LEADERSHIP TO MANAGE EMOTIONS IN HEALTH CARE ORGANIZATIONS

Dr. J. Venkatesh
Associate Professor
School of Management Studies,
Anna University of Technology Coimbatore,
Jothipuram Post, Coimbatore - 641 047
Tamil Nadu, INDIA.

Mr. D. Balaji
Full Time PhD Research Scholar,
School of Management Studies,
Anna University of Technology Coimbatore,
Jothipuram Post, Coimbatore - 641 047
Tamil Nadu, INDIA.

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to describe the relationship between effective leadership and the leader’s own ability to manage his/her emotional state. The connection between leadership and emotions is detailed and evaluated, analyzing differences between management and leadership. By describing the behaviors that are known to be essential to successful leadership in organizations and then postulating the emotional links between those behaviors and organizational performance, it is hoped the reader will be able to develop a richer conceptualization of the role leadership plays in organizations and how emotions mediate leadership performance and organizational performance. The paper has proposed a model for defining and differentiating between leading and managing. Five factors were found to be important to the exercise of leadership.
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1. Introduction:

A discussion of the relationship between emotions and leadership in organizations can include many perspectives. We could, for example, discuss the impact a leader’s emotional state has on followers. We could also include ideas and findings that relate to subordinates’ emotional states and how leaders deal with those to the enhancement or disadvantage of the organization. Or, we could describe how leaders manipulate, or use, the emotions of followers to serve the organization, or the leaders’ own, purposes. In this paper we will describe the relationship between effective leadership and the leader’s ability to manage her/his own emotional state. But, we must begin with a description and definition of leadership itself. The state of the leadership literature is such that each author’s perspective on leadership determines the definition discussed, and this definition is rarely described or differentiated from other definitions. The literature, for example, is strewn with leadership concepts including the following: “strategic leadership” (Finklestein and Hambrick, 1996), “transformational leadership” (Burns, 1978), “transcendental leadership” (Cardona, 2002), “full range leadership” (Avolio and Bass, 2002), “servant leadership” (Greenleaf, 1977), “charismatic leadership“ (Conger, 1989), “primal leadership” (Goleman et al., 2002), even “rebel leadership” (Downton, 1973), to name a few. Each of these leadership concepts is, in a way, a special case or special application of leadership; but in most cases the author does not define the limits of the concept and/or where it does not apply or how it is different from other concepts of leadership. Many authors state the case for their brand of leadership as if it is the leadership concept to answer all questions about leadership. Consequently, research findings and conclusions often remain in dispute; and reasonable arguments may be found to be unreasonable or nonsensical because the reader has a different definition of leadership and may not even realize it. We end up with a kind of “Tower of Babble.” So, devoting some energy to defining our concept of leadership seems quite important. The core of the paper includes two related discussions. First, recent research on the behavioral components of transformational leadership is shared. These five factors that have been found in the recent research will be described in detail so that the reader has a clear sense of the types of behaviors that have been found to be integral to leadership performance. Since these findings are regarding leadership behaviors, this part of the discussion leaves out the topic of emotions which, of course, is the essence of the paper. So, the second half of the paper will describe the emotional or affective correlates of the five behavioral components. This second part of the paper is largely theoretical and hypothesizes how the behavioral activities of a leader take effect on individuals and on an organization. Where research does bear on the discussion, it is cited. This paper, therefore, has several rather lofty goals. First, to share a unique model for defining leadership in a way that clearly differentiates the concept of leadership from the concept of managing. The second goal is to share some recent literature bearing on emotions and leadership. The third goal is to describe the results of recently published findings regarding leadership behaviors. The fourth and final goal is to provide a theoretical perspective on how emotions link these behaviors to organizational performance. By describing the behaviors that are known to be essential to successful leadership in organizations and then postulating the emotional links between those behaviors and organizational performance, it is hoped the reader will be able to develop a richer conceptualization of the role leadership plays in organizations and how emotions mediate leadership performance and organizational performance.
2. The Concept of Leadership:

The connection between leadership and emotions has been discussed for decades, but in the past ten years the relationship has become clearer. Part of this clarity has come about through an increased ability to specify one’s definition of leadership, which, as will be discussed, in the past has been a problem. Another contributor to the increased clarity regarding the relationship between emotions and leadership has been the ability to differentiate between management and leadership as separate, while equally important, organizational processes. In spite of this increasingly accepted differentiation, many authors continue to describe the two – leadership and managing – in the same terms; so it is difficult to say whether a given author is describing leadership or managing processes or behaviors. For a deeper discussion of these two processes – leading and managing – see Kent et al. (2001) and Kent (1999). To summarize the nature of this confusion consider these facts. Bass and Avolio (1994) describe factors that they attribute to the exercise of “transformational leadership.” Yet Tracey and Hinkin (1998) found little distinction between Bass and Avolio’s (1990) leadership factors as measured in their Multifactor Leader Questionnaire and Yukl’s Managerial Practices Survey (Yukl et al., 1990) which measures managing behaviors. One could wonder if the authors – Bass and Avolio – are describing the practices involved in managing or those involved in leading. Vroom and Yetton’s (1973) book – Leadership and Decision Making – is devoted mostly to a discussion of participative management though the title promises a discussion about leadership and decision making. Blake and Mouton’s (1964) “Managerial Grid” somehow turned into Blake and McCanse’s (1991) “Leadership Grid”. For further examples of this confusion in the scholarly literature see Kent et al. (2001). To help alleviate this confusion, we can define leading and managing, and help to differentiate between them, by looking at them from three different perspectives. Kent (2003) used a model to look at the two ideas – leading and managing – from the perspectives of their purposes, their products or outcomes, and their processes. The perspective of purpose answers the question: why do they exist; what is the reason for them taking place at all. Are they natural phenomena (this author believes they are), and, if so, do they not have their respective purposes or functions in nature? The second perspective would describe their products. This perspective would specify what results they produce independently and separately. From the perspective of purpose we answer the question why, and from the perspective of products we answer the question what. The third perspective is related to process. Process tells us how something occurs or how it comes about. With regard to leadership, process should tell us how a leader behaves or acts. The section below will describe leading and managing from these three different perspectives.

3. The Different Purposes of Leading and Managing:

Kent (2003) used the above model to differentiate between transformational leadership and managing. That work provides the basis for the definitions suggested here. It has become fairly widely accepted, since Burns (1978) first suggested it, that leaders work via their impact on others’, and their own, thinking and valuing. This, we should note, is really the first suggestion that emotions, and the affect one can have on those emotions, is critical to leading. The valuing process (creating a personal sense of worth toward a person, object, or idea) is both an emotional and a cognitive or mental function. Notice the definition of the purpose of managing has no such emotional correlate. These two distinct purposes (of leading and of managing) give us our first sense of the role emotions play in the key organizational processes of leading and of managing. Leading involves the creation of direction and,
perhaps more importantly, it involves creating the motivation or will to pursue that direction among the organization’s members. We will see later the link between emotions and this motivation, or will, to pursue. Managing, on the other hand, is primarily a cognitive or intellectual activity according to this definition. It has to do with evaluating various resources and selecting and allocating those resources for the greatest energy effectiveness and goal accomplishment.

4. The Different Prospects of Leading and Managing:

Kent (2003) also describes the different products that are associated with leading and with managing. Products speak to outcomes or results. Product is more measurable and tangible than purpose. Product may be thought of as the tangible realization of a purpose. On the other hand, purpose cannot be deduced from a given product with any certainty. If we see a beautifully manicured and freshly cut lawn, can we surmise the owner’s purpose for cutting the lawn in such a fine way? Perhaps she is selling her house and wants to get top dollar; or perhaps she is in a personal competition with her neighbor. Extrapolating from the purposes stated above leads to the following thoughts regarding the products of leading:

- The establishment of thrust toward a purpose or end
- The creation of social orderliness to carry out that thrust
- Higher states of behavior in terms of principles, values, morality, and ethics

In sum, when leaders lead it results – in the best of cases – in thrust toward an end or goal, orderly or aligned pursuit of that goal, and higher standards of ethics, morality, etc.

- Following the thinking presented above, the products of managing may be:
  - Resources, organized effort, and awareness of performance and progress toward goals;
  - The creation of a desired mode of working among people and other resources; and
  - The creation of the most energy effective way of dealing with the causes of events and situations in accomplishing a purpose tied to a particular situation.

In other words, when managers manage well the results include the organization of resources toward the accomplishment of goals, a “best” way to work toward that goal(s), and energy efficiency. So, our definition, thus far, of leading – incorporating the ideas above regarding leading’s purpose and products – would be: Leading or leadership is a process involving the creation of direction and the unified will to pursue it through the development of peoples’ thinking and valuing. This process results in a unified thrust, and an orderly pursuit, toward a purpose or end. This pursuit is carried out via behaviors reflective of higher principles, values, morality, and ethics. Our definition of managing – incorporating the purpose and products from above – would be: Managing is the process of determining and comparing alternative uses and allocations of resources and selecting that alternative which is most energy effective toward accomplishing or producing a product or end. It results in the availability of resources, organized effort, measurement and feedback regarding progress toward goals, norms or rules for working together, and the determination of the most productive ways of solving problems and working together.
5. The Processes of Leading and Managing:

Many discussions of this topic – leadership – begin here with a description of leadership processes. This is the part where we talk about how leadership works or how individuals carry out this activity called leading. This is where we say what leaders do. We are talking here about those processes that are associated with the purpose and products of leading. We will not be talking about those processes associated with managing. Yukl et al. (1990) describe 13 different processes that create the products of managing and serve managing’s purpose. We will not discuss those 13 processes here since our focus is on leadership. Rather we will focus on the processes of leading and their emotional content. Kent et al. (2001) performed a factor analysis of leaders’ behaviors as described by subordinates and identified four types of behaviors in which leaders engage. A further analysis of the data, as described in Kent (2004) and Kent (2003), revealed a fifth factor. These factors reflect the types of behaviors in which leaders engage and which are observable by subordinates. These factors are similar to Kouzes and Posner’s (1995) five factors but are behaviorally based. Kent’s work confirms and extends the work of Kouzes and Posner. Kent’s five factors will be discussed briefly below.

5.1 Process One. Visualizing greatness:

Most, these days, recognize the importance of this factor. Kouzes and Posner (1995) describe leaders as “gazing across the horizon of time, imagining what kind of future they would like to create.” People – employees – need to know where their efforts are leading if they are to put their heart and soul into their work; and leaders satisfy this need by creating a promising picture of the future for them. We know people will do what their mind’s eye pictures. If people are to have a chance to succeed, they must have a picture of what their successful performance looks like and what it leads to. Athletes and performing artists, for example, try to visualize their performance in their minds prior to the actual performance as a way to further ensure a high level of quality in their efforts. Leaders attempt to instill this common picture in the minds of all those associated with the organization so that a common effort toward the “picture” ensues. Imagine an organization where every person associated with the organization actually around in their mind’s eye a picture of the future of the organization and that all of these pictures are essentially identical and that these individuals are responding to what is now their vision as an athlete does to his/her vision of performance. If this were to occur, one might see every employee working toward the same thing; one might see inspired performance; and one might see a collective commitment to the success that comes from achieving the vision.

Organizations and their managers spend a great deal of time and money trying to affect employees’ level of motivation. They develop complex incentive schemes, special recognition ploys, group and team events such as picnics and other outings all in a vain attempt to heighten employee motivation and commitment. In reality, they simply have to unblock motivation. People will not unleash their motivated effort if they do not know what that effort is intended to create or to what it is leading. People cannot sustain their energy if they do not know the purpose of that sustained effort. Leaders know this and attempt to create a shared vision that is uplifting and inspiring. The vision enables people to focus their efforts and to prioritize their activities. It reminds them of the value of their work and of its importance to the organization and to others. It motivates, focuses, and creates a sense of value and significance.
5.2 Process Two - Empowering the “we”:

These days, it appears, leaders work through groups of people. Certainly individuals are important, and leaders do not ignore this importance. But, working through groups, it appears, that leaders attempt to create a greater sense of “we-ness” – the sense that we are all in this together, we need each other, we have to work together to succeed. Leaders try to mold a feeling of unity, of “we-ness.” Today’s organizations are a bit too complex and lean to function with a pack of “lone rangers and their faithful companions” – each lone ranger working on his/her own, and following his/her own, instincts. Too, status distinctions have no place in today’s health care organizations. This is often difficult for health care leaders to understand since their organizations are so scientifically and technologically based. In the past, status was determined by one’s mastery of, or level, of the science or technology. These status distinctions carried over into all forms of organizational and interpersonal interaction. They created barriers to communications, thinking, and acting. It is difficult for people to feel “we-ness” when they are separated from others by various forms of status symbols and status-based organizational norms. Today’s leader must break down these artificial boundaries where they are inappropriate if he or she is to be effective as a leader and if the group is to be able to deal with the complexities of today’s organizations and today’s problems. Today’s organizations are dynamic, responsive, interactive, systematic, and, in the better situations, driven by a clear direction and focal point. Teams are everywhere. Some live intact for years, some come together to complete a project then disband. Some teams live together in the same department or office while others are virtual and separated by miles and or geographical and physical boundaries. The leader recognizes the fact and value of teams and uses them to instill direction and motivation. Having created this “we-ness,” leaders loosen the reins by giving their teams, units, or group the wherewithal and the authority to decide and to act. Team wherewithal would include sufficient competence, resources, team work skills, access to expertise and information, and clear goals and a sense of direction. Imagine a team that fits this description. Why would a leader not give them the authority to decide and to act?

5.3 Process Three - Communicating for Meaning:

Communicating for meaning is not the same as other forms of communicating. We communicate when we share facts and data. We communicate when we send an email to inform others of, say, an event. These are not examples of communicating for meaning. Meaning implies grasping and understanding the subject and its implications and connections to other subjects. Understanding suggests the ability to make fact based value judgments or choices. The process of communicating for meaning can only take place in a two-way or multi-way forum. Meaning requires a sharing of perceptions, a testing and reformulation of ideas and current understanding. Communicating for meaning takes effort and time. It does not necessarily require a lot of words. Volume, as in the number of words or the length of discussion, does not correlate with developing understanding of ideas. Bennis and Nanus (1985) give examples of great leaders who were highly introverted and, so, spoke very little. Yet these quiet, “non-communicative” leaders, worked on developing, and were able to achieve, among subordinates great understanding and commitment to their vision, goals, and so on. Communicating for meaning often involves a struggle. The struggle may take various forms such as:
A struggle with one’s self in the face of the emotions that may surface when others do not, say, immediately agree or comprehend;

- The struggle of trying to understand what another person is saying when it does not fit with one’s own reality;
- The struggle involved in trying to reconcile one’s own thoughts with other’s ideas and needs; and
- The struggle to be patient with the limited time required to achieve meaning or understanding.

Trying to get things done in today’s health care organizations is more difficult than it used to be. People are extremely busy and have many demands on them. The organizations themselves are often vast and, typically, complex. In these conditions it may seem easier to command people to act. But, as the wise leader knows, this seldom is effective. Today people must see the wisdom of the task and be committed to accomplishing it. Commanding action rarely engenders understanding and commitment. Leaders know that they must help others grasp the meaning and importance of the task. Only then are people able to commit to and persevere in the accomplishment of a difficult goal.

5.4 Process Four - Managing one’s self:

An important ingredient in the relationship between leaders and followers is trust. Trust is the result of predictability and emotional (and physical) safety. Leaders are predictable in the sense that followers know who is going to “show up” when the leader acts. Here are some examples of unpredictable behaviors that destroy trust and leadership:

- The leader says one thing and does another
- The leader follows one path for a while then switches direction
- One day the leader is calm, cool and collected; the next day she is a basket case
- The leader reacts to a problem with a solid problem-solving approach; the next day he reacts to a problem with rage
- The leader treats a subordinate who made a mistake as a teacher might treat a student, latter the leader treats a subordinate who made a mistake in a demeaning, cruel way

This is the kind of leader with whom subordinates never know they are dealing. Do they, the followers, take this path or that one? Who knows; it depends on which leader they will be dealing with – Dr Jekyl or Mr Hyde or Willy Nilly. Leaders need to manage their thinking, behavior and emotions. We are not talking about stifling one’s self. We are not talking about repressing one’s feelings or thoughts. We are talking about the same dynamic as an athlete might engage to sustain his or her focus in spite of myriad distractions that occur during a match, game, or meet. Rudolph Giulliani describes an incident in which he attended the funeral of a firefighter who died during 9/11. He was so overwhelmed with emotion that he stepped out and went to a place where no one would see him cry. He then returned to the funeral after he composed himself. He said he thought it would be a terrible distraction from the purpose of the funeral if he would have lost his composure in front of the others at the funeral and in front of the media. He did not stifle his emotion; he managed it. In our research, successful leaders are described by their subordinates as steadfast and persevering. They keep their energy at high levels no matter what the circumstances. They do not give up, waver, or equivocate. They do not change direction or give in to distractions. They keep their...
thoughts and emotions positive. They do not let negative thoughts or feelings affect their performance. These are the behaviors involved in managing one’s self.

5.5 Process Five - Care and Recognition:

This author has had the opportunity over the years to address tens of thousands of leaders, managers, supervisors and their employees. Often I ask my audience, “How many of you get enough recognition for the work you do?” or “How many of you hear the words, ‘Thank you’ often enough at work?” You might not be surprised to know that, typically, less than 10 percent of every audience raise their hands to indicate that they get recognized enough. When you see this kind of thing happen – out of an audience of, say, 300 people, fewer than 30 hands go up – you might think, “Gee, saying ‘thank you’ must be a really difficult thing to do.” There are a few other conclusions one might reach from this information. Since we know that care and recognition is a key behavior for leaders, as described by their subordinates, and since few than 10 percent of people believe they get enough recognition, then, perhaps it follows that only about 10 percent or less of us are really good leaders. Or, that among leaders, this is one behavior that most good leaders are lacking; and that they could improve their leadership even more if they would concentrate on this very simple behavior. This is very simple stuff. Leaders show they care about people through the act of kindness of recognizing people’s efforts, thanking them for their work and devotion, and, simply, showing interest in what they are doing. This is not complex nor is it difficult. It doesn’t take a great deal of time. What it requires is being sincerely interested in something or someone other than one’s self. It requires the selflessness of paying attention to someone else’s interests, needs, dreams, concerns, or problems. It can begin with a question such as, “How are you doing?” Then it requires serious listening. It often ends with the kind of “thank you” that comes from realizing how critical this person’s effort is or was to the success of the organization, project, or task. In one sense it might be the easiest thing a leader can do, yet it appears to be one of the things that leaders do least.

6. The Five leader Behaviors and Associated Emotions:

If our theoretical model holds, then the five types of behaviors discovered by Kent et al. (2001, 2004) must have emotional components and we would expect these emotions would be positive. Table I lists the items identified in the Kent studies that are associated with leadership behaviors along with their emotional correlates. We will explore these relationships in this section.

6.1 Process One - Visualizing Greatness:

This process has to do with helping followers develop a mental picture of the future of the organization, project, etc. But, it is not sufficient that the picture be simply a photograph to which the follower is detached. Kouzes and Posner (1995) describe leaders going about this process with “enthusiasm.” They say leaders are “contagiously excited” about their vision; that leaders communicate a positive and hopeful outlook. They say this enthusiasm and positivity engenders an inspired feeling in subordinates. The leader him or she must not only possess a mental image of what she/he is trying to create; she/he must share this in a positive, enthusiastic way. This positive energy is based on positive emotions such as optimism, excitement, hope and the like. This positive energy spreads to subordinates, or, to use Kouzes and Posner’s word, these positive emotions become contagious. And, from our earlier
discussion regarding the reconciliation of Purpose and Understanding, we might conclude that the various discussions leaders must have about their vision would foster the reconciliation between Purpose and Understanding and bring about the energy and commitment discussed in that previous section.

6.2 Process Two - Empowering the “we”:

This process involves creating in others a sense of “we,” of team, of togetherness and then enabling that team or unit to decide and act. The emotions associated with followers in this situation include a sense of cooperation or feeling cooperative vs. feeling competitive; a sense of importance as in: “my job is important to the others in my team and to our clients/patients;” mutual trust among the team members; and ownership for the projects or tasks they work on. The leader’s own feelings must be such as to be able to downplay her own importance in order to uplift the importance of the team. She must also be able to give credit to the team and to give up credit that may come her way because of the success of the team. This requires a tremendous personal strength and self-security. The leader must enable and cause the team to strive while she takes a back seat.

6.3 Process Three - Communicating for Meaning:

Effective communication is a two way street. A key ingredient in this process for leaders is the ability to listen. It is interesting that the more you listen to people the more they tell you. It is also a truism that the more one listens to others, the more they listen to you. I am not saying that if you are a good listener, people will automatically listen to you. But, if you want to have a chance that people will listen to you, you must begin by having them realize that you are interested in what they have to say as well. If people do not feel that from you, you do not have a chance of being heard by them. People have to want to hear you before they will listen to you. If you do not listen to them, why would they want to hear you? If you are simply communicating facts alone, none of this may apply. However, if you are trying to impart understanding and meaning then both the leader and follower must be listening to each other. This is hard work. It is often frustrating, annoying, and trying. It is easy for negative emotions to take over, and, hence, to destroy any chance of communicating for meaning and understanding. The more negative things become, the less listening and, therefore, understanding is going on. The leader must demonstrate patience and a positive outlook in the face of this negativity. This requires that both the leader’s thinking and their behavior be positive as well. The leader must watch their own body language and keep their mind on the positive purpose of this interaction.

6.4 Process Four - Managing One’s Self:

This process involves managing one’s own behavior, thinking and feelings. There are many aspects to this process. The leader must keep her behavior, thinking and feeling integrated; she must keep these all positive; and she must keep them aligned, or on target with, the overall vision or objective and aligned with the organization’s principles and values. All of this must take place whether things are going one’s way or not. It must take place when going uphill as well as going down. It must happen whether people are treating you well or badly. It must take place in the face of thousands of distractions and competing priorities. An interesting cultural phenomenon occurs here to help define the leader’s behavior depending on the environment in which she/he finds himself or herself. One school of thought
(Hochschild, 1983) suggests that the cultural context in which the leader performs determines the rules and boundaries for the feeling and expression of emotion. (Fineman, 2000) This idea suggests that individual sensations, thoughts, and feelings are labeled and displayed in accordance with cultural norms and mores. This would say that what is defined as behavior representing managing one’s self would be different from one culture to another. An American leader might smile, wave, and say “Hi there” while a Russian leader would do no such thing. Yet, both might be rated by subordinates as high on managing one’s self. In this sense the leader may serve as the cultural messenger and model for followers. It may be that high managing one’s self reflects the best and most positive (in the view of the subordinates) norms and mores of the particular culture in which the leader finds him or herself. On the other hand, as a model, if the leader’s behavior, thinking and feelings are dis-integrated, so will be the followers’. If his/her actions are not on target with goals and principles, neither will followers’. If the leader is not positive, how can we expect the followers to be? This requires a tremendous sense of self-awareness or self-observation. This is work that Hochschild (1979) describes as emotional labor. Emotional labor is the effort put forth to manage, feign, repress, etc. one’s emotions in order to conform to the rules that govern the expression of emotions in an organization. Hochschild believes this emotional labor takes its toll on employees and causes psychological damage. But Fineman (2000) asserts that emotion work “. . . helps keep the organization organized; when emotion management fails, so can the organization.” It is suspected that managing one’s self may run the gamut from the “damaging” processes that Hochschild fears such as repression, etc. to more positive processes that are reflected in the integration of rationality and emotion that is attempted to be portrayed. Here neither rationality nor emotionality is the master or driving process. Neither interferes with the other, but enhances and serves the other. Nor does managing one’s self suggest that the leader is emotionless. Managing one’s self suggest the “appropriate” expression of emotion. Through self-observation and self-awareness – the emotional labor of leadership – the leader consciously manages his or her expression of feelings. Several studies have identified the importance of the expression of appropriate feelings to the success of leadership. These positive expressions convey a sense of competence and optimism to followers.

6.5 Process Five - Care and Recognition:

There is doing a job. Then there is “going beyond the call of duty.” There is the sense of “going the extra mile.” What makes some people put in this extra effort, while others do not? Does the leader make a difference? One would guess that in an environment where it does not matter whether a person works hard or not, no one would work hard. Equity theory (Adams, 1965) would predict this. Presumably, the leader has a tremendous effect on this impression – whether it matters if a person works hard. Even where the leader has little impact on the financial rewards within an organization such as in a state run institution, the leader does have control over whether employees receive other forms of recognition. The leader can also affect whether people feel that their work is important and that the organization cares how the work is performed. Through this process the leader provides encouragement and emotional rewards via recognition. To do this the leader must experience the value of a person’s work; this enables that leader to care about the person and the work. The leader must pay attention to this value and offer thanks for it. If the leader is thankless, followers will become less responsive to the organization and it’s clients’ needs. As a patient I was hospitalized in a specialty wing of a hospital. My physician was the new head of this department at the time. My treatment seemed exceptional. I mentioned this to him, and he said he thought the staff in
that unit was the best he had ever seen. I asked him if he had told them that he felt that way. He said “no, he had not.” Within three years he left that major hospital and moved on to a position elsewhere. He left the unit in shambles with high turnover and abysmal quality numbers. Here was a highly proficient surgeon with a great deal of respect for his staff. Yet, he couldn’t bring himself to recognize them and to show his respect for them. Performance declined considerably as a result. Something as simple as this, saying thank you in a variety of ways, can make a dramatic difference.

7. Conclusion:

This paper attempted to serve several purposes. First, some of the literature has led to confusion through the lack of clarity or the commingling of ideas between leadership and managing. This paper attempts to clarify the definitions in use for this paper. As a by-product, the paper has proposed a model for defining and differentiating between leading and managing in future papers. The paper has also reviewed and elaborated on five factors found to be important to the exercise of leadership. This model was then used as the basis for discussion of emotions and the role they play in the successful exercise of leadership. To this end the paper attempted to create a model for understanding, and further studying, emotions and the role they play in leadership.
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