LEADERSHIP

Ms. Corazon Alma G. de Leon
Governor, Philippine Red Cross
Leadership is both a research area and a practical skill, regarding the ability of an individual or organization to "lead" or guide other individuals, teams, or entire organizations. Controversial viewpoints are present in the literature, among Eastern and Western approaches to leadership, and also within the West, on US vs. European approaches.
In US academic environments leadership is defined as "a process of social influence in which a person can enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task". [1][2] Leadership seen from a European and non-academic perspective encompasses a view of a leader who can be moved both by communitarian goals but also by the search for personal power.
As the European researcher Daniele Trevisani states: "Leadership is a holistic spectrum that can arise from: (1) higher levels of physical power, need to display power and control others, force superiority, ability to generate fear, or group-member's need for a powerful group protector (Primal Leadership), (2) superior mental energies, superior motivational forces, perceivable in communication and behaviors, lack of fear, courage, determination (Psychoenergetic Leadership),
(3) higher abilities in managing the overall picture (Macro-Leadership), (4) higher abilities in specialized tasks (Micro-Leadership), (5) higher ability in managing the execution of a task (Project Leadership), and (6) higher level of values, wisdom, and spirituality (Spiritual Leadership), where any Leader derives its Leadership from a unique mix of one or more of the former factors". [3]
Bernard Bass and colleagues developed the idea of two different types of leadership, transactional that involves exchange of labor for rewards and transformational which is based on concern for employees, intellectual stimulation, and providing a group vision. [47][48]
The transactional leader (Burns, 1978)[49] is given power to perform certain tasks and reward or punish for the team's performance. It gives the opportunity to the manager to lead the group and the group agrees to follow his lead to accomplish a predetermined goal in exchange for something else. Power is given to the leader to evaluate, correct, and train subordinates when productivity is not up to the desired level, and reward effectiveness when expected outcome is reached.
A leadership style is a leader's style of providing direction, implementing plans, and motivating people. It is the result of the philosophy, personality, and experience of the leader. Rhetoric specialists have also developed models for understanding leadership (Robert Hariman, Political Style,[59] Philippe-Joseph Salazar, L'Hyperpolitique. Technologies politiques De La Domination[60]).
Different situations call for different leadership styles. In an emergency when there is little time to converge on an agreement and where a designated authority has significantly more experience or expertise than the rest of the team, an autocratic leadership style may be most effective; however, in a highly motivated and aligned team with a homogeneous level of expertise, a more democratic or *Laissez-faire* style may be more effective. The style adopted should be the one that most effectively achieves the objectives of the group while balancing the interests of its individual members.[61]
**Autocratic or authoritarian**

Under the **autocratic** leadership style, all decision-making powers are centralized in the leader, as with **dictators**.

Leaders do not entertain any suggestions or initiatives from subordinates. The autocratic management has been successful as it provides strong motivation to the manager. It permits quick decision-making, as only one person decides for the whole group and keeps each decision to him/herself until he/she feels it needs to be shared with the rest of the group.
Participative or democratic

The democratic leadership style consists of the leader sharing the decision-making abilities with group members by promoting the interests of the group members and by practicing social equality. This has also been called shared leadership.
Laissez-faire or Free-rein

In Laissez-faire or free-rein leadership, decision-making is passed on to the subordinates. The subordinates are given complete right and power to make decisions to establish goals and work out the problems or hurdles.
Task-oriented and relationship-oriented

Task-oriented leadership is a style in which the leader is focused on the tasks that need to be performed in order to meet a certain production goal. Task-oriented leaders are generally more concerned with producing a step-by-step solution for given problem or goal, strictly making sure these deadlines are met, results and reaching target outcomes. \[62\]
Relationship-oriented leadership is a contrasting style in which the leader is more focused on the relationships amongst the group and is generally more concerned with the overall well-being and satisfaction of group members. [63] Relationship-oriented leaders emphasize communication within the group, shows trust and confidence in group members, and shows appreciation for work done.
Task-oriented leaders are typically less concerned with the idea of catering to group members, and more concerned with acquiring a certain solution to meet a production goal. For this reason, they typically are able to make sure that deadlines are met, yet their group members' well-being may suffer.\[62\] Relationship-oriented leaders are focused on developing the team and the relationships in it. The positives to having this kind of environment are that team members are more motivated and have support, however, the emphasis on relations as opposed to getting a job done might make productivity suffer.\[62\]
Sex differences

Another factor that covaries with leadership style is whether the person is male or female. When men and women come together in groups, they tend to adopt different leadership styles. Men generally assume an agentic leadership style. They are task-oriented, active, decision focused, independent and goal oriented.
Women, on the other hand, are generally more communal when they assume a leadership position; they strive to be helpful towards others, warm in relation to others, understanding, and mindful of others' feelings. In general, when women are asked to describe themselves to others in newly formed groups, they emphasize their open, fair, responsible, and pleasant communal qualities.
They give advice, offer assurances, and manage conflicts in an attempt to maintain positive relationships among group members. Women connect more positively to group members by smiling, maintaining eye contact and respond tactfully to others' comments. Men, conversely, describe themselves as influential, powerful and proficient at the task that needs to be done.
They tend to place more focus on initiating structure within the group, setting standards and objectives, identifying roles, defining responsibilities and standard operating procedures, proposing solutions to problems, monitoring compliance with procedures, and finally, emphasizing the need for productivity and efficiency in the work that needs to be done. As leaders, men are primarily task-oriented, but women tend to be both task- and relationship-oriented. However, it is important to note that these sex differences are only tendencies, and do not manifest themselves within men and women across all groups and situations. [64]
Characteristics of a Team

• There must be an awareness of unity on the part of all its members.

• There must be interpersonal relationship. Members must have a chance to contribute, and learn from and work with others.

• The members must have the ability to act together toward a common goal.
Ten characteristics of well-functioning teams:

1. Purpose: Members proudly share a sense of why the team exists and are invested in accomplishing its mission and goals.

2. Priorities: Members know what needs to be done next, by whom, and by when to achieve team goals.
3. Roles: Members know their roles in getting tasks done and when to allow a more skillful member to do a certain task.

4. Decisions: Authority and decision-making lines are clearly understood.
5. Conflict: Conflict is dealt with openly and is considered important to decision-making and personal growth.

6. Personal traits: members feel their unique personalities are appreciated and well utilized.
7. Norms: Group norms for working together are set and seen as standards for every one in the groups.

8. Effectiveness: Members find team meetings efficient and productive and look forward to this time together.
9. Success: Members know clearly when the team has met with success and share in this equally and proudly.

10. Training: Opportunities for feedback and updating skills are provided and taken advantage of by team members.
Self-leadership

Self-leadership is a process that occurs within an individual, rather than an external act. It is an expression of who we are as people.\[75\]
Leadership, although largely talked about, has been described as one of the least understood concepts across all cultures and civilizations. Over the years, many researchers have stressed the prevalence of this misunderstanding, stating that the existence of several flawed assumptions, or myths, concerning leadership often interferes with individuals' conception of what leadership is all about.
Leadership is innate

According to some, leadership is determined by distinctive dispositional characteristics present at birth (e.g., extraversion; intelligence; ingenuity). However, according to Forsyth (2009) there is evidence to show that leadership also develops through hard work and careful observation. Thus, effective leadership can result from nature (i.e., innate talents) as well as nurture (i.e., acquired skills).
Leadership is possessing power over others

Although leadership is certainly a form of [power](#), it is not demarcated by power over people – rather, it is a power with people that exists as a reciprocal relationship between a leader and his/her followers [Forsyth, 2009](#). Despite popular belief, the use of [manipulation](#), [coercion](#), and domination to influence others is not a requirement for leadership. In actuality, individuals who seek group consent and strive to act in the best interests of others can also become effective leaders (e.g., class president; court judge).
Leaders are positively influential

The **validity** of the assertion that groups flourish when guided by effective leaders can be illustrated using several examples. For instance, according to Baumeister et al. (1988), the **bystander effect** (failure to respond or offer assistance) that tends to develop within groups faced with an emergency is significantly reduced in groups guided by a leader.[85]
Moreover, it has been documented that group performance,[86] creativity,[87] and efficiency[88] all tend to climb in businesses with designated managers or CEOs. However, the difference leaders make is not always positive in nature. Leaders sometimes focus on fulfilling their own agendas at the expense of others, including his/her own followers (e.g., Pol Pot; Josef Stalin). Leaders who focus on personal gain by employing stringent and manipulative leadership styles often make a difference, but usually do so through negative means.[89]
Leaders entirely control group outcomes

**Western cultures** it is generally assumed that group leaders make *all* the difference when it comes to group influence and overall goal-attainment. Although common, this romanticized view of leadership (i.e., the tendency to overestimate the degree of control leaders have over their groups and their groups' outcomes) ignores the existence of many other factors that influence group dynamics. [90]
For example, **group cohesion**, **communication patterns** among members, individual personality traits, group context, the nature or orientation of the work, as well as **behavioral norms** and established standards influence group functionality in varying capacities. For this reason, it is unwarranted to assume that all leaders are in complete control of their groups' achievements.
THREE LEVELS OF LEADERSHIP MODEL
The Three Levels of Leadership is a modern (2011) leadership model. Designed as a practical tool for developing a person’s leadership presence, knowhow and skill, it aims to summarize what leaders have to do, not only to bring leadership to their group or organization, but also to develop themselves technically and psychologically as leaders.
The Three Levels of Leadership model is notable for its attempt to combine the strengths of older leadership theories (i.e. traits, behavioral/styles, situational, functional) while addressing their limitations and, at the same time, offering a foundation for leaders wanting to apply the philosophies of servant leadership and “authentic leadership”. [1]
It was introduced in a 2011 book, *The Three Levels of Leadership: How to Develop Your Leadership Presence, Knowhow and Skill*, by James Scouller.[2] In Wikipedia and elsewhere it has been classified as an "Integrated Psychological" theory of leadership. It is sometimes known as the 3P model of leadership (the three Ps standing for Public, Private and Personal leadership).
The Three Levels of Leadership Model

Outer levels

Inner level
The model is intended as a practical tool for developing leaders’ leadership presence, knowhow and skill. It aims to summarize what leaders have to do, not only to bring leadership to their group or organization, but also to develop themselves technically and psychologically as leaders.
The three levels referred to in the model’s name are Public, Private and Personal leadership. The model is usually presented in diagram form as three concentric circles and four outwardly-directed arrows, with personal leadership in the center.
• The first two levels – **public and private leadership** – are “outer” or “behavioral” levels. Scouller distinguished between the behaviors involved in influencing two or more people simultaneously (what he called “public leadership”) from the behavior needed to select and influence individuals one to one (which he called private leadership). He listed 34 distinct “public leadership” behaviors and a further 14 “private leadership” behaviors.
The third level – **personal leadership** – is an “inner” level and concerns a person’s leadership presence, knowhow, skills, beliefs, emotions and unconscious habits. "At its heart is the leader’s self-awareness, his progress toward self-mastery and technical competence, and his sense of connection with those around him. It's the inner core, the source, of a leader’s outer leadership effectiveness.” (Scouller, 2011).
The two outer levels – public and private leadership – are what the leader must do behaviorally with individuals or groups to address the “four dimensions of leadership” (Scouller 2011). These are:

1. A shared, motivating group purpose or vision.
2. Action, progress and results.
3. Collective unity or team spirit.
4. Individual selection and motivation.
The inner level – personal leadership – refers to what leaders should do to grow their leadership presence, knowhow and skill. It has three aspects:

1. Developing one’s technical knowhow and skill.
2. Cultivating the right attitude toward other people.
Scouller argued that self-mastery is the key to growing one’s leadership presence, building trusting relationships with followers and enabling behavioral flexibility as circumstances change, while staying connected to one’s core values (that is, while remaining authentic). To support leaders’ development, he introduced a new model of the human psyche and outlined the principles and techniques of self-mastery (Scouller 2011).[6]
The assumption in this model is that personal leadership is the most powerful of the three levels. Scouller likened its effect to dropping a pebble in a pond and seeing the ripples spreading out from the center – hence the four arrows pointing outward in the diagram. "The pebble represents inner, personal leadership and the ripples the two outer levels. Helpful inner change and growth will affect outer leadership positively. Negative inner change will cause the opposite." (Scouller, 2011).
Public leadership refers to the actions or behaviors that leaders take to influence two or more people simultaneously – perhaps in a meeting or when addressing a large group. Public leadership is directed towards (1) setting and agreeing a motivating vision or future for the group or organization to ensure unity of purpose; (2) creating positive peer pressure towards shared, high performance standards and an atmosphere of trust and team spirit; and (3) driving successful collective action and results. Public leadership therefore serves the first three dimensions of leadership mentioned in the overview section.
Private leadership

Private leadership concerns the leader’s one-to-one handling of individuals (which is the fourth of Scouller’s four dimensions of leadership). Although leadership involves creating a sense of group unity, groups are composed of individuals and they vary in their ambitions, confidence, experience and psychological make-up.
Therefore they have to be treated as individuals – hence the importance of personal leadership. There are 14 private leadership behaviors (Scouller, 2011):

- *Individual purpose and task* (e.g. appraising, selecting, disciplining): 5 behaviors.
- *Individual building and maintenance* (e.g. recognizing rising talent): 9 behaviors.
Some people experience the powerful conversations demanded by private leadership (e.g. performance appraisals) as uncomfortable. Consequently, leaders may avoid some of the private leadership behaviors (Scouller, 2011), which reduces their leadership effectiveness. Scouller argued that the intimacy of private leadership leads to avoidance behavior either because of a lack of skill or because of negative self-image beliefs that give rise to powerful fears of what may happen in such encounters. This is why personal leadership is so important in improving a leader’s one-to-one skill and reducing his or her interpersonal fears.
Personal leadership addresses the leader’s technical, psychological and moral development and its impact on his or her leadership presence, skill and behavior. It is, essentially, the key to making the theory of the two outer behavioral levels practical. Scouller went further in suggesting (in the preface of his book, *The Three Levels of Leadership*), that personal leadership is the answer to what Jim Collins called "the inner development of a person to level 5 leadership" in the book *Good to Great* – something that Collins admitted he was unable to explain.\[7\]

Personal leadership has three elements: (1) technical knowhow and skill; (2) the right attitude towards other people; and (3) psychological self-mastery.
The first element, *Technical Knowhow and Skill*, is about knowing one's technical weaknesses and taking action to update one's knowledge and skills. Scouller (2011) suggested that there are three areas of knowhow that all leaders should learn: time management, individual psychology and group psychology. He also described the six sets of skills that underlie the public and private leadership behaviors: (1) group problem-solving and planning; (2) group decision-making; (3) interpersonal ability, which has a strong overlap with emotional intelligence (4) managing group process; (5) assertiveness; (6) goal-setting.
The second element, *Attitude Toward Others*, is about developing the right attitude toward colleagues in order to maintain the leader’s relationships throughout the group's journey to its shared vision or goal. The right attitude is to believe that other people are as important as oneself and see leadership as an act of service (Scouller, 2011). Although there is a moral aspect to this, there is also a practical side – for a leader’s attitude and behavior toward others will largely influence how much they respect and trust that person and want to work with him or her. Scouller outlined the five parts of the right attitude toward others: (1) interdependence (2) appreciation (3) caring (4) service (5) balance.
The two keys, he suggested, to developing these five aspects are to ensure that:

• There is a demanding, distinctive, shared vision that everyone in the group cares about and wants to achieve.

• The leader works on self-mastery to reduce self-esteem issues that make it hard to connect with, appreciate and adopt an attitude of service towards colleagues.
The third element of personal leadership is *Self-Mastery*. It emphasizes self-awareness and flexible command of one's mind, which allows the leader to let go of previously unconscious limiting beliefs and their associated defensive habits (like avoiding powerful conversations, e.g. appraisal discussions). It also enables leaders to connect more strongly with their values, let their leadership presence flow and act authentically in serving those they lead.
Because self-mastery is a psychological process, Scouller proposed a new model of the human psyche to support its practice. In addition, he outlined the principles of – and obstacles to – personal change and proposed six self-mastery techniques, which include mindfulness meditation.
The importance and development of leadership presence is a central feature of the Three Levels of Leadership model. Scouller suggested that it takes more than the right knowhow, skills and behaviors to lead well – that it also demands "presence". Presence has been summed up in this way:
“What is presence? At its root, it is wholeness – the rare but attainable inner alignment of self-identity, purpose and feelings that eventually leads to freedom from fear. It reveals itself as the magnetic, radiating effect you have on others when you’re being the authentic you, giving them your full respect and attention, speaking honestly and letting your unique character traits flow. As leaders, we must be technically competent to gain others’ respect, but it’s our unique genuine presence that inspires people and prompts them to trust us – in short, to want us as their leader.” (Scouller, 2011.)
In the Three Levels of Leadership model, "presence" is not the same as "charisma". Scouller argued that leaders can be charismatic by relying on a job title, fame, skillful acting or by the projection of an aura of “specialness” by followers – whereas presence is something deeper, more authentic, more fundamental and more powerful and does not depend on social status. He contrasted the mental and moral resilience of a person with real presence with the susceptibility to pressure and immoral actions of someone whose charisma rests only on acting skills (and the power their followers give them), not their true inner qualities.
Scouller also suggested that each person's authentic presence is unique and outlined seven qualities of presence: (1) personal power – command over one’s thoughts, feelings and actions; (2) high, real self-esteem; (3) the drive to be more, to learn, to grow; (4) a balance of an energetic sense of purpose with a concern for the service of others and respect for their free will; (5) intuition; (6) being in the now; (7) inner peace of mind and a sense of fulfillment.[9]

Presence, according to this model, is developed by practicing personal leadership.
MASTERY LEARNING
Mastery Learning (or as it was initially called, “learning for mastery”) is an instructional strategy and educational philosophy, first formally proposed by Benjamin S. Bloom in 1968. Mastery Learning maintains that students must achieve a level of mastery (i.e. 90% on a knowledge test) in prerequisite knowledge before moving forward to learn subsequent information. If a student does not achieve mastery on the test, they are given additional support in learning and reviewing the information, then tested again. This cycle will continue until the learner accomplishes mastery, and may move on to the next stage.
Mastery learning methods suggest that the focus of instruction should be the time required for different students to learn the same material and achieve the same level of mastery. This is very much in contrast with classic models of teaching, which focus more on differences in students' ability and where all students are given approximately the same amount of time to learn and the same set of instructions.
In **Mastery learning**, there is a shift in responsibilities, so that student's failure is more due to the instruction and not necessarily lack of ability on his or her part. Therefore, in a mastery learning environment, the challenge becomes providing enough time and employing instructional strategies so that all students can achieve the same level of learning.