

---

# A New Paradigm: Entrepreneurial Leadership

---

Lloyd W. Fernald, Jr., George T. Solomon, and Ayman Tarabishy

As the 1990's gave way to the next millennium, the current social, economic, and political environments were constantly being affected by the actions of entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial ventures. The current literature in entrepreneurship devotes considerable discussion to the role entrepreneurs play within their businesses and as opinion leaders in their markets and the general economy. Often described as

Lloyd W. Fernald, Jr., D.B.A., is professor of management, Management Department, College of Business Administration, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL 32817.

George T. Solomon, D.B.A., is associate professor of entrepreneurship, The George Washington University, Washington, DC 20052.

Ayman Tarabishy, is a doctoral student, The George Washington University, Washington, DC 20052.

innovators, paradigm pioneers, and visionaries, entrepreneurs are confronted with the issue of developing leadership qualities in order to grow their businesses and to transform them to a level of professionalism.

Since the 1980's, an increased level of entrepreneurial activity has spawned, not only because of the electronic age but due to a plethora of new materials, products, financial networks, joint venture possibilities, and paradigmatic changes in politics, economics, and societies. It appears a whole new remodeling of the ways in which business, communication, and government are conducted has emerged. Thus, it is imperative for anyone involved in entrepreneurial ventures, especially the entrepreneur, to fully comprehend the importance of sound leadership practices.

This article attempts to reveal those characteristics common to both successful leaders and entrepreneurs who operate in dynamic, changing environments. It also attempts to show the characteristics

entrepreneurs use to cope with their need to excel and explore new vistas. In essence, it seeks to demonstrate a new style of evolving leadership, *entrepreneurial leadership*, which offers a break from the past and movement into the future.

## Literature Review

*Entrepreneurship* is a relatively new, sometimes controversial, and burgeoning field of management research. *Leadership* has been studied since around 500 BC. New to the field is the subject of *entrepreneurial leadership*. Both entrepreneurship and leadership will be briefly discussed in turn.

## Entrepreneurship

Selection of the appropriate basis for defining and understanding entrepreneurs created a challenging problem for entrepreneurial research. More than ten years ago, the field of research was described as young, i.e., in its formative stage (Paulin, Coffey, & Spaulding, 1982;

Perryman, 1982; Peterson & Horvath, 1982; Sexton, 1982). Even now, no generally accepted definition of an entrepreneur exists, and the literature is replete with criteria ranging from creativity and innovation to personal traits such as appearance and style. Models of the entrepreneur are almost as plentiful as the number of researchers studying entrepreneurs (Churchill & Lewis, 1986; Cunningham & Lischeron, 1991).

Krackhardt (1995) stated that research on entrepreneurship has defined entrepreneurship in two ways, the entrepreneurial firm and entrepreneurial people. Entrepreneurial firms are small (Aldrich & Austen, 1986), fast-growing (Drucker, 1985), organic, and network-based rather than mechanistic and bureaucratic (Birley, 1986). In studying work flow leadership, a form of firm-level entrepreneurship, Sayles and Stewart (1995) defined entrepreneurship as having three components:

- (1) it is activity that seizes profit opportunities without regard to resources currently controlled (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990);
- (2) it expands existing resources through enhanced learning, synergies, or bootstrapping (Burgelman, 1983; Leibstein, 1968; Stewart, 1989; Venkatara-

man, McMillan & McGrath, 1992); and

- (3) it promotes change and innovation leading to new combinations of resources and new ways of doing business (Burgelman, 1983; Schumpeter, 1943).

Entrepreneurial people take advantage of opportunities to acquire added value. This definition sees entrepreneurship as a behavioral characteristic of employees and managers in a firm, not as a characteristic of the firm itself.

Stevenson, Roberts, and Grousbeck (1989) argued that entrepreneurship is an approach to management. They distinguished between “promoters,” individuals whose strategic direction is driven by the perception of opportunity, and “trustees,” who are driven by the resources they currently control. One could argue from this that “promoters” are actually leaders while “trustees” are managers. Others, however, have written that both management and leadership skills play important roles in determining the growth rate of a small business. The skills required include

- (1) seeing and clearly communicating a clear direction for the future,
- (2) leading and motivating others,

- (3) recognizing shortcomings in the team and supplementing those skills, and
- (4) having the business skills from an educational and experience viewpoint (Eggers, Leahy, & Churchill, 1994).

Over the years, several schools of thought on entrepreneurship have been generated that combine psychological traits with management/leadership skills. With respect to entrepreneurial activities, most important to entrepreneurs are

- (1) seeking opportunities,
- (2) needing to achieve set goals,
- (3) being independence-minded,
- (4) taking risks, and
- (5) innovating (Lepnurm & Bergh, 1995).

McClelland (1961) believed that entrepreneurial behavior was embedded in an individual’s personality, the result of one’s upbringing. Stewart (1989) documented the “fire in the belly” of employees who are always “running hot” within the firm. Thus, entrepreneurial behavior appears to be internal, similar to what is often described as characteristic of leaders.

## Leadership

Zaleznik (1977) has reported that managers and leaders are different. They differ in what they attend to and how they think, work, and interact. Also, managers and leaders have different personalities and experience different developmental paths from childhood to adulthood. Further, managers perceive life as a steady progression of positive events, resulting in security at home and at work. Leaders are “twice born.” They endure major events that lead to a sense of separateness, or perhaps estrangement, from their environments (James, 1985). As a result, they turn inward in order to re-emerge with a created rather than an inherited sense of identity. This condition may be necessary for the ability to lead. Finally, managers appear to be narrowly engaged in maintaining their identities and self-esteem through others. Leaders have self-confidence growing out of the awareness of who they are and the visions that drive them to achieve (Zaleznik, 1990).

Although research shows that certain traits alone do not guarantee leadership success, evidence that effective leaders are different from other people in certain key respects exists. Key leader characteristics are

- (1) drive, which includes achievement motivation, ambition, energy, tenacity, and initiative;

- (2) leadership motivation;
- (3) honesty and integrity;
- (4) self-confidence;
- (5) cognitive ability; and
- (6) knowledge of the business.

The key leader characteristics help the leader acquire necessary skills, formulate an organizational vision and an effective plan for pursuing it, and take the steps needed to implement the vision into reality (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991).

It is not necessarily the individual possessing the most formal authority who is the leader in an organization, large or small. The leader is anyone who exerts influence over others. Specific traits, characteristics, and personal attributes that will predict superior performance in any given role, team, and organization can be identified and defined.

### Entrepreneurial Leadership

On the surface, one can associate entrepreneurs with leadership functions such as providing vision to the development of a new product, service, or organization. A leader has to be entrepreneurial as well. It has been written that entrepreneurial leadership deals with concepts and ideas, and these are often related to problems that are not of an organiza-

tional nature (El-Namaki, 1992). Instead, they tend to be individual characteristics or behaviors. These include vision, problem solving, decision-making, risk taking, and strategic initiatives. A short discussion of each follows.

**Vision.** Only in the first decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century has the role of vision in the strategic management process and the possible relationship between vision and creativity, leadership, and entrepreneurship been given much attention. A vision is formulated by explicitly identifying a domain for competitive behavior, a set of sources of competitive strength, and a profile for resource capability. A vision implies a capability construct. This capability construct is determined by many factors including managerial vision, competence and capacity, logistic and technological profiles, as well as the financial resource access of the firm. A good vision is realistic and feasible. It provides a challenge for the whole organization and mirrors the goals of its constituents. Visions may be killed by fear of mistakes, inability to tolerate ambiguity, and lack of challenge.

**Problem solving.** Task-oriented leadership gets best results with purely technical, fact-based problems. Consideration-oriented leadership copes more effectively with emotional, personal, and interpersonal problems.

Effective leadership must solve, or face, problems quickly and forcefully, regardless of their nature.

**Decision making.** Managers are more likely to seek assistance from subordinates in solving problems than when making decisions. As a general rule, whether leaders are directive or supportive, they know they must make decisions that commit the organization to critical actions. If a leader avoids this responsibility, subordinates will poorly judge him or her and the organization will suffer accordingly.

**Risk taking.** Balancing risk is a necessity of leadership. Leaders must weigh the multitudinous factors involved, while understanding that no one can predict the future with certainty. Inability to deal with uncertainty precludes an organization from achieving its goals.

**Strategic initiatives.** Leaders must have a vision and plan for beyond a year or two in order to achieve long-term success (El-Namaki, 1992).

Entrepreneurial leadership has been coined by those who realize a change in leadership style is necessary in order for America's businesses, large and small, to be competitive with the rest of the world. Knowdell, Branstead, and Moravec (1994) have noted that corporations now undergo paradigm shifts rather than linear change. One such paradigm shift is from a "producer mentality" that

seeks instructions to an "entrepreneurial mentality" that seeks results. This has led to structural changes in organizations and new ways of doing business. The development of the MacIntosh computer is, perhaps, the prime example. Other similar "skunk works," or entrepreneurial projects, are increasing in number throughout corporate America.

One might question whether entrepreneurial leadership is truly a new style of leadership, an escape from management, or both. Since the 1980's, the concern has been that major business corporations have lost their competitiveness through an emphasis on management rather than leadership. A survey of 90 top executives and entrepreneurs revealed that the four basic competencies common to all leaders are management of attention, meaning, trust, and self-esteem (Bennis, 1988). Bennis's research indicated that potential entrepreneurs are much more likely to have had business-owning fathers or relatives and to have owned their own firms at some stage of their careers. While no differences were found between subgroups in terms of their needs for achievement or their locus of control, the likely entrepreneurs were found to have a greater need for autonomy, more creative tendencies, and a higher calculated risk-taking orientation than other managers. In all, factors in the

family background or personal profile of managers that may attract them to entrepreneurship have some potential for detecting entrepreneurs among managers (Cromie & O'Donaghue, 1992).

It is argued that the organizational archetype of the future will be entrepreneurial. Its leadership, strategies, and structure will reflect entrepreneurial thinking with associated characteristics, e.g., a problem-solving and action-orientation. The characteristics and behaviors that spell success in entrepreneurial firms and small businesses now are being considered as vital for success, even for large transnational corporations. That even large companies are interested in this phenomenon is reflected in the popularity of what has been coined as "Intrapreneurship" by Pinchot (1985). Intrapreneurship is said to exist in situations in which individuals utilize entrepreneurial thinking to initiate and implement new ideas within large corporations (Chittipeddi & Wallet, 1991).

Based on these prescriptions, and a myriad of other sources too numerous to mention here, the similarities between what is known as leaders and what is known as entrepreneurs are considerable. Regardless of the amount of study each has been given, particularly with respect to leaders, much learning is still needed. Yukl (1994) reported that, although the leadership literature includes more than 5,000 studies, the confused

state of the field can be attributed primarily to the sheer volume of publications, the disparity of approaches, confusing terms, many trivial studies, and the preference for simplistic explanations. This same charge has been levied at the research involving entrepreneurship (Vesper, 1996; Sexton & Kasarda, 1992; Zimmerer & Scarborough, 1996).

Nevertheless, much is known about both leaders and entrepreneurs. As discussed earlier, both leaders and entrepreneurs have been studied relative to their traits, skills, and behavioral characteristics. Numerous studies have been conducted in an attempt to define a successful leader or entrepreneur (Welsh & White, 1983). The general agreement is that a leader influences others toward the attainment of a vision and goals (Zaleznik, 1990; Stoner, 1995). A successful entrepreneur, likewise, influences those who can help achieve a desired goal or vision, whether the entrepreneur is a banker or other financial lender or those who can help to manufacture or distribute a product or service. Many also agree that leaders are visionary. They know what they want and where they want to go. They have a vision of their goals (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995; Hajek, 1995). This is best stated in a quote from Theodore Hesburgh:

[t]he very essence of leadership is that you have a vision. It's got to be a vision you articulate clearly and forcefully on every occasion. You can't blow an uncertain trumpet (Brainyquote.com, 2005).

Successful entrepreneurs also envision the need for a product or service and how that product or service is to be provided.

In summary, based on a review of the literature, both leaders and entrepreneurs are successful largely to the extent that they provide

- (1) strategic leadership (vision and long-term goals);
- (2) problem-solving skills;
- (3) timely decision-making;
- (4) a willingness to accept risks; and
- (5) good negotiating skills.

“Successful” is a key adverb and a vital factor in this review. Clearly, many leaders and entrepreneurs fail. Whenever possible, the authors have made an effort to include only those behavioral characteristics shared by leaders and entrepreneurs that lead to successful attainment of visions and goals.

These characteristics are intended to provide sufficient information to support a basis for the argument that the behavioral characteristics of leaders and entrepreneurs are more similar than different. In addition, it provides a basis for viewing entrepreneurial behavior as another type of leadership. This is particularly evident in view of the fact that changes in the workplace are demanding a new style of leadership. A flatter organizational hierarchy with its shrinking management ranks and less bureaucracy, coupled with the push for greater speed, better customer responsiveness, and on-going innovation, will require such. Every employee will be required to think and to act like an owner/entrepreneur (Turknett, 1995).

## Methodology

Characteristics possessed by both entrepreneurs and leaders were collected from various sources such as journal articles, dissertations and theses, books, and magazine articles. These characteristics were listed and then compared, resulting in a list of common characteristics.

No scale was attached to these characteristics. The existence of the characteristics and the degree to which they exist in any individual can be

most reliably determined by an in-depth, structured interview by an experienced and trained psychologist. Nevertheless, the number of times each characteristic was noted in the review of literature was used to compare the characteristics of leaders and entrepreneurs.

## Results

Table 1 identifies characteristics that are associated with successful entrepreneurs and leaders and the number of times those characteristics have been noted in the literature. Risk-taker,

achievement-orientated, and creative are the most highly cited characteristics among entrepreneurs whereas visionary, able to motivate, charismatic, able to communicate, honest and sound, and trustworthy are the most highly cited characteristics among leaders. By comparing the characteristics of entrepreneurs and leaders, a model can be developed that specifies the personal characteristics reflected in those who practice entrepreneurial leadership.

Characteristics that are common to both entrepreneurs and leaders are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 reveals that the characteristics common to both entrepreneurs and leaders are visionary, risk-taker, achievement-orientated, able to motivate, creative, flexible, persistent, and patient.

## Discussion

Table 1 is the result of a generally exhaustive search for entrepreneur and leader characteristics. Nevertheless, only 136 sources were included in this study. The authors believe that the numbers associated with each of the characteristics would

**Table 1**  
**Characteristics of Entrepreneurs and Leaders\***

<b>Entrepreneurial Characteristics</b>	<b>Leadership Characteristics</b>
Able to motivate (3)	Able to communicate (12)
Achievement orientated (15)	Able to listen (9)
Autonomous (6)	Able to motivate (15)
Creative (10)	Able to work with others (7)
Flexible (2)	Achievement orientated (7)
Highly tolerant of ambiguity (5)	Charismatic (13)
Passionate (3)	Committed to mission (7)
Patient (1)	Creative (5)
Persistent (3)	Flexible (6)
Risk-taker (24)	Honest and sound (12)
Visionary (6)	Patient (3)
	Persistent (2)
	Risk-taker (6)
	Strategic thinker (5)
	Trustworthy (12)
	Visionary (29)

\*Cites for these characteristics may be obtained from the authors.

**Table 2**  
**Common Characteristics**

	Entrepreneur	Leader
Able to motivate	3	15
Achievement orientated	15	7
Creative	10	5
Flexible	2	6
Patient	1	3
Persistent	3	2
Risk-taker	24	6
Visionary	6	29

change, perhaps considerably, if more sources were included. At the same time, the authors believe that it is likely that the same characteristics found in Tables 1 and 2 would remain in a future study.

Some of the characteristics noted appear consistent with anecdotal reports. For example, entrepreneurs are generally known as risk-takers, high achievers, and creative in their abilities to produce unique goods and services. Anecdotal evidence suggests the most successful leaders are visionaries. Additionally, they are charismatic, able to communicate, have reputations of being honest, and are trusted by others. Conversely, while anecdotal evidence suggests that such characteristics as autonomous, highly tolerant of ambiguity, passionate, and persistent are generally found in entrepreneurs, the study data support such, but reflect

a remarkably small number of sources. So as with leaders, it would appear from anecdotal evidence that characteristics such as achievement-oriented, strategic thinker, and committed to mission would have been more evident than the data found in this study.

A more in-depth study would likely shed light on this issue. Nevertheless, the study results reflect actual citations in the entrepreneurship and leadership journals. The data provided are considered more valid in describing entrepreneurs and leaders than that of anecdotal evidence.

Table 2 is interesting as well. Eight common characteristics were found in entrepreneurs and leaders. Risk-taker clearly led all other entrepreneurial characteristics, and visionary was the strongest characteristic in leaders. These findings are well-supported by anecdotal evidence. Other characteristics

common to entrepreneurs and leaders are not surprising, with the possible exception that the numbers were smaller than the authors anticipated.

Table 2 offers researchers several questions. When the number of cites is small, such as with "Patient," should it be discarded as a common characteristic? Could other characteristics be added to this table? Most importantly, does possessing the common characteristics found in this study predict an individual whose performance would exhibit entrepreneurial leadership and successfully contribute to an organization's success?

## Conclusions

The findings of this study, i.e., the common characteristics shared by both entrepreneurs and leaders, represent an attempt to both reveal the commonality of

these two populations and to provide a base for further studies on entrepreneurial leadership. The lists shown in Tables 1 and 2 include those characteristics often found in a successful leader or entrepreneur. This information may be helpful to individuals considering the entrepreneurial life or seeking other leadership positions.

Clearly, much remains to be done in clarifying the role and characteristics of tomorrow's leaders. New organizational designs, new thinking patterns, and new information systems will require new leadership styles. Entrepreneurial leadership offers one answer. The question remains as to whether entrepreneurial leadership will consist of the characteristics found common to both the successful entrepreneur and leader in this study.

Some will argue that entrepreneurs are not necessarily "good" or successful leaders. Such doubters can find support in the literature for the iconoclastic characteristics found in many entrepreneurs that are inconsistent with "good" leadership characteristics. For doubters, the term "entrepreneurial leadership" is seen as an oxymoron, a combination of terms that are contradictory to what they have been accustomed in the past. Successful entrepreneurs, however, have provided the risk-taking, achievement orientation, and creativity that

have lead to the birth and growth of numerous major firms in the U.S. and globally and continue to do so. Entrepreneurial thinking is being increasingly demanded in even the largest corporations.

More research in this area is essential. Future studies may rank preferences of the characteristics of leaders and entrepreneurs to permit a rank order or other statistical analyses of the characteristics of leaders and entrepreneurs, helping to further define the characteristics needed for entrepreneurial leadership.

## References

- Aldrich, H. & Austen, E. R. (1986). Even dwarfs started small: Liabilities of age and size and their strategic limitations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8: 165-198.
- Bennis, W. (1988). Ten traits of dynamic leaders. *Executive Excellence*: 8-9.
- Birley, S. (1986). The role of networks in the entrepreneurial process. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1:107-117.
- Brainyquote.com. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/t/theodorehe130760.html>. Accessed: March 9, 2005.
- Burgelman, R. A. (1983). Corporate entrepreneur-ship and strategic management: Insights from a process study. *Management Science*, 29(2): 1349-1363.
- Chittipeddi, K. & Wallet, T. A. (1991). Entrepreneurship and competitive strategy for the 1990's. *Journal of Small Business Management*: 94-98.
- Churchill, N. C. & Lewis, V. (1986). Entrepreneurial research: Directions and methods. In D. L. Sexton & R. W. Smilor (Eds.), *The art and science of entrepreneurship* (pp. 333-365), Cambridge: Ballinger.
- Cromie, S. & O'Donoghue, J. (1992). Research note: Assessing entrepreneurial inclinations. *International Small Business Journal*: 66-73.
- Cunningham, J. B. & Lischeron, J. (1991). Defining entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 6: 45-60.
- Drucker, P. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship in the American corporation*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Eggers, J. H., Leahy, K. T., & Churchill, N. C. (1994). Entrepreneurial leadership in the development of small businesses. *14<sup>th</sup> Annual Entrepreneurial*

- Research Conference*, Babson College, MA.
- El-Namaki, M. S. S. (1992). Creating a corporate vision. *Long Range Planning*: 25-29.
- Hajek, M. (1995). What is leadership? *Leading the World in Aviation/Aerospace Education*. Titusville, FL: Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University.
- James, B. G. (1985). *Business wargames*. Cambridge, MA: Abacus Press.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A. & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive*: 48-60.
- Knowdell, R. L., Branstead, E., & Moravec, M. (1994). *From downsizing to recovery*. Palo Alto, CA: CPP Books.
- Krackhard, T. (1995). Entrepreneurial opportunities in an entrepreneurial firm: A structural approach. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*: 53-69.
- Leibstein, H. (1968). Entrepreneurship and economic development. *American Economic Review*, 58: 72-83.
- Lepnurm, R. & Bergh, C. (1995). Small business: Entrepreneurship or strategy? *The Center for Entrepreneurship Review*: 4.
- Locke, E. A. & Kirkpatrick, S. A. (1995). Promoting creativity in organizations. In C. M. Ford & D. A. Gioia (Eds.), *Creative action in organizations*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: van Nostrand.
- Paulin, W. L., Coffey, R. E., & Spaulding, M. E. (1982). Entrepreneur research: Methods and directions. In C. A. Kent, D. L. Sexton & K. H. Vesper (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of entrepreneurship* (pp. 352-373), Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Perryman, R. (1982). Commentary on research in the field of entrepreneurship. In C. A. Kent, D. L. Sexton, & K. H. Vesper (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of entrepreneurship* (pp. 377-378), Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Peterson, R. & Horvath, D. (1982). Commentary on research in the field of entrepreneurship. In C. A. Kent, D. L. Sexton, & K. H. Vesper (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of entrepreneurship* (pp. 374-376), Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Pinchot, G. (1985). Intra-preneurs innovate. *Management Today*: 54-61.
- Sayles, L. R. & Stewart, A. (1995). Belated recognition for work flow entrepreneurs: A case of selected perception and amnesia in management thought. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 19(3): 7-23.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1943). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Sexton, D. L. (1982). Research needs and issues in entrepreneurship. In C. A. Kent, D. L. Sexton, & K. H. Vesper (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of entrepreneurship* (pp. 383-389), Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Sexton, D. & Kasarda, J. (1992). *The state of the art of entrepreneurship*. Boston: PWS-Kent.
- Stevenson, H. H. & Jarillo, J. C. (1990). A paradigm of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11: 17-27.
- Stevenson, H. H., Roberts, M. J., & Grousbeck, H. I. (1989). *New business ventures and the entrepreneur*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

- Stewart, A. (1989). *Team entrepreneurship*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Stoner, J. A. *Management*, 7<sup>th</sup> edition (1995). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Turknett, R. (1995). New work place to require leadership qualities in all. *The Atlanta Journal/Constitution*, B3: 3-12.
- Venkataraman, S., McMillan, I. C., & McGrath, R. G. (1992). Progress in research on corporate venturing. In D. L. Sexton & J. D. Kasarda (Eds.), *The state of the art in entrepreneurship* (pp. 487-519), Boston: PWS-Kent.
- Vesper, K. (1996). *New venture experience*. Seattle, WA: Vector Books.
- Welsh, J. A. & White, J. F. (1983). *The entrepreneur's master planning guide*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organizations*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*: 5-6.
- Zaleznik, (1990). The leadership gap. *Academy of Management Executive*: 7-22.
- Zimmerer, T. W. & Scarborough, N. M. (1996). *Entrepreneurship and new venture formation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

---

# Leadership and Upward Influence: A Survey of Business School Deans

---

J. Michael McDonald and Carl W. Gooding

An empirical study of how business school deans use “upward” influence tactics as a leadership tool to get things done has never appeared in the research literature on management. The purpose of this study is to examine what types of influence tactics business school deans use with their superiors. The methodology includes examining how frequently deans used various upward influence tactics and how effective those tactics were considered to be.

Additionally, the researchers seek to compare the tactics used by business school deans to those used by managers in general. Do business school deans use the same upward

influence tactics as other managers? Are those tactics used as frequently by deans as by other managers? Are the tactics used by deans viewed as effective for managers?

While some might argue business school deans are no different than other managers in terms of their leadership styles and patterns of behavior, the researchers hypothesize otherwise. Business managers generally have clearly defined goals to work toward such as profitability, return on investment, cost reduction, productivity, and quality improvements. Academic deans, however, work in environments in which the goals are less clearly defined and much more subject to budgetary constraints and philosophical differences. Business school deans, in particular, often report to superiors whose backgrounds are not in business. Those superiors frequently do not share the same goals, values, points of view, or needs (e.g., AACSB accreditation) as business deans. Hence, it is incumbent upon the business dean to learn how to lead

“upward.” In a very real sense, the business school dean is leading upward as resources are negotiated. To be effective, the dean of business must understand that upward power (and influence) is partly based on the ability and willingness to use influence tactics. To negotiate for limited resources, an effective dean will, by necessity, have to appreciate the upward influence nature of leadership.

## Literature Review

### Power and Upward Influence

Leadership, influence, and power are inextricably linked. In fact, some scholars think that understanding power and the use of influence might be the most important concepts in all of leadership (Burns, 1978; Gardner, 1990; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1989). While the concepts “power” and “influence” are often used synonymously, for this study, power is defined as the capacity to cause change. Influence is the degree of actual change in a target

J. Michael McDonald, Ph.D., is director of Graduate Studies, College of Business Administration, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA 30460-8050.

Carl W. Gooding, Ph.D., is professor of management, College of Business, Jacksonville State University, Anniston, AL, 36205.

person's attitude, values, beliefs, or behaviors (Hughes, Gannett, & Curphy, 2002). In one sense, power is the potential that a leader has to influence others. The leader then uses influence tactics, methods, and actual behaviors to affect change in others. Several authors note that successful managers expand their power by learning how "to influence someone higher in the formal hierarchy of authority in the organization" (Kanter, 1983; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Kotter, 1985; 1990). Early research (Pelz, 1959) suggests that upward influence is a key factor in the effectiveness of managers. Others observe that the ability to influence superiors can be "acquired, enhanced, or reduced" by a manager's behavior (Case, Dosier, Murkison, & Keys, 1988; Bartolome & Laurent, 1986).

Research has demonstrated that leaders' effectiveness with subordinates depends heavily on their abilities to develop upward influence with superiors (Pelz, 1959; Bartolome & Laurent, 1986). Likewise, influence with superiors depends on the ability of a leader to accomplish things through subordinates (Uyterhoeven, 1972; Ruello, 1973). Consequently, the more the leader enters into a set of reciprocal relationships, the more a resulting cycle develops. As the leader becomes more effective in influencing the superior, he/she will become more

effective with subordinates. The reverse is equally true; as the leader gains influence with subordinates, influence will be enhanced with the superior.

In terms of using upward influence tactics effectively, several empirical studies offer strong support for the idea that the most effective leaders in organizations understand the nature of influence, understand what influence tactics are available to them, and know "how" and "when" to use those tactics (Case et al., 1988; Kaplan, 1986; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Mowday, 1978; Schilit & Locke, 1982; Yukl & Falbe, 1990).

It is difficult to find empirical data supporting these conclusions. Numerous articles have been published in trade-oriented publications like the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Selections* (Graduate Management Admissions Council-GMAC), and various AACSB publications such as *Biz Ed*. While these articles do provide guidance and interesting, anecdotal, case-oriented advice, none has an empirical, research-oriented focus (Tyson, 2003; Bijoux, 2003; Schmotter, 1998).

One empirical study found in the literature that examined leadership among business deans basically examined clique formation (Hartman, Lundberg, & Lee, 1997). In this study of 18 deans at AACSB schools, the predictability in what causes deans to form communication cliques was very limited. This

study attempted to identify which factors might cause business deans to form informal networks. The primary focus of this study was how business school deans form communication cliques as a way of dealing with changes in AACSB guidelines. Location (i.e., proximity to another college) and opinion similarity on AACSB issues were the most important factors related to clique formation.

## Research Methods

Based on the work of Keys and Case (1990), ten upward influence tactics identified in similar surveys were used. Preliminary field interviews conducted among several business deans (or retired deans), yielded two additional upward influence tactics. These two tactics ("developing and showing support of other people" and "showing confidence and support for my boss") were added to the survey.

Then a survey identifying the twelve upward influence methods (i.e., tactics) was designed. The actual ordering of these methods was random to avoid affecting the resulting rankings.

The surveys were administered to a group of business school deans attending a meeting of the Southern Business Administrators Association. This group meets semi-annually to discuss issues of importance to business school leaders. While most of the deans present were from

AACSB schools, not all of them were. The deans represented a cross-section of schools from large to small, from private to public, and mostly from the Southeastern U.S. A 100 percent response rate was obtained from the 53 deans participating in the conference.

The survey asked the deans to rank twelve influence methods (tactics) from one to twelve in terms of frequency of use. For example, if a dean used the tactic of “presenting a rational explanation” with his/her boss more than he/she used any other tactic, he/she was to rank that tactic as number one. Then, the dean was asked to identify the second most frequently used tactic. These rankings of “frequencies of use” were summed and divided by the total number of deans responding. The result of this was a rank ordering that could be compared to the Case et al. (1988) study of managers.

This same ranking procedure was used to identify how effective the deans found each influence tactic. Similar procedures were used to sum the individual rankings and a mean response was calculated. The resulting sum totals and mean rankings are shown in Table 1.

## Survey Results

As the results show in Table 2, the most frequently used tactic for deans influencing their own bosses was to “present a rational explana-

tion” for what was needed. This is consistent with research with other types of leaders and in other types of settings, be it in the not-for-profit or for-profit sectors. In fact, most of the influence literature suggests that direct, simple, rational, logical explanation for why something is needed tends to be the most effective tactic with any “direction” of influence, i.e., with subordinates, peers, customers, etc.

The next most frequently used tactic was, surprisingly, to “tell, argue, or talk without support.” The ranking of this tactic was surprising since it was assumed that the deans as a group would be less likely to be this forceful so quickly without exhausting other tactics; however, in defense of deans, other surveys suggest that managers in general tend to quickly move into the “telling-arguing” tactic if their first tactic does not achieve results (Case et al., 1988). As seen in Table 1, the third most frequently used tactic was to “use other people as a platform to present ideas.” This tactic, while used more frequently by the deans, is the sixth most used tactic by managers in general (Case et al., 1988). Since the third, fourth, and fifth most frequently used tactics by the deans also involved people issues, it might be that business deans place a much greater emphasis on human relations and collegial behavior than do managers in other settings. The deans in

this study ranked “threatening” the boss as the least frequently used tactic. This is consistent with other studies of upward influence. The dean in an academic environment has learned to be “collegial” (if nothing else) with his/her superior, even when the dean’s requests are turned down.

One particularly interesting result from this survey of deans is that all 53 ranked “threatening the boss” as the least used of any of the tactics. This does suggest that business deans are slightly different from the managers in the Case et al. (1988) study. (Their study found that “offering to trade favors or concessions” with their bosses was the least used upward influence tactic.)

The effectiveness of the influence methods/tactics are shown in Table 2 as well. Consistent with other surveys, the deans ranked “presenting a rational explanation” to your boss as the most effective tactic; however, after this tactic, the effectiveness rankings do not match the frequency rankings on items “b” through “h.” For example, while the deans ranked “telling, arguing, or talking without support” as their second most frequently used tactic, they ranked it fifth in terms of effectiveness. Likewise, “presenting a complete plan to your boss” was seventh in frequency, yet second in terms of effectiveness.

## Discussion

The biggest difference between deans and executives appears to be the time devoted to “presenting complete plans.” Industry managers ranked “presenting a complete plan” as their third most used tactic, while deans ranked it seventh. Industry managers ranked “presenting an example of parallel situations” as the fourth most frequently used, while deans ranked it eighth. Clearly, the deans in this study do differ from other

leaders in terms of their frequency of presenting complete plans and examples from parallel situations. This may be an area in which deans could become more effective as leaders.

For example, a surprising finding in this survey was learning how quickly business deans shift to a tactic of “telling, arguing, or talking without support.” Since the researchers were able to summarize the data from the surveys and feed it back to the deans before they adjourned

from their meeting, it was interesting to hear one dean’s explanation: “I suppose we all know what we ought to be doing, but sometimes we’re only human and fail to do it.”

These survey results suggest that most deans of business schools are like their counterparts in industry. Clearly, followup research needs to be done with a larger sample. An interesting possibility would be to compare deans of business schools to their peer deans in

**Table 1**  
**Influence Methods\***

To Influence your boss ...	How frequently do you use this tactic?		How effective is this tactic?	
	Sum Total	Mean Ranking	Sum Total	Mean Ranking
a. Presenting a rational explanation	84	1.6	64	1.2
b. Telling, arguing, or talking without support	117	2.2	296	5.6
c. Using other people as a platform	137	2.6	202	3.8
d. Developing and showing support of other people (e.g., employees, staff, faculty, alumni, etc.)	219	4.1	370	6.9
e. Showing confidence and support for my boss	286	5.4	425	8.0
f. Using persistence and repetition	347	6.5	219	4.1
g. Presenting a complete plan	391	7.4	150	2.8
h. Presenting an example of parallel situation	455	8.6	213	4.0
i. Listening, offering advice, or soliciting advice	463	8.7	447	8.4
j. Offering to trade favors or concessions	478	9.0	569	10.7
k. Using manipulative techniques	552	10.4	544	10.3
l. Threatening	636	12.0	625	11.8

\* The “Sum Total” was calculated by adding all individual rankings of the 53 deans. The “Mean” was calculated by dividing the “Sum Total” by the number of deans responding (N = 53).

**Table 2**  
**Influence Methods**

To Influence your boss ...	How frequently do you use this tactic?		How effective is this tactic?	
	Deans	Managers*	Deans	Managers*
a. Presenting a rational explanation	1	1	1	1
b. Telling, arguing, or talking without support	2	2	5	2
c. Using other people as a platform	3	6	3	6
d. Developing and showing support of other people (e.g., employees, staff, faculty, alumni, etc.)	4	7	7	7
e. Showing confidence and support for my boss	5	N/A <sup>+</sup>	8	N/A <sup>+</sup>
f. Using persistence and repetition	6	5	6	5
g. Presenting a complete plan	7	3	2	3
h. Presenting an example of parallel situation	8	4	4	4
i. Listening, offering advice, or soliciting advice	9	N/A <sup>+</sup>	9	N/A <sup>+</sup>
j. Offering to trade favors or concessions	10	10	11	10
k. Using manipulative techniques	11	8	10	9
l. Threatening	12	9	12	8

\* Case et al., 1988

<sup>+</sup> not available from the Case et al. (1988) study. Rank ordering of the Case et al. research is not exactly parallel to the deans survey because in this study's field interviews, several deans mentioned that "showing confidence and support for my boss" and "listening and offering advice" were important methods. These tactics were not used in the Case et al. study.

other disciplines to see what similarities and differences might exist. A reasonable argument can be made that influence tactics are learned behaviors, and anything that can be learned, can be "unlearned" or changed. Hopefully, a dean who wants to be as effective as possible will want to learn how to develop more influence in all directions.

### References

- Bartolome, F. & Laurent, A. (1986). The manager: Master and servant of power. *Harvard Business Review*, 64 (6): 77-81.
- Bijoux, T. (2003, March-April). Diving into the dean pool. *Biz Ed*: 36-41.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Rowe.

Case, T., Dosier, L., Murkison G., & Keys, B. (1988). How managers influence superiors: A study of upward influence tactics. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 9 (4): 25-31.

- Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Hartman, S., Lundberg, O., & Lee, D. (1997, October). Factors related to the formation of a communication clique among business deans. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 5 (4): 388-400.
- Hinkin, T. R. & Schriesheim, C. A. (1989). Development and application of new scales to measure the French and Raven bases of power. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74: 561-567.
- Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (2002). *Leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Kanter, R. M. (1983). *The change masters*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kaplan, R. E. (1986). Trade routes: The manager's network of relationship. *Organizational Dynamics*, (Spring): 37-52.
- Keys B. & Case, T. (1990). How to become an influential manager. *Academy of Management Executive*, 4 (4): 38-51.
- Kipnis, D. & Schmidt, S. M. (1988). Upward influence styles: Relationship with performance evaluations, salary, and stress. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33: 528-542.
- Kotter, J. R. (1985, September). Power and influence: Beyond formal authority. *Macmillan Executive Summary Program*: 1-8.
- Kotter, J. R. (1990, May-June). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review*: 103-111
- Mowday, R. T. (1978). The exercise of upward influence in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23: 137-156.
- Pelz, D. C. (1959). Influence: Key to effective leadership in the first line supervisor. *Personnel*, 29: 209-217.
- Ruello, S. H. (1973, July). Transferring managerial concepts and techniques to operating management. *Advanced Management Journal*.
- Schilit, W. K. & Locke, E. (1982). A study of upward influence in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27: 304-316.
- Schmotter, J. W. (1998). An interview with Dean D. Joseph White. *Selections*, (Winter): 22-27.
- Tyson, G. (2003). As uncertainty persists, deans talk dollars. *Selections*, (Spring): 24-28.
- Uyterhoeven, H. (1972). General managers in the middle. *Harvard Business Review*, 50 (92): 75-85.
- Yukl, G. & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75: 132-140.

---

**SOUTHERN BUSINESS REVIEW**

P. O. Box 8109  
Statesboro, GA 30460-8109



A Unit of the University System of Georgia  
Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer

**CHANGE SERVICE REQUESTED**

---

Non-Profit Organization  
U.S. Postage  
Paid  
Permit No. 286  
Statesboro, GA