

LEADERSHIP DEFINITIONS APPLICATION FOR LECTURERS' LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Reni Rosari ^{1*}

¹Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, 55281, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Keywords:

Leadership
development,
Mutual purpose

Bernard M. Bass (1990), John P. Kotter (1988), and Joseph C. Rost (1993) defined leadership in different meanings. Among the three definitions, Rost's definition can be as a practical application as well as providing guiding principles for lecturers' leadership development. Leadership is not a person and it is different with management. Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes. Four essential elements that must be present if leadership exists are: (1) the relationship is based on influence, (2) leaders and followers are people in this relationship, (3) leaders and followers intend real changes, and (4) leaders and followers develop mutual purposes.

* Corresponding Author at Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Jalan Socio Humaniora No. 1, Yogyakarta 55182, Indonesia.

E-mail address: rosari@ugm.ac.id (author#1),

1. Introduction

There are many different meanings of leadership. Researchers usually define leadership according to their individual perspective and the aspect of the phenomenon of most interest to them. Bernard M. Bass (1990), John P. Kotter (1988), and C. Rost (1993) have their own perspective of leadership. Bass (1990) tend to define leadership as do the leader's wishes, Kotter (1988) define leadership as influence and Rost (1993) define leadership as relationship.

This paper attempts to compare and contrast each definition and then choose one of the definitions that promises the most in terms of practical applications as well as providing guiding principles for lecturer leadership development.

To organise the discussion, this paper is divided into four parts: introduction, comparison and contrast of Bass's, Kotter's, and Rost's definitions of leadership, the most promising definition in terms of practical applications as well as providing guiding principles for my own leadership development, and conclusion.

2. Comparison And Contrast Of Bass's, Kotter's, And Rost's Definitions Of Leadership

Bernard M. Bass: Leadership as Do the Leader's Wishes. Bass accepted the view that leadership is basically doing what the leader wants done. It is mentioned in his book, Bass and Stodgill's Handbook of Leadership (1990), that leadership is an interaction between two or more members of a group. Leaders are agents of change, persons whose acts affect other people more than other people's acts affect them.

Leadership occurs when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group (p.19).

Bass also seemed to equate leadership with a leader who gets "performance beyond expectations" (to quote the title of his book: "Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectation") out of his/her followers. This definition comes through from his statement: "to sum up, we see transformational leader as one who motivates us to do more than we originally expected to do (p.20).

Bass (1985) proposes that "to achieve follower performance beyond the ordinary limits, leadership must be transformational" (p.xiii). Superior leadership performance is transformational leadership (Bass, 1990). It occurs when "leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group, and when they stir their employees to look beyond their own self-interest for good of the group" (Bass, 1990, p. 21).

According to Bass (1985, p.20), the extent to which a leader is transformational is measured primarily in terms of the leader's effect on followers. The leader transforms and motivates followers by: (1) making them more aware of the importance of task outcomes, (2) inducing them to transcend their own self interest for the sake of the organisation or team, and (3) activating their higher order needs. I have problem with his opinion that effective leader can induce followers to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organisation. Because in reality, it is evidence that most people do not act in

the long run against their own self-interest.

Bass (as cited in Tracey and Hinkin, 1998) proposes that transformational leadership comprises the "Four I's". The first dimension is idealised influence. Idealised influence is described as the behaviour that results in follower admiration, respect, and trust. Idealised influence involves risk sharing on the part of leaders, a consideration of follower needs over personal needs, and ethical and moral conduct. The second dimension is inspirational motivation. This dimension is reflected by behaviours that provide meaning and challenge to followers' work. It includes behaviours that articulate clear expectations and demonstrate commitment to overall organisational goals. In addition, team spirit is aroused through enthusiasm and optimism. The third dimension is intellectual stimulation. Leaders who demonstrate this type of leadership solicit new ideas and creative problem solutions from their followers, and encourage novel and new approaches for performing work. The fourth dimension is individual consideration. This is reflected by leaders who listen attentively and pay special attention to follower achievement and growth needs.

John P. Kotter: Leadership as Influence

Although Kotter did not use the word influence but he put the concept of influence in his definition. Kotter (1988, p.16) defines leadership as "the process of moving a group or groups in some direction through (mostly) non-coercive means". Parentheses in definitions bother me, so I have problem with the word mostly in his definition. Kotter's definition of leadership also refers to "a process that helps direct and

mobilise people and/or their ideas" (Kotter 1990a, p.3). The function of leadership is constructive or adaptive change. Leadership achieves this function through three sub processes: establishing direction, aligning people, and motivating and inspiring. Based on his explanation about leadership, it seems that leadership is quite similar with management. "Management and leadership, so defined, are clearly in some ways similar (Kotter 1990a, p.5)

However, Kotter (1990a) notes that despite management and leadership have some similarities, they also have differences which makes management and leadership very distinct (see Appendix 1 and 2). Leadership and management differ in term of their primary function. The first can produce useful change, the second can create orderly results which keep something working efficiently. However, it does not mean that management is never associated with change; in tandem with effective leadership, it can help produce a more orderly change process. Nor does this mean that leadership is never associated with order; to the contrary, in tandem with effective management, an effective leadership process can help produce the changes necessary to bring a chaotic situation under control. However, leadership by itself never keeps an operation on time and on budget year after year. Management by itself never creates significant useful change (Kotter, 1990a).

Joseph C. Rost: Leadership as Relationship

Rost (1993, p.102) defines leadership as "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual

purposes". There are four essential elements that must be present if leadership exist: the relationship is based on influence, leaders and followers are the people in this relationship, leaders and followers intend real change, and leaders and followers develop mutual purposes. All that people need to do to establish if leadership is happening is to determine if these four essential elements are present. If they are present, the phenomenon is leadership (Rost, 1993).

The first essential element of leadership is a relationship based on influence, which is defined as using persuasion to have an impact on other people in a relationship. Leadership as an influence relationship has two characteristics: (1) it is multidirectional, in that influence flows in all directions and not just from the top down; and (2) it is non coercive, meaning that it is not based on authority, power, or dictatorial action but it is based on persuasive behaviours (Rost, 1993).

Leaders and followers are the people in the influence relationship called leadership. In the new paradigm, which Rost (1993) named 'the post-industrial era', followers are active, not passive, in the relationship. Followers and leaders do leadership. They are in the leadership relationship together. They do not do the same things in the relationship, but they are both essential to leadership. The influence patterns in the relationship are inherently unequal because leaders typically exert more influence than do followers. This is because leaders are willing to commit more of power resources they posses to the relationship, and they are more skilled at putting those power resources to work to influence others in the relationship (Rost, 1993).

The third essential element of leadership is that the leaders and followers intend real change. 'Intend' means that the leaders and followers purposefully desire certain changes. 'Real' means that the changes the leaders and followers intend are substantive and transforming, not pseudo changes. Leadership is a relationship of leaders and followers who intend real changes, not who produce real changes. Changes may, indeed, be produced as a result of a leadership relationship, but they are not essential to it. Leadership can still be leadership when the relationship fails to produce results.

Leaders and followers develop mutual purposes. The changes the leaders and followers intend reflect their mutual purposes which is forged through the non-coercive, influence relationship. Mutual purposes become common purposes because followers and leaders engage in leadership together.

According to Rost (1993) there are four differences between leadership and management (see Appendix 3). The first difference is influence versus authority relationship. Leadership is an influence relationship and management is an authority relationship. Influence requires that coercion not be used. Authority allows the use of coercion. Attempts to influence other people in a leadership are multidirectional. Attempts to use authority in managerial relationship are unidirectional and top down. The second difference is leaders and followers versus managers and subordinates. Leaders and followers are the people involved in a leadership relationship. Managers and subordinates are the people involved in a managerial relationship. The third difference is intending real changes vs. producing and selling goods and/or

services. Leaders and followers intend real changes, while managers and subordinates produce and sell good and/or services. The fourth difference is mutual purpose versus coordinated activities. The intended changes must reflect the mutual purposes of the leaders and followers. The goods and/or services result from the coordinated activities of the managers and subordinates.

3. The Contrast of Bass's, Kotter's, and Rost's Definitions of Leadership

Both Bass (1990) and Kotter (1988) tend to emphasise leadership on the peripheral elements of leadership, such as preferred behaviours, born or made issues, and effectiveness, and the content of leadership, such as what leaders need to know about a particular organisation in order to be influential in it. Rost (1993) with his so called a new school of leadership, emphasise leadership on the essential nature of leadership as an influence relationship, leader-followers interactions, and mutual purposes (Rost, 1993).

Both Bass (1990) and Kotter (1988) also tend to equate leadership with leader, confusing a process with a person. They also tend to put followers as subordinates who are submissive and passive, and leaders as managers who are directive and active. Rost (1993), with his so-called new paradigm of post-industrial era, has different idea. He argues that leaders are not equated with managers, and followers are not equated with subordinates. Leaders can be anyone, and followers can be anyone too. Leaders and followers together do leadership. Followers are active agents in

the leadership relationship, not passive recipients of the leader's influence. Followers sometimes may change place and become leaders, but they do not have to be leaders to exerts influence, to use power resources to persuade others of their position. In this extent, however, Rost (1993) never means that leaders and followers are equal. Rost (1993) never put leaders and followers in equal relationship due to unequal influence pattern. Leaders typically have exert more influence than do followers (Rost, 1993).

Bass (1990) and Kotter (1988) do not make clear distinction between management and leadership. They tend to describe leadership as good management. Bass (as cited in Hughes et al., 1996) wrote that "leaders manage and managers lead, but the two activities are not synonymous". Management is not only leadership nor is leadership only management; those appointed to a position of responsibility as managers need to appreciate what leadership is expected of them. If they are to be transactional leaders, they will need to provide their subordinates with a clear understanding of what is expected of them and what they can hope to receive in exchange for fulfilling these expectations. As subordinates become competent, managers who aspire to become transformational leaders must pay attention to each of their subordinates, sharing their concerns and development and treating them as individuals (Bass, 1985). Kotter (1993) clear up the confusion between the two concepts (leadership and management) by insisting that leadership is non-coercive influence. However, Rost (1993) argues that the word non-coercive is not the whole answer, it is the part of the

answer in differentiating between management and leadership. As explained in the previous part, Rost (1993) makes clear his own distinction between management and leadership (see also Appendix 3). This is one that Rost (1983) has different ideas with Bass (1990) and Kotter (1988) about leadership and management. Leadership is not good management.

As opposed to Bass (1990) and Kotter (1988) who do not deny coercive behaviour in leadership, Rost (1993) argues that when coercive and authoritarian processes are characteristics of a relationship, it cannot be called as leadership. "A relationship in which the pattern of behaviours is classified as predominantly coercive and authoritarian is not leadership" (Rost, 1993).

Rost (1993) also has different opinion with Bass (1990) and Kotter (1988) about charisma as a leadership factor. Bass (1990) and Kotter (1988) see that charisma is one of the most important factors in transformational leadership. Bass (as cited in Yukl, 1994) notes that "charisma is a necessary ingredient of transformational leadership". Charismatic leadership is central to the transformational leadership process (Bass, 1985). Charisma is something important and can be learned (Bass, 1992). Leaders can be trained to be charismatic in both verbal and nonverbal performance (Bass, 1990). Kotter (1990) also notes that "charisma is the attribute most important to being a good leader, especially a good motivator". However, he also notices that charisma is not that important to effective leadership in complex organisation. Charisma is not something that is learned later in life; it comes with genes and the early

personality. Even for people were perceived as charismatic, their experiences as adults often contribute to that sense of personal magnetism. Rost (1993) does not agree that charisma is the important factor in transformational leadership. According to him the notion of leadership as charismatic is more consistent with the do-the leader's-wishes conceptual framework than it is with the leadership-as transformation work. "Doing the leader's wishes is what charismatic leadership is all about. There is no essential transformational quality to charismatic process as applied to leadership; the only requirement is to do what the leader wishes" (Rost, 1993).

4. The Most Promising Definition In Terms Of Practical Application As Well As Providing Guiding Principles For Lecturers' Leadership Development

Rost's definition of leadership (1993) can be the most promising definition as a practical application and a guiding principle for lecturers' leadership development. Rost (1993) ideas about leadership give clear understanding about the essential nature of what leadership is, the process of leadership whereby leaders and followers relate one another to achieve a purpose. Bass (1990) and Kotter (1988) do not explain clearly the role of followership in a dynamic interplay of leader-follower activism. They also tend to have linear views of leadership. They tend to have assumptions (1) that leaders and followers resemble a hierarchical chain of command; (2) that leaders announce the goals they have for a group or organisation and followers more or

less automatically accept those goals and then set about achieving them; (3) that leadership is primarily a one-way communication process which involves telling and selling when ordering is not feasible; (4) that leaders have the right answer and thus lead the parade of followers. Meanwhile, Rost (1993) explains that all these notions are unacceptable when leadership is distinguished from management (Rost, 1993). According to Rost (1993) leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes. Four essential elements that must be present if leadership exists are: (1) the relationship is based on influence, (2) leaders and followers are people in this relationship, (3) leaders and followers intend real changes, and (4) leaders and followers develop mutual purposes.

The relationship that is leadership must be based on influence. As an influence relationship, leadership has two characteristics: it is multidirectional influence and it is non-coercive behaviours (Rost, 1993). University lecturers must be a part of a movement to increase quality education and research in their university. Universities as higher education institutions usually have common visions, for example quality education and research. To achieve the university purpose, lecturers have to joint with other people (other lecturers, students, administrators, directors, and so on) in the university in a leadership relationship. In this leadership relationship, multidirectional influence exists; influences flow in all directions and not just from the top down. Everyone in the leadership relationship interacts and influences one another by

communicating through speaking, writing and doing. Lecturers should try to influence and persuade their students to be the best students. On the other hand, they get influence from their students, other lecturers, director, and may also from society to be good lecturers in their university. In this leadership relationship, behaviours used to persuade other people must be non-coercive. Coercive behaviour never produces more than short-term results. In this leadership relationship, for example, Lecturers do not need to use any coercive behaviour in order to influence their students. They do not need to control and manage their students to be the best students. What lecturers need to do is to help their students to be able to control and manage themselves, and develop the desire to want to change themselves. If lecturers try to control and manage their students by punishment, for example, the relationship become power not leadership any more.

Leaders and followers are the people in the leadership relationship. Followers are active, not passive, in the relationship. They do leadership, not followership. Followers and leaders do leadership. They are in the leadership relationship together. They are the ones who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes. Followers and leaders develop a relationship wherein they influence one another as well as the organisation and society, and that is leadership. They do not do the same things in the relationship, but they are both essential to leadership. In this leadership relationship, followers sometimes change places and become leaders. However, they do not have to be leaders to exert influence, to use power resources to persuade others of their

position (Rost, 1993). Lecturer and students, for example, they both do leadership. They develop relationship wherein they influence one another as well as the university and society. In this leadership relationship, lecturers need to be good lecturers and students also want to be good students. They influence one another to be able to change their self (to be good lecturers and students) as well as their university (to be good university) and also their society (to be good educated society). In this leadership relationship, students as followers, for example, may change their place become leaders to influence others (lecturers or administrators) to increase the quality education and services in the university.

Leaders and followers intend real change. Intend means that the leader and followers purposefully desire certain changes in an organisation and/or in the society. Real means that the leaders and followers intend changes in people's lives, attitudes, behaviours, and basic assumptions, as well as in the groups, organisations, societies, and civilisations they are trying to lead. Changes means that different people in the relationship can emphasise different but related purposes (Rost, 1993). As lecturers have the same purpose to change their university to be the best university, they are in the leadership relationship.

Lecturers, students, directors, administrators and all that can emphasise different purposes in the relationship. For example, lecturers emphasise their purpose to be good lecturers and researchers, students emphasise their purpose to be the good students; have good results from Quality University, and administrators emphasise their purpose to provide good services for the students and the lecturers. However,

they all have common or related purpose in the leadership relationship that is having quality education (and research) in the university.

Leaders and followers develop mutual purposes. Mutual purposes are common purposes because followers and leaders together do leadership. Leadership cannot be done without commonality of purposes. Independent goals mutually held are not enough because they are not common purposes. To reflect their mutual purposes, leaders and followers must come to some agreement about their purposes. That agreement must be consciously achieved by the interaction of leaders and followers. It must be developed using non-coercive methods. It must be forged in the relationship that leaders and followers have, one which allows followers to influence leaders (and other followers) as well as leaders to influence followers (and other leaders) (Rost, 1993). So, as leaders and followers in the university, lecturers, students, administrators, staffs, directors, and so on need to develop mutual or common purposes in the leadership relationship. For example, we have common vision in our university: being the best university and having the best education and research in the university.

In addition, Foster (as cited in Rost, 1993) says that when the mutual purposes become more common among the leaders and followers, leadership takes on new meaning as a communal relationship. At that point, leaders and followers will have come to understanding that putting their own good as individuals, groups, or organisations ahead the common good of the community is not leadership, because that kind of understanding does not

reflect mutual purposes, only independent goal mutually held. In leadership writ large, the mutual purposes are the common good (Rost, 1993).

5. CONCLUSION

Bass (1990), Kotter (1988), and Rost (1993) definitions of leadership give us understanding what leadership is. However, among these definitions, Rost's definition (1993) is the most promising definition in terms of practical application as well as providing guiding principles for lecturers' leadership development. Leadership is not a person, sitting at the top of hierarchy, determining for a group of loyal followers, the direction, pace, and outcome of everyone's effort. Leadership is not management. Rost's ideas (1993) about leadership is different with Bass's (1990) and Kotters's (1988) ideas about leadership. Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes.

For a leadership relationship to be exist, there must be four essential elements presents in the relationship: (1) the relationship is based on influence; (2) leaders and followers are the people in this relationship; (3) leaders and followers intend real changes; and (4) leaders and followers develop mutual purposes.

Leadership is done by active people. Only active people are able to do leadership. In the leadership relationship leaders are not equated with managers, and followers are not equated with subordinates. Followers are active, not passive, in the relationship. They do leadership, not followership. Followers and leaders together do leadership. This

role of followership in the leadership activism is the main point that Bass (1990) and Kotter (1988) did not mention in their explanation about leadership definitions.

REFERENCES

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

Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stodgill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*. Third Edition. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.

Bass, B.M. (1992). Assessing the charismatic leader. In Syrett, M. and C. Hogg, (eds.), *Frontiers of Leadership: An Essential Reader*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Bass, B.M. (1995). Concepts of leadership. In Pierce, J.L. and J.W. Newstrom, (eds.), *Leaders and Leadership Process*. Boston: Irwin.

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

Bass, B.M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9-32.

Hughes, Richard L., R.C. Ginnett, and G.J. Curphy. (1996). *Leadership:*

Enhancing the lessons of experience. Second Edition. Boston, Massachusetts: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Kotter, J.P. (1988). *The Leadership Factor*. New York: Free Press.

Kotter, J.P. (1990a). *A Force for change: how leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.

Kotter, J.P. (1990b). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, 103-111.

Rost, J.C. (1993). *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. Westport: Praeger.

Tracey, J.B. and Hinkin, T.R. (1998). Transformational leadership or effective managerial practices? *Group and Organisation Management*, 23 (3), 220-236.

Yukl, Garry. (1994). *Leadership in Organisation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendix 1. The Difference between Management and Leadership

Management	Leadership
Companies manage complexity first by <i>planning and budgeting</i> .	Leading an organisation to constructive change begins by <i>setting a direction</i> .
Management develops the capacity to achieve its plan by <i>organising and staffing</i> .	The equivalent leadership activity is <i>aligning people</i> .
Management ensures plan accomplishment by <i>controlling and problem solving</i> .	For leadership, achieving a vision requires <i>motivating and inspiring</i> .

Source:

Kotter, J.P. (1990). What leaders really do. **Harvard Business Review**, May-June, 103-111.

Appendix 2. Comparing Management and Leadership

	Management	Leadership
<i>Creating an agenda</i>	Planning and Budgeting - establishing detailed steps and timetables for achieving needed results, and then allocating the resources necessary to make that happen.	Establishing Direction - developing a vision of the future, often the distant future, and strategies for producing the changes needed to achieve that vision.
<i>Developing a human network for achieving the agenda</i>	Organising and Staffing - establishing some structure for accomplishing plan requirements, staffing that structure with individuals, delegating responsibility and authority for carrying out the plan, providing policies and procedures to help guide people, and creating methods or systems to monitor implementation.	Aligning People - communicating the direction by words and deeds to all those whose cooperation may be needed so as to influence the creation of teams and coalitions that understand the vision and strategies, and accept their validity.
<i>Execution</i>	Controlling and Problem Solving - monitoring results vs. plan in some detail, identifying deviations, and then planning and organising to solve these problems.	Motivating and Inspiring - energising people to overcome major political, bureaucratic, and resource barriers to change by satisfying very basic, but often unfulfilled, human needs.
<i>Outcomes</i>	Produce a degree of predictability and order , and has the potential of consistently producing key results expected by various stakeholders (e.g. for customers, always being on time; for stakeholders, being on budget).	Produces change , often to a dramatic degree, and has the potential of producing extremely useful change (e.g. new products that customers want, new approaches to labour relations that help make a firm more competitive).

Source:

Kotter, J.P. (1990). Management and Leadership. **A Force for change: how leadership differs from management**. New York: Free Press

Appendix 3. Distinguishing Leadership from Management

Leadership	Management
Influence relationship	Authority relationship
Leaders and followers	Managers and subordinates
Intend real changes	Produce and sell goods and/or services
Intended changes reflect mutual purposes	Goods/Services result from coordinated activities

Source:

Rost, J.C. (1993). **Leadership for the Twenty-First Century**. Westport: Praeger.