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For over the past sixty or more years, much of the leadership and organizational literature has continued to present largely similar arguments. These arguments have tended to suggest that all efforts made to elicit desired behaviors from people, represent leadership, to greater or lesser extents. This study provides a review and ideological analysis of the behavioral artifacts exhibited by Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar, as recorded in the first chapter of the book of Daniel. The results of this analysis suggest that: (a) differences actually exist between several different types of providing direction; (b) those differences primarily relate to whether or not, known, standard procedures exist to help guide the required efforts, and who the directors primarily intendeds to benefit from the associated outcomes; and (c) most of the current literature actually addresses desired organizational culture, rather than desired behaviors unique to leadership. The study also includes recommendations for future research, based on these results and the associated conclusions.

What context leadership? Some people have seemed to suggest or imply that leadership serves or should serve as the end all to meet all--the panacea that will solve all of the world's problems and lead humanity into a utopian-like stage of existence. Cries like "we lack leadership" and "we need leaders" have routinely echoed in classrooms, boardrooms, and in halls of government. While speaking at Regent University during a graduation commissioning ceremony in 2010, then a successful business owner and candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable Scott Rigell suggested that America lacks both leaders and leadership and that if left unchecked, these shortcomings would ultimately lead to the county's
demise. However, others have suggested that leadership does and should exist in every group at every level. While speaking at a luncheon at Regent University in 2008, former U.S. Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Vern Clark explained that he expected members of every rank and rate in the U.S. Navy to demonstrate leadership; regardless of their formal or informal roles, tasks, or functions. Although some might argue some amount of bias in Mr. Rigell's comments, differences nonetheless appear to exist between how Admiral Clark and he contextualized both leaders and leadership.

Through the years, scholars and others have defined leadership in both simple and complex terms. In a personal discussion in 2007 with the famed leadership author, John Maxwell intimated that leadership only amounts to influence and that most all of the other constructs presented in the literature more aptly reflect types or facets of management. In his seminal work on servant leadership, Robert Greenleaf (1977) presented a similarly simple, general definition of leadership as related to going before others and showing the way. Conversely, in their meta-analysis of leadership, Bruce Winston and Kathleen Patterson (2006) identified over 90 constructs that scholars have suggested contribute to leadership. These include factors ranging from the support and development of those who work with and for leaders to the identification and development of processes to accomplish missions. Even if the constructs influence, going before, and showing the way, as presented in the Maxwell and Greenleaf definitions, prove more complex than they appear at face value; the 90-plus constructs presented by Winston and Patterson would likely prove, a priori, at least 30 times more complex. From the disparities presented between these definitions, it further appears that scholars, as well as others, generally view leadership in different ways. In that regard, on a group page in an on-line, professional networking site, early in 2010, a member asked fellow members to identify the differences between management and leadership. The request generated over 2000 responses. A review of these responses indicated that the participants perceived the existence of three general categories of leadership and management. These three categories included leadership or management by hierarchical positions; by formal, operational roles; and by functional behaviors, otherwise informal roles.

It also appears that some scholars have attributed to leadership any types or sets of directing behaviors, regardless of the context or nature of the given situations. Bennis and Goldsmith (1997) suggested that management consists of doing things right while leadership consists of doing right things (4). While some people might argue that this statement presents an overly simplistic view of both management and leadership, the basic conclusions appear to suggest premises that hold true upon closer inspection. To do things right or correctly implies that procedures and standards exist for the performance of tasks, objectives, and goals. By most definitions, managers first weigh particular requirements, including the desired levels of quality, efficiency, and effectiveness for particular jobs. They then implement the use of procedures, based on given requirements, usually in accordance with cultural norms, through the use of standard decision making techniques (regardless of whether learned or intuitive). They then provide direction and apply accountability to any other members involved in accomplishing the selected procedures; thereby fulfilling desired outcomes. By observation, in praxis, management has presented as collections of standardized techniques, methods, and procedures employed to achieve contextual objectives and supporting tasks at specified levels of efficiency and effectiveness. Organizations have typically developed, adopted, and maintained these techniques, methods, and procedures to allow managers to control the order or flow of work in order to achieve desired outcomes to given standards. Conversely, the imposition or limitation of only doing right or correct things implies that those tasked with providing direction might possess only general standards, procedures, or rules to apply in particular, given situations. Since, if they possessed validated, standardized procedures, then
arguably, no need for leadership would exist. The one providing direction could simply apply standardized management techniques to achieve their desired outcomes.

I. DEFINITIONS

Based on these premises and arguments, it seems that, as applied to organizations, the following definitions generally reflect the meanings of the words management and leadership, when considering behaviors associated with directing, in praxis:

1. Management consists of answering non-emergent opportunities, contextual to particular objectives where, in given situations, representatives of organization exercise authority in directing activities, with the behavioral intentions of maximizing effectiveness and efficiency in achieving organizational outcomes, as defined by relevant stakeholders; and

2. Leadership consists of answering emergent opportunities, contextual to particular goals where, in given situations, experts in subject matter or process exercise authority, assumes personal responsibility, and submit to accountability in and for creating processes and directing activities, with the behavioral intentions of mitigating loss or maximizing success in achieving organizational outcomes, as defined by relevant stakeholders.

By these definitions, the term non-emergent associates with answering given opportunities with standard, validated, known, and agreed upon procedures and rules. Therefore, those who follow standard operating procedures to provide direction or otherwise supervise, in both routine and otherwise non-routine, emergency situations, actually employ management behaviors to reach their desired outcomes. Conversely, those who discover, create, or develop and utilize new or otherwise untested, non-validated, or non-standardized methods to reach their desired outcomes, appropriately do so by employing leadership behaviors. Additionally, by this definition, members would only provide actual leadership in one of three instances: (a) when no validated, standardized procedures exist; (b) when choosing validated, standardized procedures to use; and when validated, standardized procedures currently in use, no longer meet the quality levels required by the relevant stakeholders (West, 2014).

At this point a rub presents, however, in that beyond management and leadership, authors through the ages have also described other forms of directing, even if they or other people referred to those collective behaviors as leadership. Specifically, it appears that people have sometimes directed others by methods that present as either non-contextual (for lack of a better term), at least in relation to the desired outcomes of other stakeholders; or multi-contextual. For example, according to one translator and biographer, some people have generally vilified Machiavelli (1961) as they inferred that he had suggested that leaders should employ certain behaviors they (the readers) found repugnant. However, incongruence exists, in that Machiavelli clearly stated that he wrote directly to and in regard of one or more feudal lords or princes with his recommendations. He never suggested or implied that the behaviors he recommended should extend to captains of business, democratically elected representatives, or people assigned to direct the efforts of team members trying to reach goals, with or without the use of standard procedures. This suggests the probable existence of a third category of directing, beyond management and leadership: that of lordship or ruler-ship. Like other writers have suggested that standardized procedures and rules, as well as concerns for efficiency and effectiveness relate to management, Machiavelli suggested that these likewise, relate to lordship. However, lordship arguably did not appear to present with the same contextual focus as has management or leadership.
II. FORMS OF DIRECTION

Whether they serve as antecedents or as supporting constructs, some behaviors have appeared to overlap between all forms of directing. Adjudicating, empowering, influencing, planning, and supervising, to name just a few, have seemed to correlate with or apply to the directing of behaviors, no matter the context or application. However, it also seems, a priori that some specific behaviors, groups of behaviors, or priorities in the applications of behaviors must have related uniquely to management, leadership, lordship, and a forth category, coined dictatorship (emergent, person-centric), as represented in the figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization-centric</th>
<th>Non-Emergent</th>
<th>Emergent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Person-centric

|                      | Lordship              | Dictatorship?  |

In that regard, two questions present: (a) What behavioral artifacts uniquely support each of the categories; and (b) does context define the differences between the sets of Management and Leadership, and Lordship and Dictatorship.

III. METHOD

When examining rhetoric, researchers have several options that pertain to different levels within the text. Specifically, these levels include inner texture, inter-texture, social and cultural texture, and ideological texture, among others (Robbins, 1992). Inner texture refers to the actual vernacular usage; including type, positioning, and repetition. Intertexture refers to how other passages within a given work comments and informs the object passage and often the subjects within. Both social and cultural and ideological textures refer to assumptions, values, and artifacts shared by or compared between people. Researchers can readily observe physical and behavioral artifacts and they can discern values by observation and interviews and by the reviews of accurate accounts of history, including the review of historical documents. However, Schein (1992) suggested that investigators can only identify deep-seated cultural assumptions through the use of data triangulation of the observed artifacts and values. The major difference between social and cultural texture and ideological texture mainly exists in the level of analysis. Where social and cultural analyses focus on the social aspects of why certain events took place, ideological analyses focus more on political and social-psychological dynamics – or how subjects moved, both individually and in groups, to achieve particular ends.

As noted by West & Bocârnea (2008), Robbins described that ideology essentially consists of moral beliefs ascribed to by a person or a group. In this regard, ideology represents the surface values that reflect widely-held, deep-seated cultural assumptions and it informs the behaviors and other artifacts selected by a given individual or group. Where assumptions present as the cultural level of analysis and answer why questions; ideology (a set of collective values) presents as the political level of analysis and answers how questions; and behaviors and relics present as artifacts and answer what questions (Schein, 1984, 1992). As such, ideology contributes directly to choice-making processes and to the resulting choices selected. Typically, as significant emotional events affect individuals or groups, their assumptions can change (Massey, 1979) and this can contribute to ideological change. However, as West and
Bocârnea also noted, the values represented by a given ideology can also remain intact long after the disappearance of the initial cultural and behavioral reasons or criteria for adopting that ideology. For the purposes of this investigation, I chose to investigate from an ideological perspective.

**IV. RESULTS**

Examples exist in scripture of how both Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar directed others. The aims of this present study include: (a) to categorically compare Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar's methods of directing (how they directed self and others, as applicable) and (b) to establish, beyond the constructs of emergence and measurements of success, the construct of direction that relate to center of focus.

**Daniel:**
1. "… Resolved that he would not defile himself with the king's rich food, or with the wine which he drank..." (Daniel 1:8, Revised Standard Version).
2. "… Asked the chief of the eunuchs to allow him not to defile himself" (Daniel 1:8).
3. Suggested to the steward who feared for his own life, "...Test your servants for ten days; let us be given vegetables to eat and water to drink" (Daniel 1:12).

In this example, Daniel suggested the incorporation of processes created and developed to answer specific opportunities. He possessed expertise in the knowledge of God's standards. However, he did not possess or ascribe to rules or procedures previously standardized and validated in order to achieve the goals and objectives associated with the given situations in which he and his kinsmen found themselves. He also directed his concerns toward success – maximizing gain and mitigating loss, rather than toward determining levels of efficiency and effectiveness. These behaviors generally suggest that in these opportunities he employed values and resulting behaviors associated with emergence. Additionally, his behaviors also appear to represent the stated goals and objectives of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuchadnezzar's servants, and Daniel's own kinsmen. Therefore, from a contextual perspective, his behaviors represent values that align with the given definition of leadership.

**Nebuchadnezzar:**
1. "... Commanded Ashpenaz... to bring some of the people of Israel, both of the royal family and of the nobility, "youths without blemish, handsome and skilful in all wisdom, endowed with knowledge, understanding learning, and competent to serve in the king's palace" (Daniel 1:3-4).
2. "... Assigned them a daily portion of the rich food which the king ate, and of the wine which he drank (Daniel 1:5)
3. Directed that they receive education "... for three years, and at the end of that time they were to stand before the king" (Daniel 1:5)

Clearly, Nebuchadnezzar presented requirements to follow standardized rules and procedures meant to affect and generally apply to the Israelites as a people. It also appears that he exhibited concern for levels of efficiency and effectiveness, rather than opting for measurements of success that would merely identify the mitigation of loss or maximization of gain. These behaviors generally suggest that in these opportunities Nebuchadnezzar employed values associated with non-emergence. Some might categorize Nebuchadnezzar's behaviors as a type of leadership, but as described, his behaviors appear to more closely align with the given definition of management. Additionally, his behaviors also appear to not represent the stated goals and objectives of Daniel and his kinsmen, the ministers who carried out Nebuchadnezzar's directives or any other sub-group of the kingdom; otherwise, the organization; but rather, they appear to represent Nebuchadnezzar's own, personal goals and supporting agenda. This presents similarly to the general warning about kings, provided in 1 Samuel 8:11-18. In that passage, God through Samuel said:
These will be the ways of the king who will reign over you: he will take your sons and appoint them to his chariots and to be his horsemen, and to run before his chariots; and he will appoint for himself commanders of thousands and commanders of fifties, and some to plow his ground and to reap his harvest, and to make his implements of war and the equipment of his chariots. He will take your daughters to be perfumers and cooks and bakers. He will take the best of your fields and vineyards and olive orchards and give them to his servants. He will take the tenth of your grain and of your vineyards and give it to his officers and to his servants. He will take your menservants and maidservants, and the best of your cattle\[b\] and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your flocks, and you shall be his slaves. And in that day you will cry out because of your king, whom you have chosen for yourselves; but the Lord will not answer you in that day.

Therefore, from a contextual perspective, Nebuchadnezzar's behaviors represent values that fail to align with the given definitions of either management or leadership. The resulting definition of his demonstrated behaviors might include that of lordship. Therefore:

Lordship consists of answering non-emergent opportunities, contextual to particular objectives where, in given situations, representatives of organizations exercise authority in directing activities, with the behavioral intentions of maximizing effectiveness and efficiency in achieving outcomes that will primarily benefit them or other individuals or groups that they choose to benefit.

V. DISCUSSION

At the 2010 Biblical Perspectives in Leadership Roundtable conference, at Regent University, some people categorized Daniel's behaviors, in the focal passages, as leadership, regardless of Daniel's young age (a teenager), the fact that he lacked any positional authority, and that the initial application of his resolve only affected him – regardless of the stated definitions. Some others also argued that Nebuchadnezzar's behaviors represent leadership, as well. In fact, one participant's stated perception included that no differences existed between the general behaviors of Daniel and those of Nebuchadnezzar, from a leadership perspective. This participant implied that both examples represent two facets or categories of leadership. Additionally, another conference participant seemed to suggest that management ultimately amounts to nothing more than one tool in a set that effective leaders should have at their disposals.

The fact that different people understood these disparate examples as falling under types of broad "leadership umbrellas" could suggest one of at least three things; that: (a) no substantive differences actually exist between leadership, management, and lordship; (b) leadership and lordship serve as constructs of management or vice versa; or (c) authors of leadership definitions and explanations have so diluted the concept of leadership that people have started acknowledging as leadership, practically anything that a person does, as long as that person serves in an authoritative position or role. Choice (a) seems unlikely, since some leadership authors have spent decades describing and explaining how leadership differs from management. Even theorists and researchers like McGregor (1960) and Mescon (1958), active in the discussion of leadership more than a half-century ago, suggested and implied that leadership differs from management. Choice (b) seems more likely than choice (a), in that even the Academy of Management has traditionally referred to leadership as a sub-category of organizational behavior and organizational behavior as a category of management. Therefore,
choice (c) seems most likely, as suggested by the previously noted, 90 constructs that theorists and researchers have collectively identified as factors of leadership (Winston & Patterson, 2006).

The Dilution of the Concept of Leadership

To dilute a concept (or theory) means to reduce the concentration of the effect of that concept. Concept dilution can occur by partially disproving the given concept; by adding one or more competing, valid theories to explain the associated phenomenon; or by adding to the explanation of the given concept one or more constructs beyond the minimum necessary to support its generally accepted definition. When considering the 90-plus constructs that theorists have regarded as necessary ingredients of leadership, in light of concept dilution, it seems easy to understand why Burns (1978) found leadership: "... one of the most observed, yet least understood, phenomena on earth" (3) and Bennis (1989) found leadership: "... like beauty... hard to define, but you know it when you see it" (1).

Greenleaf (1977) offered that going before and showing the way represents the dictionary definition of leadership (109). The vast majority of attributes, skills, and other characteristics to which the authors identified by Winston and Patterson (2006) have ascribed to leadership, do not actually reflect the constructs that define, describe, or otherwise explain leadership, in terms of what it takes to go before and show the way. Rather, they describe leadership in terms of how leaders should lead. After all, that the people who go before and show the way do so with concern for their subordinates and for their own good manners, primarily represents the authors' stated perceptions of desired ideological ends. With all other things equal, applying any or all of those 90-plus constructs might result in more affectively committed and satisfied subordinates, who work at higher levels of productivity. However, because those constructs represent values-based ideology (how), rather than behavior and other artifacts-based, technical implementation (what), they would likely yield similar results when applied to any members of any organizations, by any other members of those same organizations, regardless of the variances of positions between the given members. In other words, regardless if a boss, a peer, or a subordinate interfaces with a member, by using any of those 90+ constructs, the results might vary by degree, but those efforts will yield about the same types of affective impact. The fact that perceived organizational support has mediated and moderated the relationships between leadership and the organizational outcomes of affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Bang, 2007, West, 2010; Woodcock, 2010) supports this notion. In fact, the constructs through which researchers have typically measured perceived organizational support, may actually better define, describe, and explain the technical (what) aspects of leadership, than do any of the constructs cited by Winston and Patterson. Either way, however, it seems unlikely, in light of these considerations, if any objective evaluation of Nebuchadnezzar's behaviors, cited in the study, actually represent leadership, per se.

VI. LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS OR CULTURAL NORMS

Based on these conclusions, it also appears that what some people have recognized as leadership really represents the type of culture that they desire for their organizations to adopt or maintain. From experience, some of these people have primarily acknowledged hierarchical heads of organizations as leaders and they have identified the various desired organizational values as leadership constructs. Arguably, they have done this because they have perceived (consciously or subconsciously) that these leaders possess higher levels of authority than they do, as subordinates; and that because of those higher levels of authority the leaders also,
necessarily possess the power to transform and maintain the desired cultural norms within their organizations. They have acknowledged, through interviews and questionnaires that they desire for their leaders to prove honest, caring, trustworthy, and to exhibit great communication skills, among many others, in order to realize the best organizational outcomes (Winston & Patterson, 2006; Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002). However, researchers have seldom asked what would happen if subordinates failed to prove just as honest, just as caring, just as trustworthy, and just as adept at applying every other ideologically based attribute, behavior, characteristic, skill, or trait with which theorists have typically defined, described, and explained those constructs required of leaders. If they did, it seems likely that members throughout organizations would desire for all other members to exhibit the same value-based behaviors that they desire from those whom they have designated as leaders. Either way, those who occupy hierarchical positions of authority, only possess the power that subordinates and others have yielded to them through their social contracts together. Anyone, in any organization, at any level can reclaim their power, at any time (Terry, 1993; West, 2008). West (2008) also implied that any member can grasp authority, at will and that those who grasp authority face the associated existential risks.

Given that the level of value alignment between members, within organizations, correlate positively with organizational effectiveness (Cram, 2012; Jehn, Chadwick, & Thatcher, 1997) and organizational effectiveness serves as a desired organizational outcome; then organizations should work to align the values and assumptions of every member, regardless of rank or station. Certainly, the requirement to align values should apply to leaders (whether acknowledged through permanent position or through long-term or temporary role), but it should also apply to all other members of the given organizations, as well (Schein, 1992). Similarly, in establishing, changing, and maintaining organizational cultures, those who work in leadership positions and roles and everyone else in the given organizations, should model desired behaviors for others, both within and outside of their organizations. In order to best accomplish this modeling, every member should first understand and embrace the factors and dynamics of not only the relatively surface, value-based, ideological questions of how; but they should also understand and embrace the factors and dynamics associated with the deep-seated, taken-for-granted, assumption-based, cultural questions of why (Schein, 1992). For example, regarding servant leadership, Greenleaf (1977) suggested that servant leaders should be servants first. Two relatively obscure, value-based implications from that statement include that for servant leadership to work best—and maybe to work at all: (a) entire organizations should embrace servant-hood as a cultural norm and (b) members of those organizations should initiate and continue to implement the behaviors associated with the values and assumptions related to servant-hood; regardless of whether or not they ever become leaders in their organizations. Greenleaf further supported this position, when he acknowledged that people would face challenges, if they had to transition from other lifestyles, into cultures that involve servant-hood as a primary component, while also transitioning into servant-led positions of hierarchical authority. Making lifestyle transformations, alone, might prove difficult for some people; but entering higher profile positions and roles, with greater levels of authority, responsibility, and accountability, all while trying to adapt to new assumptions and values could jeopardize the success of realizing desired outcomes.

VII. LEADERSHIP, LORDSHIP, AND MANAGEMENT

If the constructs listed in the Winston and Patterson (2006) work actually represent operational behaviors required from some members (designated as leaders), in order for them to go before others to show the way; and those constructs do not present as equally important for every member to implement across entire, given organizations, in order to maximize
efficiency and success of those organizations; and if the operational behaviors required to lord over others do not relate to the maintenance of systems, whether primarily established for the overall benefit of the organizations or of the given lords; then leadership and lordship might present as the same construct as lordship, especially as described by theorists like Machiavelli (1961) and generally presenting as “bad” leadership, at least from a non-axiomatic perspective.

Conversely, if the constructs listed in Winston and Patterson (2006) represent prescribed ideological behaviors, rather than required operational behaviors; and if the operational behaviors required for members to lead, relate to going before others to show the way, for the overall effectiveness or success of given organizations; and if the operational behaviors required to lord over others relate to the maintenance of systems primarily established for the overall benefit of the given lords; then leadership and lordship necessarily differ.

Similarly, if the constructs listed in Winston and Patterson (2006) represent prescribed ideological behaviors, rather than required operational behaviors; and if the operational behaviors required for members to lead, relate to going before others to show the way, for the overall effectiveness or success of given organizations; and if the operational behaviors required to manage relate to the maintenance of systems primarily established for the overall benefit of given organizations; then leadership and management necessarily differ.

VIII. IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The time has long past for members of the academy to agree upon a general definition of leadership. I posit that leadership likely exists as a universal, process-type concept that consists of one general set of constructs and that it requires its users to possess the antecedents of job-task content knowledge and cultural adaptation, in adequate levels for given contexts, in order for them to achieve successful outcomes. If this proves true, the potential implications associated with this position include that people who have once learned the actual leadership process should only have to master the job-task contents related to the new assignments, as well as the cultural norms of the associated organizations, in order to achieve successes. Therefore, this agreed upon definition should lend itself to the development of measurable, behavior-based constructs.

Additional research should include an investigation to determine if existing constructs, designated as contributing to leadership and designed by theorists to measure ideological perspectives through the perceptions of followers, and that relate to leadership types (e.g., servant leadership, transformational leadership, etc.), should generally apply to measuring cultural values within and throughout organizations, as indices that can identify both the perceived levels of desired values and the alignment of those values and their supporting, latent assumptions.

Finally, researchers should further investigate if theoretical and empirical differences exist between the concepts of leadership, lordship, management, and the forth form of directing that I have, in this present study, labeled dictatorship. Rather than serving permanently in any of these roles, researchers should determine if the utilization of these roles should last only as long as the associated requirement that precipitated their use. For example, could directors lead in a given project, then later in the same project could they manage or even follow, all based on their (and other members') technical preparation and cultural alignment? If so, then even if supervisors possessing positional authority might retain the responsibilities for the associated outcomes, might they also ideally delegate their authority to direct to other, better prepared members of their organizations?
IX. CONCLUSION

Leadership exists as a concept that people should appropriately apply in emergent situations that require organization-centric solutions. Conversely, lordship exists as a concept that people should appropriately apply in non-emergent situations that require person-centric solutions. Up until now, authors of academic literature have generally obfuscated these differences, primarily by having diluted the concept of leadership. This dilution has taken place as theorists have identified, as leadership constructs, attributes, behaviors, skill sets, traits, and other characteristics that more appropriately represent ideological and cultural values, rather than leadership attributes, and that all members of given organizations should embrace and display, regardless of their positions or roles within those organizations.

After removing the ideological factors from the concepts of leadership and lordship, these concepts appear to apply primarily to roles, rather than to positions. For example, directors (regardless of rank or station) would appropriately apply leadership, when emergent situations require the use of leadership; and then they might appropriately shift to other forms of directing when the circumstances or situations change. In other words, the same people, working on the same projects, might lead during one period, manage during another period, and even follow during yet another period; all based on their and other members’ technical preparations and cultural alignments. In organizations that employ hierarchical structures, the primary responsibilities for resulting outcomes would likely remain with the people who hold positional authority. However, those possessing positional authority would ideally delegate their authority to lead or otherwise direct, to those other members within their organizations who have proven themselves technically or culturally better equipped to provide the required direction.

Theorists need to develop uniform definitions of leadership, lordship, and other types of directing. These definitions should describe, in general terms, what people actually have to do to employ the different types of directing, rather than focusing on answering the ideological questions of how. Researchers also need to investigate to confirm that the ideological constructs that authors have associated with leadership actually represent cultural norms that organizations desire that all members display. Finally, researchers should conclude if leadership, lordship, and other forms of directing would provide better representations of long-term positions or short-term roles, regarding the people who employ these concepts.
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