Chapter 7
Development of an Inclusive Leadership Theory Rooted in Respect for Human Dignity

Debra J. Dean

Introduction

Leadership theories are often birthed out of a need. Authentic leadership theory was cultivated during an ethical meltdown in businesses where companies were failing to deliver as promised. The world is in desperate need of a new theory that will attend to the needs of today. Development of an inclusive leadership theory is needed more today than at any other point in history. Landesz (2018) wrote "we live in a crucial moment in history in which true leadership will define whether we can meet critical social, political, economic, and environmental challenges" (p. 39). As the world is facing unprecedented changes at lightning speed, it is time to take a good look at the leadership styles of the past and examine what is needed for the future. Theories such as authentic, autocratic, charismatic, laissez-faire, servant, situational, spiritual, transactional, and transformational have been involved with a wide range of studies examining desirable outcomes. However, the gap in literature exists to have a modern leadership theory that will address the issues seen in 2020 in addition to the unknown issues that are heading our way.

In 25 years of working in corporate America, I have seen good and bad leadership styles. The bad were rooted with dark triad traits of Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy. Wantaate (2019) reported that such leaders could be abusive, exploitative, impulsive, selfish, or toxic leading to conflict, lack of productivity, and turnover. In my own experience, the toxic leadership caused me to feel isolated and smothered as they pushed me down and tried to hold me back. A mentor of mine gave advice on the situation in saying that not all people can lead, some are very good at what they do and are promoted into leadership positions only to find that

D. J. Dean (✉)
Regis University, Denver, CO, USA
e-mail: drdebra@drdebradean.com

they do not have people skills. I believe that was the case with the two extreme toxic leaders I encountered in my career. This chapter will expand on what bad leadership looks like for the sake of knowing what not to do. In the end, this chapter will identify leadership traits that are needed for the twenty-first Century, especially the competencies that are needed to address the current climate of exclusivity, pandemics, and incivility.

Bad Leadership

Roque et al. (2020) spoke of how an organization can go from thriving to collapsing with one leadership change. The person at the helm will have a major impact on the success or failure of the company. An example of such implosion is the "colossal failure" with General Electric after Jack Welch left the company and Jeff Immelt assumed the position of Chief Executive Officer (Belvedere, 2018). Others might argue that similar situations are seen when power is transferred in the White House as one party focuses on certain issues and the next party spends their first months in office undoing much of the efforts from the prior administration.

What does bad leadership look like? Well, this question might be subjective as some followers may construe certain traits as positive or negative based on their own perspectives; however, a majority of people can agree that bad leaders are mean, they lack consistency, and they do not communicate well. In my own experience, I saw bad leaders control their employees so as to not allow them to develop and promote into other positions. I also saw them gossip and talk badly about their staff, customers, or other employees. Bad leaders may lack vision or company values, fail to produce positive results, are self-centered, lack empathy, fail to communicate, are inflexible, and lack humility (Stowell, 2020). Bad leaders may not pay attention and may not be fully committed. They lack character or integrity, lack performance, lack love and kindness, lack focus, are satisfied with the status quo, blame others, and know-it-all (Myatt, 2012). Bad leaders may also fear change, may be too eager to compromise, are too bossy, are wishy-washy, a poor judge of character, and have a lack balance between work and other parts of their life (Marr, 2020). In return, bad leadership will have a negative relationship with the triple bottom line: people, planet, and profit. And, as seen with the global pandemic and explosion of incivility and hatred in the world, bad leadership can lead to failing companies and even loss of human life.

Good Leadership

Good leadership includes honesty and integrity, confidence, inspiring others, commitment and passion, good communication, decision making capabilities, accountability, delegation and empowerment, creativity and innovation, empathy, resilience,

emotional intelligence, humility, transparency, and vision and purpose (Hasan, 2019). Collins and Hansen (2011) conducted a study to look at why "some companies thrive in uncertainty, even chaos, and others do not" (pp. 1–2). They focused on companies that did better than reacting, they created. They did more than succeed, they thrived. They noted Coach John Wooden as the basketball legend and phenomenal leader; yet cautioned that enterprises can decline after great leaders retire (Collins & Hansen, 2011, p. 6). Wooden is best known for his basketball greatness that includes leading the UCLA Bruins to ten National College Athletic Association (NCAA) national championships. He is also recognized for his leadership pyramid that he carefully crafted for 14-years, and the way he and his family loved and supported one another.

Wisdom of what great leadership looks like can be found in the history books. Winston Churchill, Nelson Mandela, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Sir Trevor McDonald, and Margaret Thatcher top the list of the greatest twentieth century leaders by BBC (Clementi, 2021). Strock (2021) maintains a list of inspiriting twenty-first century leaders including Alan Mulally, Arthur Demoulas, Bill Gates, Carl Icahn, Charles Schwab, Cheryl Sandberg, Donald Trump, Elon Musk, Herb Kelleher, Howard Schultz, Indra Nooyi, Jeff Bezos, Mark Zukerberg, Sir Richard Branson, Steve Jobs, and Tony Hsieh. With the mention of each name, some readers may find themselves rejoicing with celebration or cringing with disbelief that such a name could be uttered as a great or inspiring leader. At the core of each name though is a competency that shines as a great leader. Collins and Hansen (2011) wrote that contrary to popular belief, great leaders "did not have a visionary ability to predict the future" (p. 9). The authors wrote that the leaders "observed what worked, figured out why it worked, and built upon proven foundations" (Collins & Hansen, 2011, p. 9). Collins and Hansen continued in saying, "they were not more risk taking, more bold, more visionary, and more creative… they were more disciplined, more empirical, and more paranoid" (p. 9). Great leaders compared to their competitors were not more creative, more visionary, more charismatic, more ambitious, more blessed by luck, more risk seeking, more heroic, nor more prone to making big bold moves (Collins & Hansen, 2011, p. 18). Instead, they were willing to accept what was within their control and reject the idea that "forces outside of their control" would determine the outcome" (p. 18). In short, Collins & Hansen found a triad of core behaviors that empowered great leaders to reach big results in chaotic and uncertain environments. The triad, which is termed Level 5 Ambition, includes fanatic discipline, productive paranoia, and empirical creativity. When the triad is coupled with humility, doubt, and drive (also known as professional will) from Collin's Level 5 Leadership a noticeable difference takes place that catapults the leader from good to great in times of uncertainty (Collins, 2009). Collins' Level 5 competencies are

Table 7.1 Collins Level 5 competencies

Collins Level 5 competencies			
Level 5 ambition	Fanatic discipline	Productive paranoia	Empirical creativity
Level 5 leadership	Humility	Doubt	Professional will

displayed in Table 7.1. Throughout the remaining pages of this chapter additional competencies will build upon one another to show what stands out as constructs of various leadership styles. The gap in literature regarding the competency of respect is noticeable; whereby, reinforcing the urgent need for the development of an inclusion leadership theory rooted in respect for human dignity.

Respectful Pluralism

Respectful Pluralism is the theory developed by Hicks (2003). His original work focused on religion in the workplace; however, his theory can extend to differences of all sorts including age, ethnicity, gender, and health related disorders. The core belief of respectful pluralism is to respect people for the sake of human dignity and the proactive approach encourages cultivating a culture of mutual understanding (p. 183). Hicks encourages the "establishment of respectful communication across employee difference" (p. 190). He argues that many companies "fail to create conditions of equal respect for their workers" (p. 195). And, he contends that employees should be "respected rather than avoided, reduced or exploited" (p. 200). To accomplish this, rhetoric is front and center in the spotlight to examine if the "content of the message itself reflects respect or disrespect for human dignity" (p. 177). This effort of treating employees humanely and fairly does more than tolerate differences, but encourages them, so long as there is not a threat to society. To understand what construes a threat, there must be an agreed upon moral compass that informs all citizens of what constitutes a threat. In his book, Hicks used India and Singapore as examples of countries that are quite diverse, but have found a way to respect differences and define a country wide code of conduct that establishes the boundaries citizens are able to exercise their free will and differences within.

While it does not appear that a formal Respectful Leadership Theory has been articulated, discussion of this topic has been ongoing for more than a decade. Quaquebeke and Eckloff (2010) developed an instrument to measure respectful leadership. Their 19 categories included accepting criticism, acknowledging equality, appreciating, being attentive, being error-friendly, being open to advice, being reliable, conferring responsibility, considering needs, excavating potential, granting autonomy, interacting friendly, maintaining distance, promoting development, seeking appreciation, showing loyalty, supporting, taking interest on a personal level, and trusting. Decker and Quaquebeke (2015) studied horizontal respect and vertical respect. They wrote that horizontal respect is an unconditional attitude to extend equal dignity and virtual respect is conditional respect honoring a person's expertise, excellence, or status. In other words, horizontal respect is respecting human dignity for the sake of realizing we are all humans. For the sanctity of human life argument, human life is deserving of respect for the mere sake we are all the

same – we are human. Whereas, vertical respect is the type of respect we give to a manager or teacher whom we may not like as a person, yet we respect their position. When a supervisor treats an employee badly but the employee continues to report to work each day and do their best job, they are respecting the position, not necessarily befriending the person. Ng (2016) stated that "overall, being respected is universally desired" (p. 604).

Leadership Theories

Theories have boundaries that clearly define what is within the theory and what is not within the theory. Some theories have similarities, but they should be different with regard to constructs or competencies. Alban-Metcalfe and Alimo-Metcalfe (2000) wrote of the "emergence of the New Leadership Approach" shifting from transactional methods to visionary and then transformational. This section will cover many of the popular leadership theories briefly to show constructs of each theory in an effort to reveal character traits of such leaders and reaffirm the need for respectful leadership. This textual discourse will reveal the gap in literature and defend the development of an inclusive leadership theory rooted in respect for human dignity.

Authentic Leadership Theory

Yukl (2010) explains that authentic leadership expects the authenticity of the leader to shine through with consistency of words, actions, and values. George (2004) wrote that his book was written for a new generation of leaders to emerge from the ashes of unethical companies such as Enron and Arthur Anderson that failed with leaders at the helm that tolerated and possibly encouraged misconduct. He encourages leaders to lead with integrity, purpose, and values. Authentic leadership theory, according to Avolio and Gardner (2005) speak of the ethical and moral component required for authenticity. As shown in Table 7.2, the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (Walumbwa et al., 2008) and the Authentic Leadership Inventory (Neider & Schriesheim, 2011) both measure self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and internalized moral perspective.

Table 7.2 Authentic leadership competencies

Authentic leadership			
Self-awareness	Relational transparency	Balanced processing	Internalized moral perspective

Autocratic Leadership Theory

Lewin et al. (Lewin et al., 1939) examined three types of leadership including auto-cratic/authoritative, consultative/democratic, and laissez-faire. The first level of clarity showed authoritarians as leaders who determined all activities; whereas, democratic leaders enlisted group discussion for decision making, and laissez-fair leaders offered complete freedom for individualized decision making. The second level of clarity between these three styles of leadership discovered the authoritarian leader who dictated steps to accomplish the task; whereas democratic leaders sketched general ideas to meet the goal allowing for discussion between the leader and follower(s) to succeed. Laissez-faire leaders offered supplies, but did not take part in the specifics of how to accomplish the task. A third level of clarity between the leadership styles showed the authoritative leader who offered individual praise or criticism with a friendly or impersonal style; whereas, the democratic leader was more fact-based or objective, and the laissez-faire leader offered few comments, if any.

Today, Autocratic Leadership Theory posits that autocratic leaders are self-serving and do not welcome input from others. They typically exhibit a lack of trust with others and prefer to make all decisions alone. Woodard wrote of this leadership style where authoritarians are "ruling with an iron fist" (2017, p. 40). Ferguson et al. (2006) examined autocratic leaders with the three constructs of obedience, conformity, and appearance as shown below in Table 7.3.

Charismatic Leadership Theory

Charismatic Leadership Theory by Max Weber has held a prominent place in religious leaders for nearly a century. However, scholars have expanded the field of charismatic leadership to apply to management studies and political science (Chryssides, 2012). Weber defined Charisma as:

> The term 'charisma' will be applied to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a 'leader.' (1978, p. 241)

Conger and Kanungo (1987) introduced Charismatic Leadership Theory and noted the "conspicuous absence from research" to date as the (a) mystical connotation of the word charisma, (b) the need for a conceptual framework, and (c) the difficulty to access leaders that are charismatic. However, they mentioned leaders such as Lee

Table 7.3 Autocratic leadership competencies

Autocratic leadership		
Obedience	Conformity	Appearance

Iacocca and John DeLorean as leaders that took high personal risks to achieve a shared vision. Conger et al. (1997) developed an instrument to measure five dimensions of charismatic leadership including strategic vision and articulation, sensitivity to the environment, unconventional behavior, personal risk, and sensitivity to members needs. The Charismatic Leadership in Organizations Questionnaire (De Hoogh et al., 2005) measures articulation of an attractive vision, providing meaning to followers work, role modeling of desired behavior, power sharing, intellectual stimulation, and consideration as shown in Table 7.4.

Democratic Leadership Theory

Northouse (2021) explains that the Democratic Leadership Style involves leaders treating followers as if they are "fully capable of doing work on their own" and that the leader works "hard to treat everyone fairly without putting themselves above followers" (p. 394). Democratic Leadership Theory posits that decision making is a shared responsibility between leader and follower(s). Ferguson et al. (2006) examined autocratic leaders with the five constructs of appearance, aggression, superiority, winning, and negotiation. The Leadership Styles Questionnaire by Northouse (2021) measures authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles (Table 7.5).

Laissez-Faire Leadership Theory

Northouse (2021) wrote that the Laissez-Faire Leadership Style is sometimes considered "nonleadership, in which leaders ignore workers and their motivations and engage in minimal influence" (p. 395). Yukl (2010) explained it is "best described as the absence of effective leadership" (p. 277). Ferguson et al. (2006) evaluated the three leadership styles of Lewin et al. (1939). They found that autocratic leaders "made the rules, controlled order, and [the followers] had little freedom" (Ferguson et al., 2006, p. 46). However, laissez-faire leaders "provided no direction…[the followers] had freedom without order" (p. 45). Ferguson et al. (2006) examined autocratic leaders with the nine constructs of negotiation, fair play, mutual respect,

Table 7.4 Charismatic leadership competencies

Charismatic leadership					
Articulation of an attractive vision	Providing meaning to followers work	Role modeling of desired behavior	Power sharing	Intellectual stimulation	Consideration
Strategic vision and articulation	Sensitivity to the environment	Unconventional behavior	Personal risk	Sensitivity to members needs	

Table 7.5 Democratic leadership competencies

Democratic leadership				
Appearance	Aggression	Superiority	Winning	Negotiation

Table 7.6 Laissez-Faire leadership competencies

Laissez-Faire leadership								
Negotiation	Fair play	Mutual respect	Creativity/ originality	Empathy	Personal wishes	Freedom	Being different	Selfishness

creativity/originality, empathy, personal wishes, freedom, being different, and self-ishness as shown in Table 7.6.

Servant Leadership Theory

Greenleaf (1970) coined the term Servant Leader and many more scholars have come after him to continue the field of research. Patterson (2003) built upon the servant leadership theory to identify several constructs. Building upon Patterson's work, the Servant Leadership Assessment Index (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005) measures agapao love, altruism, empowerment, humility, serving, trust, and vision. Northouse (2021) states that Servant Leadership Theory is an emerging field of study calling for leaders to care for their followers and encourage their autonomy, knowledge, and servanthood (p. 396). The Servant Leadership Behavior Scale (Sendjaya et al., 2019) measures voluntary subordination, authentic self, conventional relationship, responsible morality, transcendental spirituality, and transforming influence. The Servant Leadership Questionnaire (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) measures altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship. The Servant Leadership Scale (Liden et al., 2008) measures emotional healing, creating value for the community, conceptual skills, empowering, helping subordinates grow and succeed, putting subordinates first, and behaving ethically. The Servant Leadership Survey (Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011) measures empowerment, accountability, standing back, humility, authenticity, courage, forgiveness, and stewardship. Each of the instruments mentioned above are displayed in Table 7.7.

Situational Leadership Theory

Hersey and Blanchard explained that the basic concept of situational leadership is that there is "no one best way to influence people" (1988, p. 171). The experts posited that the leadership style a leader uses should depend on the readiness of the group. Originally called the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership in 1969, the authors

Table 7.7 Servant leadership competencies

Servant leadership				
Agapao love	Voluntary subordination	Altruistic calling	Emotional healing	Empowerment
Altruism	Authentic self	Emotional healing	Creating value for the community	Accountability
Empowerment	Conventional relationship	Wisdom	Conceptual skills	Standing back
Humility	Responsible morality	Persuasive mapping	Empowering	Humility
Serving	Transcendental spirituality	Organizational stewardship	Helping subordinates grow and succeed	Authenticity
Trust	Transforming influence		Putting subordinates first	Courage
Vision			Behaving ethically	Forgiveness
				Stewardship

Table 7.8 Situational leadership competencies

Situational leadership			
Telling or redirecting	Persuading or coaching	Participating or supporting	Delegating

changed the title to Situational Leadership in their 1972 book of *Management and Organizational Behavior*. The Managerial Grid used by Hersey and Blanchard (1996) represent the degree of leader's concern for people and production. The four quadrants include telling or directing, persuading or coaching, participating or supporting, and delegating (Table 7.8).

Spiritual Leadership Theory

Spiritual Leadership Theory was developed by Fry (2003). Northouse (2021) calls it an emerging approach examining how a leaders values, sense of calling, and membership motivate followers (p. 396). Yukl (2010) wrote that spiritual leadership is an answer to a need to have more meaning in work as a result of spending so much time at work and lacking opportunity for purpose outside of the workplace. The Spiritual Leadership Scale (Fry et al., 2005) measures altruistic love, hope/faith, and vision. The Spirituality at Work Scale by Ashmos and Duchon (2000) measures inner life, meaningful work, and sense of community. Both instruments are shown in Table 7.9.

Table 7.9 Spiritual leadership competencies

Spiritual leadership					
Altruistic love	Hope/faith	Vision	Inner life	Sense of community	Meaningful work

Transformational Leadership Theory

Transformational Leadership Theory (Bass, 1985) emerged from Transactional Leadership Theory. Bass (1985) explained the two leadership styles were not mutually exclusive. Conger and Kanungo (1998) explained that the difference between transformational and transactional leadership is the exchange between leader and follower; whereas, transformational leaders focus on higher order needs and transactional leaders focus on what they will give to the follower so the follower will give the leader what they want.

The Transformational Leadership Questionnaire by Alban-Metcalfe and Alimo-Metcalfe (2000) measures genuine concern for others; political sensitivity and skills; decisiveness, determination, self-confidence; integrity, trustworthiness, honesty, openness; empowering, develops potential; networker, promoter, communicator; accessibility, approachability; clarifies boundaries; and encourages critical and strategic thinking. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1990) also measures transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and passive avoidant leadership. The constructs of transformational leadership include idealized attributes, idealized behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Each scale above is displayed in Table 7.10.

Transactional Leadership Theory

Transactional Leadership Theory began with James MacGregor Burns (1978). The theory is premised with a series of exchanges between the leader and follower. His efforts helped to define the constructs of contingent rewards, management by exception active, and management by exception passive as shown in Table 7.11. The concept of passive management by exception is the attitude of "if it's not broke, don't fix it" (Sosik & Jung, 2018, p. 8). Active management by exception, on the other hand, closely monitors for operational errors so as to correct it promptly or to avoid it all together. The contingent reward aspect of transactional leadership is an "implied contract" where the follower promises to do something in return for extrinsic motivation (Sosik & Jung, 2018, p. 11). The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1990) measures transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and passive avoidant leadership.

Table 7.10 Transformational leadership competencies

Transformational leadership						
Genuine concern for others	Political sensitivity and skills	Decisiveness, determination, self-confidence	Integrity, trustworthiness, honesty, openness	Empowering, develops potential	Networker, promoter, communicator	Accessibility, approachability
Clarifies boundaries	Encourages critical and strategic thinking	Idealized influence	Individualized consideration	Inspirational motivation	Intellectual stimulation	

Table 7.11 Transactional leadership competencies

Transactional leadership		
Contingent reward	Active management by exception	Passive management by exception

Table 7.12 Respectful leadership competencies

Respectful leadership				
Accepting criticism	Being error-friendly	Considering needs	Maintaining distance	Supporting
Acknowledging equality	Being open to advice	Excavating potential	Promoting development	Taking interest on a personal level
Appreciating	Being reliable	Granting autonomy	Seeking appreciation	Trusting
Being attentive	Conferring responsibility	Interacting friendly	Showing loyalty	

Conclusion

Respectful Leadership Theory is desperately needed to fill a gap in the world today. This theory will do more than tolerate differences, it will encourage and embrace differences allowing humans to flourish and be human without fear of bullying, judging, or persecution. In the world today, we see bigotry, division, hatred, incivility, and disrespect for human beings on a daily basis. It is truly a sad state of affairs that must be addressed in our day-to-day lives and the environment that influences us. This does not mean that we condone all behavior that we find offensive to our personal moral compass. It does; however, mean we do not condemn others for their beliefs. There must be a way for people to get along out of respect for the nature of our being is all the same. We can agree to disagree and still treat others with respect for human dignity. Respectful Pluralism encourages the choosing of language that will lift others up and not tear them down.

The instrument, shown in Table 7.12, by Quaquebeke and Eckloff (2010) is a great start to measuring respectful leadership. However, much more work is needed to qualitatively examine the needs of humans today and the needs of humans in the future to ensure the constructs of respect are properly defined. For respectful leadership to become a theory, it will require much more work from scholars around the globe to examine what respect means and how to measure it.

The essence of respect is treating all people the way we would want to be treated. This is also known as the Golden Rule. By evaluating the leadership theories of the past, we can see the gap in development of an inclusive leadership theory rooted in respect for human dignity. Some theories include aspects of respect such as authentic leadership's relational transparency, laissez-faire's fair play and mutual respect, servant leadership's agapao love and trust, and the altruistic love of spiritual leadership or the genuine concern for others within transformational leadership; however, the focus of respect must be more prominent in the future than it has been in the past.

In recent years, many scholars have been working on developing the Full Range Leadership Model. Sosik and Jung (2018) note the birth of this concept was more than 30 years ago when Bass presented a model of Full Range Leadership

Development. Avolio explains that he and Bass worked together to coin the phrase Full Range Leadership as a model of leadership where (a) participants would want to expand their "range" of leadership throughout their career, (b) academic partners would challenge the word "full" continuously asking "what is missing and why," and (c) the full range leadership model could honor the theories of the past (Sosik & Jung, 2018, p. xv). This is such a time to question if the existing leadership theories are inclusive and rooted in respect for human dignity and if not, challenge one another to expand the breadth of the full range leadership model to include all theories of the past in addition to the respectful leadership theory of the future.

Chapter Takeaways

The takeaways from this chapter are numerous. First, the simple fact that respect should be integrated into leadership theory and leadership styles is clearly stated. Second, the popular leadership theories are mentioned along with quantitative instruments that measure their constructs. While the list of instruments is not exhaustive, this does provide a quick snapshot of leadership theories and the genetic makeup of those theories to carefully examine if respect is part of the theory or not. Third, the gap in literature is established as respect has not been a priority in the past. Perhaps it was assumed respect would occur naturally; however, the fact remains that a major lack of respect is clearly an issue in the world today. And, finally, an urgent plea is sent to scholars and practitioners to work together in developing an inclusive leadership theory rooted in respect for human dignity.

Reflective Questions

As this chapter comes to a close, several reflective questions come to mind.

1. How can each person respect all people for the sake of human dignity?
2. Reflecting on activities of this past week, month, or year, what could be done differently to respect human beings better today than in the past?
3. How can we, as a family, workplace, country, or world, work together to establish an agreed upon moral compass?
4. What needs to happen right away to treat other people the way I would want to be treated?
5. How can we realistically agree to disagree and maintain respect for human dignity?

References

Alban-Metcalfe, R., & Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (2000). The transformational leadership questionnaire (TLQ-LGV): A convergent and discriminant validation study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 21*(6), 280–296. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.regent.edu/10.1108/01437730010343077

Ashmos, D. P., & Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at work: A conceptualization and measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 9*(2), 134–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/105649260092008

Avolio, B., & Gardner, W. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 315–338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001

Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(3), 300–326. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601106287091

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Consulting Psychologists Press.

Belvedere, M. (2018). Ex-director Ken Langone: GE's 'destruction' happened after Jack Welch and it could now be 'busted up'. Retrieved January 30, 2021, from https://www.cnbc.com/2018/02/28/ken-langone-ge-destruction-happened-after-jack-welch-left-as-ceo.html

Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.

Chryssides, G. (2012). Unrecognized charisma? A study and comparison of five charismatic leaders. *Max Weber Studies, 12*(2), 185–204. https://doi.org/10.15543/MWS/2012/2/4

Clementi, D. (2021). Icons: The greatest person of the twentieth century - Leaders. Retrieved February 02, 2021, from https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/articles/5jg7HLycnxZFSwPkd1BYZwV/leaders

Collins, J. (2009). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap ... and others don't*. Collins.

Collins, J., & Hansen, M. (2011). *Great by choice: Uncertainty, chaos, and luck-why some thrive despite them all*. Harper Business/An imprint of Harper Collins.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *The Academy of Management Review, 12*(4), 637–647. https://doi.org/10.2307/258069

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Sage Publications.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., Menon, S. T., & Mathur, P. (1997). Measuring charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 14*(3), 290–301. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-4490.1997.tb00136.x

De Hoogh, A., Den Hartog, D., & Koopman, P. (2005). Linking the big five-factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership; perceived dynamic work environment as a moderator. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(7), 839–865. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.344

Decker, C., & Quaquebeke, N. V. (2015). Getting respect from a boss you respect: How different types of respect interact to explain subordinates' job satisfaction as mediated by self-determination. *Journal of Business Ethics, 131*(3), 543–556. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2291-8

Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 26*(8), 600–615. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730510633692

Dierendonck, D. v., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*(3), 249–267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1

Ferguson, E. D., Hagaman, J., Grice, J. W., & Peng, K. (2006). From leadership to parenthood: The applicability of leadership styles to parenting styles. *Group Dynamics, 10*(1), 43–55. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.10.1.43

Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(6), 693–727. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001

Fry, L. W., Vitucci, S., & Cedillo, M. (2005). Spiritual leadership and army transformation: Theory, measurement, and establishing a baseline. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(5), 835–862. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.07.012

George, B. (2004). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. Jossey-Bass.

Greenleaf, R. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Robert K. Greenleaf Publishing Center.

Hasan, S. (2019, December 05). Top 15 leadership qualities that make good leaders. Retrieved January 30, 2021, from https://blog.taskque.com/characteristics-good-leaders/

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1996). Great ideas revisited: Life-cycle theory of leadership. *Training & Development, 50*(1), 42. Retrieved from http://eres.regent.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.regent.edu/trade-journals/great-ideas-revisited-life-cycle-theory/docview/227028768/se-2?accountid=13479

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (5th ed.). Prentice-Hall.

Hicks, D. A. (2003). *Religion and the workplace: Pluralism, spirituality, leadership*. Cambridge University Press.

Landesz, T. (2018). Authentic leadership and Machiavellianism in young global leadership. *The ISM Journal of International Business, 2*(2), 39–51. Retrieved from http://eres.regent.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.regent.edu/scholarly-journals/authentic-leadership-machiavellianism-young/docview/2109233565/se-2?accountid=13479

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". *The Journal of Social Psychology, 10*(2), 269–299. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(2), 161–177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006

Marr, B. (2020). The 8 signs of a bad leader. Retrieved January 30, 2021, from https://www.bernardmarr.com/default.asp?contentID=994

Myatt, M. (2012). 15 ways to identify bad leaders. Retrieved January 30, 2021, from https://www.forbes.com/sites/mikemyatt/2012/10/18/15-ways-to-identify-bad-leaders/?sh=506a964715da

Neider, L. L., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2011). The authentic leadership inventory (ALI): Development and empirical tests. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*(6), 1146–1164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.09.008

Ng, T. (2016). Embedding employees early on: The importance of workplace respect. *Personnel Psychology, 69*(3), 599–633. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12117

Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Introduction to leadership: Concepts and practice*. SAGE Publications.

Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model.*

Quaquebeke, N. v., & Eckloff, T. (2010). Defining respectful leadership: What it is, how it can be measured, and another glimpse at what it is related to. *Journal of Business Ethics, 91*(3), 343–358. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0087-z

Roque, A., Moreira, J. M., Dias Figueiredo, J., Albuquerque, R., & Gonçalves, H. (2020). Ethics beyond leadership: Can ethics survive bad leadership? *Journal of Global Responsibility, 11*(3), 275–294. https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-06-2019-0065

Sendjaya, S., Eva, N., Butar, I., Robin, M., & Castles, S. (2019). SLBS-6: Validation of a short form of the servant leadership behavior scale. *Journal of Business Ethics, 156*(4), 941–956. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3594-3

Sosik, J. J., & Jung, D. D. (2018). *Full range leadership development pathways for people, profit, and planet*. Routledge.

Stowell, S. (2020). Are you a bad leader? Here are 7 signs to look for. Retrieved January 30, 2021, from https://cmoe.com/blog/are-you-a-bad-leader/

Strock, J. (2021). 21St century leaders list. Retrieved February 02, 2021, from https://servetolead.org/21st-century-leaders-list/

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management, 34*, 89–126.

Wantaate, F. S. M. (2019). *Gossiping about the supervisor: The mediating role of follower self-esteem on the relationship between the dark triad traits and workplace gossip* (Order No. 22584253). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ Regent University. (2275500394). Retrieved from http://eres.regent.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.regent.edu/dissertations-theses/gossiping-about-supervisor-mediating-role/docview/2275500394/se-2?accountid=13479

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society*. University of California Press.

Woodard, T. D. (2017). *Autocratic leadership and stress on law enforcement officers: A narrative inquiry* (Order No. 10690593). Available from ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global; ProQuest One Academic. (1968595650). Retrieved from http://eres.regent.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.regent.edu/dissertations-theses/autocratic-leadership-stress-on-law-enforcement/docview/1968595650/se-2?accountid=13479

Yukl, G. A. (2010). *Leadership in organizations*. Prentice Hall.

The City Is Ours

Market forces privatize public property forgetting we are all citizens of the city
regardless of rising prices & exclusive policies
everyone deserves a right to the city

Stakeholders forget to share, consumers don't care
they just want what's new, they'll even take it from you
& take it again when you're not looking
The script is oblivious to the we nation
the central crisis of urbanism
the dichotomy of class division

the collapse of distinction between production & distribution
delineates districts into divided prisons defined by Social Darwinism

Whether it's America, China, Australia, Brazil, Japan or Austria
cities are workshops
of civilization choked by exploitation and stifled circulation complicated
by rising inflation & gentrification,
the emerging nation needs transformation

Human consumption has become an individual function fixated on capital
all the self-serving gluttony is like too much coffee
a city running on hyper-speed moving too fast to breathe
slow down to speed up, take a deep breath
& forget the rush
we are all interrelated, this can't be overstated

Bring it back to brick and mortar,   we still live in a physical world
though the marketplace is digital,   matter is made from a concrete core
Build the bridge,   lay down the bricks
Fill in the ridges,   stack the sticks
Feed the fire,   consider the cost
Take it up higher,   the city is ours!
           ~ Mike Sonksen