahar (1976)	The effectiveness of a leader is contingent upon the situation and the leader's ability to adjust his orientation.
Cognitive Leadership (20 th -Century Great-Man)	H. Gardner (1995); J. Collins (2001)	Leaders markedly influence behaviors of their fellow human beings through their words & personal examples.
Theories & Models of Interactive Processes	Davis & Luthans (1979); Fiedler & Leister (1977); Fulk & Wendler (1982); Graen (1976); Greene (1975); Yuki (1971)	Leadership is interactive, with relationship between the leader's intelligence and the group's performance.
Power-Influence (Participative Leadership, Rationale-Deductive)	Coch & French (1948); J. Gardner (1990); Lewin, Lippitt, & White (1939); Vroom & Yetton (1974)	Deals with power sharing and empowerment of followers by a leader with influence.
Attribution, Information Processing, & Open Systems	Bryon & Kelley (1978); Katz & Kahn (1966); Lord (1976, 1985); Lord, Binning, Rush, & Thomas (1978); Mitchell, Larsen, & Green (1977); Newell & Simon (1972); H. M. Weiss (1977)	Leadership is a socially constructed reality.
Integrative (Transformational & Values-Based)	Bass; Bennis (1984, 1992, 1993); Burns (1978); Downton (1973); Fairholm (1991); O'Toole (1995); DePree (1992); Tichy & Devanna; Renesch	Leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation.

Charismatic Leadership	Conger & Kanungu (1987); House (1977); Kets se Vries (1988); J. Maxwell (1999); Meindl (1990); Shamir, House, & Arthur (1993); Weber (1947)	Leaders possess exceptional qualities as perceived by subordinates.
Competency-Based Leadership	Bennis (1993); Boyatzis; Cameron; Quinn	A leader can learn and improve critical competencies that predict outstanding leaders.
Aspiration & Visionary Leadership	Burns; Kouzes & Posner (1995); Peters; Waterman (1990); Richards & Engle (1986)	The art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations.
Managerial & Strategic Leadership	Drucker (1999); Jacobs & Jaques (1990); Jaques & Clement (1991); Kotter (1998, 1999); Buckingham & Coffman (1999); Buckingham & Clifton (2001)	Leaders are responsible for performance of their organizations and for the community as a whole.
Results-Based Leadership	Ulrich, Zenger, & Smallwood (1999); Nohria, Joyce, & Robertson (2003)	A leadership brand that describes the distinct results leaders deliver.
Leader as Teacher	DePree (1992); Tichy (1998)	Motivating others by teaching stories; effective leadership equates with effective teaching.
Leadership as a Performing Art	DePree (1992); Mintzberg (1998); Vaill (1989)	Leaders do not outwardly perform leadership actions but perform unobtrusive actions that encompass all the things a leader does.
Cultural & Holistic Leadership	Fairholm (1994); Senge (1990); Schein (1992); Wheatley (1992)	Leaders create synergistic relationships between individuals, organizations, and the environment.
Servant Leadership	Greenleaf (1996); Spears & Frick (1992)	Leaders primarily lead by serving others.
Spiritual Leadership	DePree (1989); Etzioni (1993); Fairholm (1997); Greenleaf (1977); Hawley (1993); Keifer (1992); J. Maxwell; Vaill (1989)	Leadership involves influencing people's souls rather than controlling action.

Categories of Leadership Literature

While some of the literature focuses on a specific brand of leadership, e.g., moral, facilitative, etc., a large percentage of the literature presents a broad stroke of the entire spectrum of leadership styles, genres, and theories. Marion (2002) organized leadership philosophy into three major paradigm shifts of organizational theory: (1) Closed Systems theory, including Machine and Human Relations theories; (2) Open Systems theory, such as Contingency theory; and (3) Anti-Positivism, which is an Open Systems theory that posits that organizations are

largely unpredictable and cannot be generalized. In the category of Closed Systems theory, managing tasks and supervising people are addressed. In Open Systems theory, motivation, communication, conflict, and prescriptions for leadership are studied. Within the Anti-Positivistic theory, a multitude of leadership dimensions are visited: decision making, learning, loose coupling, schools as cultures, morality, complexity, and pressures that shape organizations. In this perspective, all 20th century leadership theories and philosophies can be categorized into one of these three paradigms. Although the hierarchical leadership style is alive and well, the top-down, bureaucratic category is omitted here intentionally. Most agree there is no one best way to lead an organization. Greenleaf (2003) said that, “Not much that is really important can be accomplished with coercive power. Headship, the holding of a titular position or possessing coercive power, is not at all synonymous with leadership” (p. 73). Here, for the sake of simplicity, 20th and 21st century leadership literature has been grouped into three categories: Visionary Leadership, Shared-Responsibility Leadership, and Integrative Leadership.

Visionary Leadership Literature

Lashway (1997) called it transformational; Sergiovanni (1992) and Fullan (2001) called it moral, while Bolman & Deal (2003) referred to it as symbolic. Leadership literature placed in this category includes work that describes leaders as inspirational, symbolic, persuasive idealists who transform organizations. Some of the 21st century literature includes Wheatley’s *Leadership and the New Science*, Greenleaf’s *The Servant-Leader Within*, and Pellicer’s *Caring Enough to Lead*. Although Bolman & Deal placed servant leadership in the Human Resources frame, here it is placed in the visionary category to accommodate a simplified system of classification. Greenleaf’s (2003) servant leadership and Wheatley’s (1999) holistic chaos perspective fit well into this category although both authors acknowledge that all good leaders must use whatever works in the situation in which they find themselves, which acknowledges integration as a

necessity in leadership. Greenleaf said, “Avoid the how-to-do-it books; avoid any stereotyped leader model. Rather, choose your own role, the one that best fits your nature, and allow your own best leader style to emerge out of your own experience” (p. 70). Wheatley, with her focus on *disorder* becoming the source of new *order* and growth appearing from imbalance, also leaned toward shared responsibility when she said that, “Knowledge grows inside relationships, from ongoing circles of exchange where information is not just accumulated by individuals, but is willingly shared. Information-rich, ambiguous environments are the source of surprising new births” (p. 104).

The Moral Imperative (Fullan, 2001) and *Moral Leadership* (Sergiovanni, 1992) both spoke to leadership practices with a moral dimension, centered on purpose, values, and beliefs. These same qualities were addressed by Lashway (1997) as the key ingredients to transformational leadership – inspiration, persuasion, idealism, and intellectual excitement rather than coercion. The transformational leader convinces his followers that their deepest values will be realized.

In *Caring Enough to Lead*, Pellicer discussed reflective thought and serving others as a means to moral leadership. While Pellicer also spoke of collaboration and shared vision, which fit well into the shared-responsibility category, he also articulated the outcome of visionary leadership within the school:

In such a school, bureaucratic lines are blurred, and the need to manage people is reduced because people manage themselves in accordance with the shared vision. In the rare instances where this kind of fundamental change in structure occurs, schools are truly transformed and become “virtuous enterprises.” (p. 153)

Sergiovanni called this type of visionary-led, transformed educational organization a covenantal community.

Shared-Responsibility Leadership Literature

This category entails collaboration, participation, and facilitation. In *School Leadership That Works*, Marzano, Waters, & McNulty (2005) described leadership in terms of shared responsibility, teams, and purposeful communities: “Fortunately, a solution exists if the focus of school leadership shifts from a single individual to a team of individuals” (p. 99). In *Facilitative Leadership*, Hord (1992) urged principals, leadership teams, and superintendents to embrace facilitative leadership through creating an atmosphere and culture for change [improvement]; developing and communicating the vision; planning and providing resources; and providing training and development. Shared-responsibility leadership involves power sharing and empowering followers. The instructional leader spreads the responsibilities throughout the learning community, allowing followers to do what they do best. Leaders must be skilled in the art of inviting participation in the decision-making process (Buffie, 1989). This shared decision making creates power through people.

Bolman & Deal would include the shared-responsibility category in the political frame because leaders identify key players and use them to accomplish that in which they excel. In *What Great Principals Do Differently* (Whitaker, 2003), collaboration and facilitation were the means to the end of teaching the teachers, creating loyalty, making good decisions, and setting expectations. Whitaker said, “The difference between more effective principals and their less effective colleagues is not what they know. It is what they do” (p. 1).

In *The 8th Habit*, Covey (2004) described the successful leader as one who finds his voice and inspires others to find theirs. Although this is a holistic view, and could easily fit into the visionary category, it is included here in the shared-responsibility leadership style because it is based on establishing trust, searching for third alternatives, and developing a shared vision.

In *Leadership for Differentiating Schools & Classrooms*, Tomlinson (2000) articulated the shared-responsibility model by describing leaders who listen to the ideas of others and incorporate those ideas into the visions of their schools. She also pointed out, however, that the systemic change [improvement] required in schools must be headed up by leaders who are active participants in the process, accepting responsibility and not merely assigning duties. Peters and Waterman (1982) echoed this sentiment: “Treat people as adults. Treat them as partners; treat them with dignity; treat them with respect. Treat them...as the primary source of productivity gains” (p. 238).

Integrative Leadership Literature

In this day and age, it would be difficult to find a researcher, theorist, or practitioner who would argue solely for a top-down hierarchical or strictly facilitative approach to leadership within the school. Sometimes there are immediate decisions that must be made in an instant, with no stakeholder buy-in or collaboration. And there are still many more times when power sharing and participation are absolutely essential to the success of the campus. In *Rethinking Leadership*, Sergiovanni (1999) said, “In this idiosyncratic world, one-best-way approaches and cookie cutter strategies do not work very well” (p. 22). Integrative leadership literature looks at synthesis of leadership philosophies – utilizing whatever style is necessary to successfully lead at this moment. Lashway (1997) told us that there is neither conclusive evidence to link a particular style of leadership to student success, nor is there any way a single-strategy approach can address the complex issues within the school environment. He recommended matching the leadership strategy to the situation and being flexible enough to incorporate many different styles. Deal & Peterson (1994) gave similar counsel when they said, “...accept the seemingly contradictory approaches as a paradox to be embraced and creatively addressed, not to see them as an either-or

choice to be made” (p. 9). Blending leadership approaches is a natural part of the complicated process of leading schools.

Bolman & Deal (2003) believed strongly in the integrative process as well. They suggested balancing the frames (political, structural, human resources, and symbolic) and “recalibrating” in response to new circumstances. They said:

Several lines of recent research find that effective leaders and effective organizations rely on multiple frames. Studies of effective corporations, of individuals in senior management roles, and of public administrators all point to the need for multiple perspectives in developing a holistic picture of complex systems. (p. 319)

They went on to say that those leaders who develop the ability to respond in more than one way to a dilemma possess a “liberating sense of choice and power.”

In *The Learning Leader*, Reeves (2006) reflected on leadership dimensions: visionary, relational, systems, reflective, collaborative, analytical, and communicative. Rather than focusing on one style as being better than another, he recognized that they must all be employed at one time or another when he wrote:

Great leaders are not mythological composites of every dimension of leadership. Instead they have self-confidence, and without hubris they acknowledge their deficiencies and fill their subordinate ranks not with lackeys but with exceptional leaders who bring complementary strengths to the organization. (p. 33)

No man is an island, and no one person possesses every leadership style. Being able to share responsibility, integrate leadership models, and shift gears depending on the situation is mandatory for successful educational leadership. Siefert & Vornberg (2002) wrote in *The New School Leader for the 21st Century*:

A point will come in this journey that the principal realizes the old approach of directing the “ship’s journey in the educational sea” will become overwhelming. The captain of any vessel cannot stand the watch all of the time. Others must be trusted at the helm. This maturation process as a leader will bring on honest and open communications, trusting the decisions of others, and instilling the vision of what could be accomplished in the empowerment of others as leaders. (p. 25)

Although Senge (2006) spent a great deal of space writing about shared vision and collaboration, *The Fifth Discipline* is placed in the Integrative category for its attention to systems thinking, collective learning, seeing organisms as a whole, and using whatever tactics and leadership styles necessary to make improvements. Senge wrote of systems thinking, “It is a framework for seeing interrelationships rather than things, for seeing patterns of change rather than static ‘snapshots’” (p. 68). He went on to say:

Our traditional views of leaders – as special people who set the direction, make the key decisions, and energize the troops – are deeply rooted in an individualistic and nonsystemic worldview. Especially in the West, leaders are heroes – great men (and very occasionally women) who “rise to the fore” in times of crisis. So long as such myths prevail, they reinforce a focus on short-term events and charismatic heroes rather than on systemic forces and collective learning.(p. 320)

Conclusion

Integrative, multi-dimensional examinations of leadership are not new to the literature (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Gardner, 1988; Barth, 1990); however, they do make up the bulk of current literature. Except for revised volumes, such as Greenleaf’s 2003 update to his 1977 book *Servant Leadership*, there are few if any “new” styles of leadership being introduced. Of the 59 books reviewed for this analysis, 31 were from the 20th century, and 28 were from the 21st

century. Of the 31 books from the 20th century, 48% fall into the visionary leadership category; 29% fall into the shared-responsibility leadership category; and 23% fall into the integrative leadership category. The 28 books from the 21st century break down like this: 36% visionary; 14% shared-responsibility; and 50% integrative.

Three trends are noticeable in the 21st century leadership literature: (1) The majority are geared toward synthesizing a number of leadership styles rather than concentrating on a single style; (2) Authors and researchers fairly consistently use the word *change* when hopefully they mean *improvement*; and (3) Many have moved toward listing research-based attributes of leaders who are considered to be “successful,” e.g., 10 traits, 5th discipline, 8th habit, 21 leadership responsibilities, 21 irrefutable laws, 15 things that matter most, etc.

Even when these formulas and lists are steeped in data, science, and research, they cannot address the practical-use decisions that educational leaders are making on a daily basis. Solving these problems is too individual for standard recipes (Sergiovanni, 1992). Assuming that universities and professors are teaching educational leadership from a solid theoretical base, there may be room to expand the discussion of leadership in the new millennium to qualities such as creativity, design, innovation, and empathy brought forth in the past two years by many authors and researchers (Pink, 2006; Friedman, 2006; National Center on Education & the Economy, 2007).

Rather than scrutinize lists of leadership traits and characteristics, it would serve educational leaders well to focus on the *difference* between good and great, and spend some time there reflecting. Collins said that, “Greatness is not a function of circumstance. Greatness, it turns out, is largely a matter of conscious choice, and discipline” (2005, p. 31).

References

- Barth, R.S. (1990). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (1995). *Leading with soul: An uncommon journey of spirit*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership, (3rd ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Buffie, E.G. (1989). *The principal and leadership*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Collins, J. (2005). *Good to great and the social sectors: A monograph to accompany good to great*. New York: Jim Collins.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap...and others don't*. New York: Harper Business.
- Collins, J., & Porras, J.I. (1994). *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Covey, S.R. (2004). *The 8th habit: From effectiveness to greatness*. New York: Free Press.
- Crow, G.M., Matthews, L.J., & McCleary, L.E. (1996). *Leadership: A relevant and realistic role for principals*. Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education Publishers.
- Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1994). *The leadership paradox: Balancing logic and artistry in schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dowd, J. (1936). *Control in human societies*. New York: Appleton-Century.

- DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.
- Friedman, T. L. (2006). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gardner, J. W. (1988). *Leadership papers, (vol. 1-11)*. Washington, D. C.: Independent Sector.
- Gladwell, M. (2005). *Blink: The power of thinking without thinking*. New York: Little Brown and Company.
- Goldberg, M.F. (2000). *Profiles of leadership in education*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2003). *The servant-leader within: A transformative path*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Hord, S. M. (1992). *Facilitative leadership: The imperative for change*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1982). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.
- Lashway, L. (1997). *Multidimensional school leadership* [Fastback]. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Educational Foundation.
- Marion, R. (2002). *Leadership in education: Organizational theory for the practitioner*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Marzano, R.J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B.A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Maxwell, J.C. (1999). *The 21 indispensable qualities of a leader: Becoming the person others will want to follow*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.

- McEwan, M.K. (2003). *Ten traits of highly effective principals: From good to great performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- National Center on Education and the Economy. (2007). *Tough choices or tough times*.
- Pellicer, L. O. (2003). *Caring enough to lead: How reflective thought leads to moral leadership* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Peters, T., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York: Warner.
- Phi Delta Kappa International (2000). *Readings on Leadership in education*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Educational Foundation.
- Pink, D. H. (2006). *A whole new mind: Why right-brainers will rule the future*. New York: The Berkley Publishing Group.
- Reeves, D.B. (2006). *The learning leader: How to focus school improvement for better results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Rost, J.C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Seifert, E. H., & Vornberg, J. A. (2002). *The new school leader for the 21st century: The principal*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.
- Senge P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1999). *Rethinking leadership: A collection of articles by Thomas J. Sergiovanni*. Arlington Heights, IL: SkyLight Training and Publishing Inc.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.

Tomlinson, C.A., & Allan, S. D. (2000). *Leadership for differentiating schools & classrooms*.

Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wheatley, M. J. (1999). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world*.

San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Whitaker, T. (2003). *What great principals do differently: Fifteen things that matter most*.

Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education.