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Picture this.....Teddy Roosevelt storming San Juan Hill, saber in hand, rallying his troops, “Follow me men, I’m your leader!” A classic example of a charismatic, authoritative leader—the kind of leader that has been prevalent in the American business world for many years.

But David Rock, in his book *Quiet Leadership* explains why businesses are in desperate need for a new kind of leader. Leadership practices are not keeping up with the realities of organizational life.

About one hundred years ago (agricultural age), most people were paid for their physical labor. Managing people was simple. Effective leadership in those years was to find ways how people could improve the way they hit a hammer or used a plow. It was basically a master/apprentice relationship. By the mid twenties (industrial age), much of the work involved executing recurring tasks that required less physical exertion. This shift was driven by the arrival of electricity and mechanization. Workers were paid to do repetitive tasks like running machinery, sorting products, and entering data. The dominant leadership paradigm became the management of *tasks*; and analyzing linear systems to find greater efficiencies. Consider the values of this leadership approach:

*I, BOSS, know all the answers. The answers of how to run the business, how to make money, and what you as employees need and want.*

*Since I, BOSS, know all the answers, I expect you as the workers to do what you are told. You don’t need to THINK or question what I say. Just do it!*

*Because I’m not sure you’ll do what you are told, I need middle managers to supervise and watch over you.*

*You, the workers, will have a guaranteed job for life. If you do what you are told and do it well, you will be in my company for life.*

So what’s wrong with these values? Nothing. Except they were designed for another era. The world is changing so quickly that these values are hard to uphold.
“The Information Age has set the stage for a continuously changing world of turmoil in organizations today. From a relatively calm past, business organizations have moved to a world of continual whitewater where they have to change to survive and where they have to respond quickly to survive.”
Paul Larson

Because of all the computerization, outsourcing, and knowledge-based industries, most people in companies and businesses today are paid to THINK. The problem is that many management models in use today are still those of the TASK era. Consider a new set of leadership values:

BOSS realizes and proclaims that he/she doesn’t have all the answers.
BOSS then hires workers whose main purpose is to do what they should do...do the THINKING themselves--to serve the customer, to create the product.
Since BOSS can’t tell the workers the answers anymore, employees need to THINK what will produce the best value...for the company, the customer, the stakeholders, and themselves.
So what’s the role of the leader? They need to follow a new leadership paradigm: Contemporary Leadership. It becomes management’s job to remove obstacles so workers can do their work better.

According to Tim Lautzenheiser in the article, Foundation of Contemporary Leadership, the view of leadership has shifted over the last three decades. The strong-armed approach to leadership success has given-way to the concept of allowing the follower to become an invested contributor to the overall mission. The emphasis is now focused on intrinsic motivation rather than using extrinsic rewards as a means to individual or group achievement.

The cornerstone of this paradigm shift emphasizes a win-win concept embracing both the requirements of the project responsibilities and the welfare of the people involved. It diminishes the power-struggle often associated with the traditional positioning, turf protection, rank-and-file status, etc.Kevin Cashman, CEO of LeaderSource and the Executive to Leader Institute, calls this contemporary approach to leadership Authentic Leadership.

“After 20 years of wrestling with this question, I’ve come to this simple yet profound realization. Leadership is not simply something we do. It comes from somewhere inside us. Leadership is a process, an intimate expression of who we are. It’s our being in action. At its deepest level, leadership is authentic self-expression that creates value. The foundation of leadership is authenticity. How do we go about expressing ourselves more authentically? Where is my leadership coming from? Do our actions originate from deep within ourselves, or are they coming from a more superficial, limited place? Is our leadership arising from our character, the essence of who we are? Or is it only coming from our persona, the external personality we’ve created to cope with life circumstances?”

According to Cashman, Ultimately, a leader is not judged by how well he or she leads, but by how well he or she serves. “We serve our organization. We serve our people. We serve our customers. We serve our marketplace. We serve our community. We serve our family. We serve our relationships.”
Caveat...Authentic Leadership - Two Different Meanings

However, we need to distinguish between two somewhat overlapping meanings for the term Authentic Leadership. First, **Authentic Leadership** focuses on the need for better corporate leaders who espouse and act consistent with higher order business ethics and ethical values. This approach focuses on the "leader as person", and could be classified as a "self-awareness approach to leadership and leadership development".

There's a second meaning to authentic leadership. In the helping professions (counseling, facilitating, etc) authenticity refers to being open, honest and real. The idea originates with the Humanistic School of Psychology that emerged in the 1960's which suggests that we cannot help others unless we share ourselves openly and honestly -- that we are "real".

While authentic leadership sounds like a good thing (how can one argue with being honest and real), it may be that being completely authentic can be problematic for modern leaders in the complex organizational world. First there is a danger that a leader will lose the distinction between him or herself as a person, and him or herself as a leader, which is a constrained role within a constrained context. Second, and a very practical issue, is that complete and utter honesty and openness is not always possible in a world of proprietary knowledge, actions that must be kept hidden in the planning stages, and so on. Those subscribing to the need for authentic leadership need to recognize its strengths and limitations (Leadership Development Resource Center).
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