Transforming Leadership

DEVELOPING PEOPLE THROUGH DELEGATION

KARL W. KUHNERT

Department of Psychology, University of Georgia

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Because of such influences as downsizing, restructuring, and greater international competition for products and services, organizational leaders over the past decade have had to rethink radically how to manage their people and institutions. With fewer employees required to share greater work loads, many of these leaders have had to stretch the capacity of their human resources to keep pace with rapid changes in the market. To address these ongoing changes and to capitalize on an organization's human assets, leaders must continuously develop their people to higher levels of potential. This chapter explores the process of *delegation,* one of the least appreciated and most misunderstood ways of developing people. Specifically, the chapter will show how three different leadership models consistent with the full-range model of leadership can be used to understand how transformational leaders use delegation to develop their people. In terms of the full-range model presented in Chapter 1, much of the discussion in this chapter will focus on life-span development as it relates to individualized consideration.

Delegation and Development

The professional development of employees is big business world-wide. Traditionally, professional development has been conceptu-

alized as training opportunities provided outside the immediate work environment. Recent estimates of annual corporate investment in classroom training in the United States reach approximately $40 billion. This is a staggering figure given that most of what a manager learns (as much as 90% to 80%) comes from on-the-job experiences and practices. Knowing that development and learning are primarily the result of job experience, it becomes obvious that what one is able to learn directly results from the opportunities made available on the job. It is not surprising, then, that individuals who receive greater opportunities and get more meaningful assignments throughout their careers will be more likely to develop and grow professionally, eventually becoming leaders in their own right.[1]

One common way for organizations to expose potential leaders to development opportunities is through rotating job assignments. Often these assignments are in highly visible positions in different departments across the organization and usually are for a specified period of time. The purpose of such assignments is to test the capabilities of the leader in an attempt to transform potential, perhaps latent, talent into actual talent.[2] The costs of such programs, however, are considerable. Relocation expenses, salary increases, losses in efficiency and errors during the learning process, and the cost of failure in a new assignment all contribute to the high price of development.[3] Too often, the strategy underlying the use of job rotation for development is short-term and is disrupted as the needs of the organization change. That is why we must look for other strategies to develop personnel.

Delegation is another way to do so. Defined simply, it is the assignment of responsibility or authority to another; it is a frequently used management tool in organizations around the world.[4] Delegation has been conceptualized as a time-management tool[5] a decision-making process,[6] or a way of getting more things done through others, especially under such conditions as those described at the outset of this chapter. However, few authors have viewed delegation as a way of developing and transforming employees to higher levels of ability and potential.

Although delegation can ease the job of managing and increase the effectiveness of the manager, this is a relatively narrow view of delegation. Some of the more forward-looking authorities mention that delegation can develop individuals' skills and enhance individual involvement. Nonetheless, there is virtually no discussion of what is getting developed through delegation or how or why some leaders seem to be able to develop the potential in others while other leaders cannot.

As with other, more traditional concepts, we examine in this chapter the process of delegation using the full-range perspective.

Delegation and the Development Leader

To understand the process of delegation, we must first examine in greater detail the orientation or perspective of the delegating manager or leader. As noted in Chapter 1, Burns and Bass's [8,9] comprehensive views of leadership identified two types of leadership: nontransactional-transactional and transformational. Transactional leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purposes of an exchange of something valued; that is, leaders approach followers with an eye toward negotiation. Focus of the leader can be either to correct a problem or to establish an agreement to increase the probability of achieving positive results-for example, a constructive transaction. Transformational leadership, on the other hand, is based on more than the compliance of followers or the establishment of agreements: It involves shifts in followers' beliefs, values, needs, and capabilities. Thus from the standpoint of theory building, these two orientations toward leadership offer striking contrasts in philosophy toward development and delegation.

More recently, Kuhnert and Lewis to have expanded on Burns and Bass's work by incorporating a developmental framework that identifies three distinct leadership models within the transactional and transformational paradigm. According to their framework, each successive model has its own frame of reference and represents unique ways of understanding leader behavior and, in turn, the impact of the leader's behavior on followers and colleagues. It is through each of these models that we can explore a leader's central preoccupations, focal tasks, and expectations. This information can be extremely helpful in clarifying a developmental view of delegation.

The purpose of presenting these views of delegation through the three models is to help you understand your own personal beliefs about delegation. Ultimately, you can see how this fits with your leadership orientation, whether it occurs in an individual or team context. Leadership and delegation are viewed here through three lenses at different levels of development.

It is important to confront the philosophy and behavior that each model advocates and contrast them with the leader's beliefs and ways of delegating duties, responsibilities, and learning experiences. In applying these models, you may ask: Do I agree with one model more than another? Which model describes the way I think about delegation? Which model offers the surest path toward the development of people who work with me?

Applying Three Leadership Models to Delegation

Model I: The Transactional Operator

The first leader type can be called the *transactional operator. As* Table 2.1 shows, a transactional operator is an individuals who has a personal agenda that is pursued without true concern for the welfare of others. These others are seen as instrumental or detrimental to the accomplishment of the operator's own goals. The operator is, fundamentally, a purely transactional person: He or she enters into agreements to satisfy his or her own personal agenda. This is not to say that all transactional leaders are self-serving and interested only in their own personal initiatives and goals. Rather, at the *lowest* level of development they would concern themselves only with their own personal needs.

Unfortunately, people do not often trust operators: They believe that operators will go beyond permissible bounds to satisfy their own needs. Common wisdom is that an operator is secretly "looking out for number one" despite occasional appearances to the contrary. However, this rather negative view of operators is perhaps too narrow. Successful Model I individuals usually are very good at planning, organizing, directing, and controlling. In fact, Model I individuals may be highly task-oriented, as well as self-interested, and thus can be reasonably effective leaders. They can be positive and productive by expecting and demanding results. Whether they stay within the boundaries of acceptable behavior depends on their values and motives. Also, followers may feel that they have been fairly treated as long as there are enough rewards to go around.

What distinguishes these leaders is not that they have self-serving personal agendas, but that they can pursue tasks and goals only in a way that reflects a characteristically one-sided, narrow view of the world. Their critical shortcoming is an idiosyncratic perspective of the world. They find it impossible to subordinate their goals and agendas to the good of other individuals, the group, or the organization. The limitation of the operator is an inability to internalize another person's view of him or her, and, in the extreme, a lack of concern for such views. This lack of empathic ability makes it impossible for such operators to participate fully in those collective processes that are so essential to the higher order forms of leadership along the full range that we have labeled as transformational leadership, or leadership that is characterized by mutual trust and team spirit. As a consequence, operators are limited in their ability to develop others through delegation. They use delegation

TABLE 2.1   Model I: The Transactional Operator

Major Attributes
- Operates out of own needs and agenda.
- "Manipulates" others and situations.   P
- Seeks concrete evidence of success.

View of Others
- Others seen as facilitators or obstacles to meeting own goals.
- Others seek own payoffs and can be manipulated with that knowledge.

Leadership Philosophy
- Play by my rules and I will get you what you want.

Follower Philosophy
- Let me know what you want and I will get it for you (if you take care of my needs).

Major Blind Spots in Delegation
- Cannot suspend agenda or coordinate agenda with others.
- Cannot think of others as thinking about him; lack of trust.
- Does not understand that some people will forego immediate payoffs to maintain a relationship of mutual trust or respect.

to serve their own purposes, not to develop followers to higher levels of potential.

For operators, delegation is a purely transactional process in that they are likely to delegate responsibility to others in exchange for fulfilling an actual or perceived agreement that emphasizes control, accountability, and clear lines of authority. Although the agreement may be in both parties' best interests, it is not certain how long a transactional leader can continue to strike such a bargain. If, after a time, the operator can no longer reward the individual for entering into agreements, the individual will likely begin to resent the delegation. One reason that delegation is often seen as a "dumping process" is that operators give to their associates those tasks that leaders find undesirable while keeping for themselves tasks that afford the most personal enjoyment, visibility, or payoff, whether it be short- or long-term. When followers and colleagues see delegation in this light, they view it as merely a transfer of tasks, often undesirable ones, rather than as a tool for developing their individual skills, even when such tasks could be viewed in that manner. This can result in a loss of respect for the operator and resentment for what others see as the operator's failure to recognize their potential. There also is a loss because of the failure on the operator's

part to apply the full potential of followers to the challenges confronting the organization. This lack of internal perspective and concern for others can have very damaging effects on employees at very early stages in their careers.

Because of the operator's inability to trust others, delegation may be perceived as a risk. Delegation for the transactional operator may trigger feelings of loss of power, authority, meaning, personal expression, and personal achievement. The delegation process is thus seen as a subtraction from one's assets. In other words, what is delegated is seen as removed from the operator's power rather than as something gained: the bringing together of leaders and employees to define tasks, increase productivity, and meet organizational goals. The operator's perspective ignores the role of the leader as "coach" and makes it impossible for the operator to provide associates with the support and guidance necessary to see a task through to completion; the operator thus wholly lacks the facility of development. Remember, the operator is the way he or she is because of a lack of capability, which has not been developed.

Examples of Operator (Model I) Leader Delegation

Andres could not let go of much of what he had to do although he was overloaded with assignments. He was afraid that if he delegated too many of his duties to others, then his boss would believe he was shirking his responsibilities. Furthermore, he usually felt he could get the work done better and in less time if he did it himself, so he delegated tasks only when absolutely compelled to do so.

Beatrice was likewise overloaded, but gave tasks to her followers only if two conditions prevailed: If she felt it would not take too much of her time to explain to them what had to be done and if she judged they would complete the tasks without complaining that they were underpaid because of the additional work.

Charles dumped work on followers whenever possible to lighten his own work load and checked carefully to see that others completed delegated assignments as directed, promising them recognition for success, and reproof for failure. All of these leaders demonstrated a view of others that was dominated by external contingencies, which characterizes the transactional operator.

Model II: The Team Player

The second type of leader is the *team player*. Table 2.2 outlines the strengths and limitations of being a team player and shows that the team

player's stock-in-trade is connection and relationships with others. Team players define themselves by how others view them, are motivated to maintain good interpersonal relations among members of the work team or with individual colleagues, and are highly sensitive to how others feel. For the team player, task outcomes or consequences are important for what they reveal about working relationships and for what they contribute to the group's sentiments and feelings of camaraderie. Critical for the team player is how people simultaneously feel about one another on the team. Do they work toward a common goal? Is there a special feeling of satisfaction in working with other team members? Do they perform out of a feeling of mutual respect? Is there a satisfactory degree of team loyalty? The team player is transactional to the extent that his or her efforts are stimulated mainly by his or her need for affection from others; he or she can be seen as transformational to the degree that team outcomes take center stage. Yet what others think of the team player dominates this leader's actions, so he or she is driven by external contingencies like the operator.

With the ability to establish positive interpersonal roles and connections, team players are able to motivate associates through trust, respect, and consideration. For team players, effective delegation is a two-way process that encourages an open exchange of ideas and problem perspectives. In contrast with operators, they are less likely to be directive in style. They understand that people will sometimes delegate responsibility as a means of pursuing group goals, sharing knowledge, and fostering achievements that will engender shared trust and loyalty. For the team player, delegation may also be a way to communicate trust in other team members and respect for their level of skills. The very act of- delegating tasks to employees shows that these leaders trust their associates, respect their skills, and have confidence in their abilities and potential for contributing to the organization. Thus delegation for the team player is a way of building and maintaining interpersonal relationships. In turn, team players do not view the delegation of tasks by the manager or leader as an "off-loading" of undesirable responsibilities. They can receive both good and poor task assignments, which may or may not have high payoffs. This view stems from the level of trust established in the team's relationships.

Although team players can delegate through transactional agreements, they also can capitalize on mutual feelings of trust, respect, or affection in the exercise of leadership. Leaders who are team players (Model II) have a broader perspective of delegation than do their operator (Model I) counterparts. Whereas operators are constrained to view the world as a place in which delegation is done to gain personal

TABLE 2.2 Model II: The Team Player

Major Attributes

- Very sensitive to how he or she is viewed or experienced internally by others.
- Self-definition derives in part from how he or she is experienced by others.
- Lives in a world of interpersonal roles and connections.

View of Others

- Thinks others define themselves by how he or she experiences them, so feels responsible for others' self-esteem.

Leadership Philosophy

- Show associates consideration and respect and they will follow you any-where.
- The "unit" and team morale are paramount.

Follower Philosophy

- I will do what it takes to earn your respect, but in return you must let me know how you feel about me.

Major Blind Spots in Delegation

- Unable to define self independent of others' view or independent of role expectations.
- Unable to make difficult decisions that entail a loss of respect.

advantage, team players see delegation as a way of strengthening relationships, as well as improving follower contributions and satisfaction. This does not suggest that personal gain would not be desirable, but that it is not predominant in the leader's thinking.

Despite the broader and added influence possessed by team players in comparison with operators, team players also have a critical flaw. Their perspectives are unduly influenced by concerns for their relationships, connections, and loyalties. In other words, team players are disproportionately controlled by others' views of them. Because follower acceptance and support are paramount for team players, they are unlikely to delegate problems that may entail a loss of respect. It is unlikely that team players would delegate authority that might undermine the work teams' cohesiveness, even where a temporary loss of cohesiveness may be necessary to achieve a particular critical task. Team players can and do delegate for the development of followers, but the delegated activities are concentrated on the enhancement of the interpersonal commitments among the work group members and not to foster autonomy, individuality, and growth. Teams may be strengthened, but the

leadership does not transform its individual members. To sacrifice team goals for the good of specific individuals is a difficult, if not impossible, assignment for Model II leaders.

Examples of Team Player (Model 11) Leader Delegation

Dan kept his team informed about any new assignments that his boss asked him whether he could handle. He would turn to his team to ask if he should accept the new responsibilities and if the team would be ready, willing, and able to help him. Delegation of assignment was accomplished through negotiation with his goal of avoiding dissatisfaction for any of his associates.

Emilia complained to her team members about being overloaded and asked them if it was all right to off-load some of these tasks to them. Emilia would complete the tasks if she sensed any resistance from her followers.

Frank met weekly with his team to discuss new assignments that were allocated on the basis of consensual discussions. Frank was determined that all members were always satisfied with their assignments. Maintaining group harmony was quite important to him.

In the context of the full-range model, our team leader is demonstrating an integration of contingent reward and individual consideration. Yet such leaders have not established a stronger inner sense of direction or belief that characterizes the higher end of the full-range model of leadership.

Model III: The Transformational "Self-Defining" Leader

The third model of leadership is not simply an alternative to the others, it transcends them. As summarized in Table 2.3, Model III describes the characteristics and outlook of "self-defining" leaders. Such leaders tend to be self-defining by having strong internalized values and ideals. They are able and willing to forgo personal payoffs and, when necessary, to risk loss of respect and affection to pursue actions that they are convinced are right. These leaders have a sense of self-worth that is self-determined: not in a self-serving way, but in a manner that allows them to make tough, unpopular decisions. They exhibit a strong sense of inner purpose and direction, which often is viewed by others as the great strength of their leadership.

Such transformational, self-defining, leaders are able to energize followers to take actions that support higher purposes rather than their own self-interest, and they are able to create an environment in which people are encouraged to address problems and opportunities with

TABLE 2.3 Model III: The Transformational "Self-Defining" Leader

Major Attributes
- Concerned about values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals.
- Self-contained and self-defining.

View of Others
- Able to grant others autonomy and individuality.
- Concerned about others without feeling responsible for their self-esteem.

Leadership Philosophy
- Articulates clear long-term standards and goals.
- Bases decisions on broad view of the situation, not just immediate factors.

Follower Philosophy
- Give me autonomy to pursue broad organizational goals.
- Do not ask me to compromise my own values or standards of self-respect, unless it is for the good of the group or organization.

Major Blind Spots in Delegation
- Can be too self-contained and reluctant to delegate.
- May become isolated in leadership role.

creativity and personal commitment. Because self-defining leaders are guided by their internal values and standards rather than their needs, relationships, or purely external standards, they are able and quite likely to base their delegation decisions in a much broader context. They can consider the long-term goals and interests of the organization, as well as of the individual, rather than being shackled by immediate or short-range goals. Thus the self-defining leader is the first leader who comfortably can delegate autonomy and individuality to others and develop them in ways that can enhance learning and build a high-performance team and work environment. Unlike operators, who delegate to accomplish certain goals to enhance their own worth, or team players, who delegate to feel appreciated by their colleagues and to maintain their own self-esteem, self-defining leaders are transformational in the confidence with which they delegate to accomplish higher-order objectives. In the process, they help to move associates closer to becoming self-defining, transformational leaders themselves.

Note that delegation in exchange for personal gain or for work team cohesion is not discarded as one moves from transactional to transformational leadership. Obviously, we all are transactional in pursuit of personal goals at one time or another. Many of us cultivate team play. Through self-definition, however, the transformational leader is able to

construct a broader understanding and perspective of, development. This leader has the ability to see the organization's larger mission, as well as followers' needs and demands. Specifically, the transformational, self-defining leader can separate the needs of individual followers from the needs of the leader and the team and, at critical times, align many of those needs to maximize both performance and development.

Examples of Self-Defining (Model 111) Leader Delegation

Gloria discussed with each of her department members their career plans in the organization and whenever possible assigned them tasks that fit their career plans as well as contributed to the organization's needs to get the work done expeditiously. Emphasis in these discussions was on continuously striving to improve performance potential.

Henry focused the attention of each of his team members on the importance of taking on challenging assignments that met not only their own needs, but also those of team members and ultimately those of the organization.

Ignacio was willing to put in the extra time to coach those of his colleagues who otherwise might not be able to do the job as well as he could do it if he did not delegate the work to them. He also was willing to risk early mistakes to develop associates who could do the work better in the future. He worked with others to establish a long-term perspective on what they could achieve in their careers individually and collectively by enhancing one another's perspectives and potential.

Models Parallel Moral Development

The three models of leadership discussed above parallel three stages of moral development. Model I operators are arrested in their development at the level of judging what is right and wrong in terms of whether what is done is a gain or loss, a reward or punishment for themselves. They are purely transactional in their approach. It is the least mature stage of development. Model II team players judge on the basis of what others will think of their actions as leaders; in the extreme, they are constrained by such judgments. Model III self-defining leaders are most mature in their moral and cognitive development. They are most transformational. They are more prepared to take full responsibility for their actions, judging what is right or wrong in terms of balance and integration of conflicting individual, team, organizational, and societal interests. Their basis for evaluation and decision making is likely to be internal standards that are considered right or morally correct. They will

more likely choose courses of action not because they necessarily serve their own best interests or the current interests of the followers, but because the choice is the right thing to do.

Note that Model III leaders have the capacity to view the world at a higher level of morality. Yet for many reasons they may choose to operate at a lower level. Thus given the available evidence on the moral development of leaders, we can say that Model III leaders have the capacity to base their decisions on the interests of the group rather than on their own interests. However, under pressure or for reasons beyond their control, they may choose to operate as Model I or II leaders. The lack of maturity and capability of Model I leaders significantly reduces the probability that they will make decisions for the good of the group.

Effective Delegation for Development

One purpose of presenting these three models is to help managers classify others and thus determine their stage of development. The next question is, Now do these models of leadership help managers become better delegators? The three models presented above represent successive stages in the potential development of every person. In other words, how you delegate says a good deal about your own level of development as a leader. Thus each model has important implications for the development of others and, more generally, for the development of leader effectiveness.

In applying this developmental framework, managers must realize that no model of leadership or of delegation is necessarily sufficient. The appropriate leadership and delegation style is a function of the leader, the associate's needs and abilities, and the leader's objectives. This view thus may help to explain why any one approach to delegation may be inappropriate for a given situation or inadequate for the development of all associates.

For example, in an environment that calls for highly structured planning and careful control, the operator's style of leadership and delegation may be most appropriate in the short term. But if the environment is one that values and requires a cohesive team spirit and significant cooperation, then the team player's style of leadership and delegation may be most appropriate. In an organization that highly values individuals who work interdependently toward common goals, then the transformational leader is the one who fits most readily. What is important is not that there is one correct style, but the ability of the leader to distinguish the appropriate style for the environment and to

make choices about the leadership and delegation approach that is most likely to fit the context. Ultimately, a leader needs to be able to operate at the level of Model III, even though the leader might sometimes consider Models I and II appropriate. Only the self-defining leader can operate at all three levels.

In addition to the environment, leaders must understand that the developmental level of followers also affects the appropriate leadership and delegation style. An approach may not work because followers have not reached a phase in their own development where they understand and are motivated by higher-level considerations. This is not the fault of the leader or the environment. For example, individuals who are operators may not be in a position to benefit from delegated activities that focus primarily on cooperation and group goals. To motivate these people, the leader may initially have to appeal to their basic and lower-level transactional nature by emphasizing the advantage of such activities in terms of their personal interests, rather than appealing to their status on a mutually supportive team. Ultimately, however, development of those individuals to a level on the full range must come from delegation of those activities that drive them to confront the limitations of their own self-interests and to see how there may be greater gains through a broader perspective.

Although both the environment and the individual will influence the appropriate leadership and delegation styles, what should also be clear is that the leader's capacity to make choices among the appropriate styles also is paramount. Unfortunately, in the paradigm presented, Model I leaders are not able to make such a choice because they have not developed to a level that allows for an understanding of the perspective of Model II or Model III leaders. Similarly, Model II leaders are unable to fully understand Model III leadership, although they remain able to reflect on and appreciate Model I perspectives. Thus, only the Model III leader has the capacity to understand and make choices among the three models.

The Model I and Model II leaders' inabilities to reflect on all three models of leadership ultimately limits their capacity to delegate effectively as a means of developing employees. For example, leaders who are operators will not recognize the opportunities for followers' professional development that may result from delegation. Because the perspective of such leaders is their own personal agenda, they will be unable to recognize the overall value of delegation to individuals or to the organization as a whole. The value in delegation can accrue only from personal payoff to the leader.

At the next level, leaders who are team players will recognize the advantages to followers of delegation, but only if such delegation can be viewed as fair and does not risk violating team cohesion. Values of team players are shared values, or those that are derived from their connection to the group. Team players will embrace organizational values if their team adopts those values as standard. If team players perceive a growing divergence between the interests of their own unit and those of the organization at large, then organizational values are likely to be sacrificed.

The same risk does not exist with Model III transformational leaders. For these leaders, delegation becomes a question of defining and providing followers with opportunities to engage in activities that explore the compatibility between organizational and personal standards and strongly held values. In other words, transformational leaders are able to delegate activities and tasks that may be contrary to their individual agendas or that may be perceived as inequitable to other team members, if such delegation ultimately will increase the individual's professional development while enhancing organizational functioning. Often, what may be perceived by followers as inequitable is not when considered through the leader's long-term vision of developing followers to their highest potential.

The only way to help a follower develop is to understand how he or she views the world and then help him or her in confronting experiences that illustrate the limitations of that view. Thus, the ability to fully use delegation as a developmental tool requires that leaders understand that delegation of specific types of activities is necessary if followers are to advance to the next level of development. Delegation by abdication of responsibility will not develop others.

From the viewpoint of organizational growth and maturity, the development of employees who are able to become self-defining or transformational leaders is fundamental to long-range survival. In other words, leaders must aspire to more than just getting others to follow: They must see the development of their associates as their personal responsibility if the organization is to grow and maximize its potential. It is not enough to motivate operators to be good managers; they also must learn how to be a part of the shared commitment and mutual trust of a work team. Similarly, team players must transcend their loyalty to the work team by embracing and articulating organizational values. According to Chester Barnard, the ultimate moral act of the executive is to delegate responsibly because "organizations can only endure in accordance with the breadth of morality by which they are governed." [11]

This chapter has explored delegation as a method of professionally developing employees within the context of the full-range model of leadership. Three different leadership models have been proposed by which to understand delegation. Each model starts with different attributes of leaders based on their perspective-taking abilities and leadership philosophies. Differences in these models lead to very different orientations toward delegation.

The transactional operators of Model I, for example, are motivated by self-interest and see others as similarly motivated; delegation is thus a means of influence, control, and personal gain. Although not rejecting this perspective, the team players of Model II are able to define themselves through the eyes of others and use delegation as a way to gain trust, commitment, and loyalty among group members. The transformational, self-defining leaders of Model III take the team players' views a step farther, believing that the needs of their teams are best served through the attainment of individual needs that serve worthwhile purposes. Such leaders thus can see delegation as a means of individual as well as organizational development because they know that exceptional organizational performance rests on the entire organization's creativity and dedication to its mission. In sum, transformational, self-defining leaders realize their responsibility for the development of future leaders.

In the final analysis, how one leads says much about how one delegates, how one delegates says much about the quality of the people being led, and the quality of followers says much about a leader. A leader thus must know him- or herself before the development of others through delegation can be understood. It is through the process of delegation that one is revealed as a leader. Ultimately, delegation is not only a tool to be used in the professional development of followers, but also a way to develop oneself as a leader.

We next examine how the full range of leadership can be direct or indirect.

Notes

1. Tritt, F (1978). Delegation-the essence of management. *Personnel Journal, pp.* 528-530. This article outlines reasons for delegation.

2. Jennings, G. (1971). The *mobile manager.* New York: Free Press. This is one of the first books to comment on the importance of assigning managers to challenging tasks that benefit the organization.

3. McCall, M. W., Lombardo, M. M., & Morrison. M. (1988). *The lessons of experience: How successful executives develop on the job.* Lexington, MA: Lexington.

    4. Nelson, R. B. (1988). *Delegation: The power of letting go.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman. The author of this book presents the essential steps of delegation and explains how to avoid crucial mistakes in order to achieve desired results.

    5. Jenks, J. M., & Kelly, J. M. (1985). *Don I do. Delegate!* Toronto, CA: Franklin Watts.

    6. Carrie, R. L. (1986). Predictors and consequences of delegation. *Academy of Management Journal, 29,* 754774. This work found that supervisors' perceptions of subordinates, the volume of supervisors' workloads, and the importance of decisions were significant predictors of delegation.

    7. LeBoeuf, M. (1979). *Working smart: How to accomplish more in half the time.* New York: Warner. The author explores various strategies for improving managerial skills.

    8. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row. This book sketches the leadership styles of many political leaders.

    9. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: Free Press. The author explores transformational leadership and its impact on followers.

    10. Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P L. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review, 12,* 648-657.

    11. Wolf, W. B. (1973). *Conversations with Chester 1. Barnard.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. The author interviews Barnard.

01