

than consistency and order. “Throughout the ages, individuals who have been seen as leaders have created change,” Kotter says.

In his “Managers and Leaders: Are They Different?” Abraham Zaleznik answers his title question with a big yes. He argues that managers and leaders differ in motivation, personal history, and how they think and act. Zaleznik sees the manager as a problem solver, oriented to achieving organizational results, and the leader as a risk and opportunity seeker driven by broader purposes that may not be in line with those of the organization. His leaders may do things that force managers to react.

Although leading comes off as more glamorous than managing, there is not a clean split between the two. Both the leader and the manager assess situations, influence people, and pursue goals. Agricultural businesses depend on the functions associated with both if they are to endure. Farms and ranches need to meet schedules and stay within budgets, as well as to create useful change and adapt over time. If leadership at the top does not, in Drucker’s terms (Chapter 2), continually rethink “the theory of the business” – i.e., pay attention to where the organization is today and where it needs to be tomorrow – the business can slip out of tune with markets, technology, and regulations. But if the farm cannot manage its human and other resources well enough to bring quality goods to market at competitive price, the business is bound to fail before adaptive strategic planning is relevant.

In practice, many people play managerial and leadership roles at once. By virtue of their positions in agricultural businesses, supervisors and other managers are expected to cover the classic functions of management. They may use leadership qualities in fulfilling their managerial responsibilities. Leadership by non-managers is not so reliably exercised to serve the business.

Leaders Influence People

Whatever else they may do and for whatever purposes, leaders influence other people, and they appear to do so at a deeper, more personal level than garden variety managers. In *On Leadership*, John Gardner stresses the closeness and interdependence of the leader and the led. “Leadership is the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers. [Leaders] are integral parts of the system . . . They perform certain tasks or functions that are essential if the group is to accomplish its purposes. All that we know about leaders and their constituents or followers tells us that communication and influence flow in both directions. Leaders shape and are shaped, even in systems that appear to be run in authoritative fashion.”

J.M. Kouzes and B.Z. Posner also focus on leadership as a profound influence process, though without the dimension of reciprocity noted by Gardner. In *The Leadership Challenge*, they offer that while managers get others “to do,” leaders get others “to want to do” by teaching, facilitating, coaching, and mentoring. The essential leadership activities they identify are:

- Challenging the process
 - Search for opportunities
 - Experiment and take risks
- Inspiring a shared vision
 - Envision the future
 - Enlist others
- Enabling others to act
 - Foster collaboration
 - Strengthen others
- Modeling the way
 - Set the example
 - Plan small wins
- Encouraging the heart
 - Recognize individual contribution
 - Celebrate accomplishments

What does it take to be a leader? Psychologist Daniel Goleman has popularized the idea that leaders need to have a high level of “emotional intelligence” (EI) to effectively manage themselves and others. In “Leadership that Gets Results” and other publications since 1990, he describes a model comprising four areas of EI competence – self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skill. Where the first two of these components deal with relationship to self, the latter two deal with management of relationships to others.

In brief, self-awareness is a keen understanding of one’s emotions, strengths and weaknesses, and ability to accurately and honestly self-assess. Self-management is control of one’s disruptive impulses, especially when events deviate from the plan, plus trustworthiness, conscientiousness, flexibility, initiative, and achievement orientation. Social awareness includes empathy, the ability to discern others’ feelings, and sensitivity to the currents of organizational life. Social skill is proficiency in communication, persuasion, influence, conflict management, and collaboration with employees or coworkers. The abilities covered by EI have been studied by other psychologists for many years, and an impressive body of research suggests that these abilities are important for success in many areas of life. Not surprisingly, a person’s ability to perceive, identify, and channel emotion provides the basis for competencies that contribute to success in almost any job.

Goleman describes six leadership styles that respectively spring from different components of emotional intelligence and he indicates when each works best.

Figure 4.5. Goleman's leadership styles.

Style	In a Phrase	When Best
Coercive	“Do what I tell you.”	In a crisis, to kick-start change, or with problem employee
Authoritative	“Come with me.”	Change requires new vision or strong direction
Affiliative	“People come first.”	To heal rifts in a team or to motivate people during stressful circumstances
Democratic	“What do you think?”	To build buy-in or consensus, or get input from valuable individuals
Pacesetter	“Do as I do, now.”	To get quick result from motivated, competent team
Coaching	“Try this.”	To help employee improve or develop strengths

What, then, really makes a leader? With all due respect to the glories of emotional and other sorts of intelligence, there is only one essential that can be observed from all the different perspectives of managers, theorists, and philosophers. There is no leader without followers. So the question converts to a practical equivalent: What does it take to develop and maintain a following? Why would a person follow another or do another's bidding? Generally, because the latter has power.

Supervisory Power to Influence

Sometimes a supervisor's best move is not to lead but rather to get out of the way and let workers do what they know needs to be done in the way they know how to do it. In the normal course of events, though, supervisors in agriculture want to initiate employee action or at least modify its direction. They need the power to influence.

One conceptual scheme identifies five types of power, each related to a different basis for followers accepting the influence of a leader. The five types and their respective bases are listed in Figure 4.6. **Coercive power** is based on fear or the threat of punishment. A worker's belief that failure to accept influence (i.e., to follow directions) would subject him to disciplinary action, undesirable task assignments, firing, or physical harm would vest power in a supervisor who is able to bring about these consequences. Possessors of **reward power**, on the other hand, can provide something of value to the follower. Pay raises, promotions, training opportunities, better work assignments, inside information, recognition, and other forms of approval are among the rewards that employees usually accept influence in order to obtain.