The Zeroth P Framework and Effective Leadership Behavior in Problematic, Non-Problematic, and Issue-ridden Situations

Rajendra Khandekar, Ph.D.
College of Business, Campus Box 78
Metropolitan State University of Denver
PO Box 173362
Denver, CO 80217-3362
USA

Email: KhandekR@msudenver.edu
Tel: +1-303-615-0154

The ZP Framework and Effective Leadership Behaviors in Problematic, Non-Problematic, and Issue-ridden Situations[i]

Abstract

A review of leadership literature reveals three patterns. First, all leadership theories address problematic situations. Second, leadership theories address problems at increasingly complex levels of social systems from individual to relationships to groups to organizations and finally societies. Third, leadership theories imply that an effective leader identifies, flexibly prioritizes and acts accordingly on task and emotional problems confronting the social system to achieve goals. This paper reframes the concept of "situation" using the Zero[th] P (ZP) framework to integrate the above three patterns. The ZP framework provides a way to sort situations into four different types of problematic and non-problematic situations. It is proposed that each type of situation requires different types of leader behaviors. The proposed appropriate combinations are - Celebratory behavior in a non-problematic situation when what is happening is what should be happening; Boundary-clarifying behavior, in a non-problematic situation where nothing is happening that should not be happening; Rebellious behavior when what is happening should not be happening; and Visionary / Innovative behavior when the leader envisions a better world or situation that does not yet exist, but should exist. Application of the framework is illustrated at the individual and group levels, and research avenues are pointed out.

Introduction

If we trace the progression of leadership theories over the past century, we find many definitions. Northouse (2013) quotes "there are as many definitions of leadership as those who have tried to define it (Stogdill, 1974)", and "as many as 65 classification systems to define the dimensions of leadership (Fleishman, et al., 1991)". When we examine this multitude of theories, we find three patterns.

Pattern One: All leadership theories address problematic situations, leaders solve problems.

All theories and conceptualizations of leadership equate leadership effectiveness with achievement of goal(s). A goal always defines a situation different from the actual or prospective situation. Any gaps between the *actual* situation and the *desired* situation, whether in the past, present or future, are known as problems (Tuggle, 1978). Solving a problem is transforming a given situation into a desired situation or goal (Hayes, 1989). Thus, the presence of a goal indicates a gap between actual and desired situations, i.e., the presence of a problem to be solved. All leadership theories therefore seek to identify effective leadership behavior(s) in problematic situations, i.e., situations where some goals are to be achieved. The leader shares a vision and goal(s) and motivates others to join in the effort to achieve those goals, i.e. solve the problem(s).

Pattern Two: Leadership theories address problems at increasingly complex levels of social systems from individual to relationships to groups to organizations and finally societies.

Trait theories (Stogdill, 1948; Mann,1959) and Style theories of leadership – commonly known as Michigan studies (Katz, Maccoby and Morse, 1950) and Ohio State studies (Hemphill, 1950) address leadership at the individual level. Traits and styles are characteristics of the leader as an

individual. Traits are individual proclivities to act in certain ways. "Style" theories imply that the leader has a bias towards giving higher priority to either task problems (task-orientation) or to emotional problems of people (people-orientation). These theories ask which of these traits / behaviors / characteristics are effective in achieving goals, i.e., in solving problems faced by the leader and followers. Assuming there are some traits or styles that are effective in achieving goals, if a person does not possess such "effective" characteristics, does it then become a goal for that person to transform and develop those characteristics? If yes, then these leadership theories really address "personal leadership" where the person must settle on a goal of either transforming or not transforming himself / herself and achieve it.

In the LMX (Leader-Member Exchange) theory, the focus changes from the individual (leadership traits, leadership styles) to the domain of dyadic relationships. This theory addresses how close relationships develop between a leader and some followers, leading to the formation of in-groups and out-groups. Members of in-group enjoy greater trust, communication and responsibility from the leader, while members of the out-group receive mostly formal and infrequent communication. LMX is a descriptive theory. For it to be useful, one must ask the questions: (a) should a leader develop close relationship with every follower to make them feel that they all belong to the in-group? (b) How does a leader develop a close relationship with followers? The first question defines a problem in the context of relationships, and the second question addresses the solving of that problem. Thus, the LMX theory addresses transformation of "relationships" and the leader in the relationship must lead the transformation.

There is no one dominant theory of leadership in the context of groups, but as suggested by Hill (2013), Team Leadership involves managing internal task and relational (maintenance) processes in the group, as well as managing external processes across group boundaries. Goals for team performance are set either by the group or by the larger organization. Effectiveness of the leader is determined by goal achievement for the team. The leader must understand nature of groups and the task and relational group processes that need to be managed. Task processes are often referred to as business processes in literature. Emotional processes in the group are usually triggered by task problems, by individual behaviors and by relationships between individuals. William Schutz (1958) describes three emotional issues of "In or Out", "Top or Bottom" and "Close or Far" that repeatedly rise in the group. The leader must manage as necessary both the task and emotional processes in the group, in addition to managing relationships with each person in the group and managing the leader's own biases in prioritizing task and emotional problems.

Theories of organizational leadership exist mostly as extensions of theories of strategic management. To Kenneth Andrews (1987), the Chief Executive Officer is the "architect of strategy" to organizations where multiple teams and large number of people are involved. An organization is a much more complex system compared to a group or team. Peter Drucker (1993) declared that the job of top management (organizational leadership) is to understand answers to the question "What is our business, and what should it be?" A small retailer such as the Acer Corporation transformed into a giant, fully vertically integrated and innovative company because of leadership vision of Stan Shih (Bartlett and St. George, 2001).

The word "business" can be interpreted as "the company" (e.g., our business is to print journals)

or as "the industry" (e.g., we are in the business of oil and gas). Sometimes a company leader transforms not just the company, but the industry. Today, this is known as "disruption". For example, back in the 1960s and 70s, IBM and other computer companies thought of their business (or industry) as "creating bigger and faster machines that crunch data at high speeds". Steve Jobs on the other hand, had a different view of computer industry with a mission of "placing a computer on everyone's desktop". His vision created a whole new industry of personal computing. An industry is obviously much more complex than any one organization, but an organizational leader can often become an "industry" leader.

Societal leaders were often the subject of study by scholars of leadership and are often used as models against which to evaluate current societal leaders. Ronald Heifetz viewed societal leadership as involving "adaptive work". Adaptive work "consists of the learning required to address conflicts in the values people hold, or to diminish the gap between the values people stand for and the reality they face." (Heifetz, 1994). As can be seen later in this paper, this may be understood as "value clarification" and "factual clarification" when faced with "issues". The leader essentially makes the society face the existence of a "Problem" where the solution may lie in changing goals and values themselves.

As described above, leadership theories address problems and problem-solving processes at multiple levels of systems with increasing complexity.

Pattern Three: Leadership theories imply that an effective leader identifies, flexibly prioritizes, and accordingly acts on task and emotional problems confronting the system to ensure achievement of goals.

An effective leader must accurately identify a current or prospective problem, and the implications of solving or not solving the problem for the relevant set of people. This requires a broader understanding of any situation and an ability to visualize a better situation that others have not been able to visualize.

As pointed out earlier, the notion of task vs. people orientations implies that leader behaviors are directed towards solving task and emotional problems, and an individual's style is the bias in prioritizing task vs. emotional problems. A leader high on Task Orientation will exhibit a tendency to pay attention to task problems first, and followers' emotional problems later. Contingency Theory of leadership (Fiedler, 1964) and Situational Theory of leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 1969) made it explicit that effectiveness of the leader in achieving goals depends on the fit between leadership style and the situation (factors external to the leader), and imply that the leader should be flexible in addressing and acting upon task vs. emotional problems depending on what is involved in the situation.

Reframing "Situations"

The two primary theories in the Situational Approach utilize somewhat different ways to frame the situation. Fiedler (1964) viewed "situations" as Highly Favorable to Highly Unfavorable to the leader based on three variables – "Leader-member relations", "Task Structure" and "Position Power of the leader". Hersey and Blanchard (1969) defined type of situation based on the

"Maturity" of followers. Maturity of followers was defined by a combination of Competence (High – Low) and Commitment (High – Low) of followers.

Both these theories view "situation" in a small group context, and therefore their concept and operationalizations of "situation" are not applicable the level of an individual, relationship, or organization.

The situational theory has come under criticism for its conceptualization of situation in terms of competence and maturity of followers as well as for "few research studies … to justify the assumptions and propositions set forth by the approach (Northouse, 2019). One of recent studies addresses leadership styles (combinations of directive and supportive styles) in Lean Manufacturing context (Tortorella and Fogliatto, 2017), but does not reformulate the concept of situation. Thompson, G., & Glasø, L. (2015) found that the degree of agreement between leader rating of follower competence and commitment and follower self-rating was a core issue for determining follower competence and commitment. This indicates that a reframing of situation may be necessary. A second study by the same authors (Thompson and Glasø, 2018) used the degree of agreement between leader rating and follower self-rating to determine follower competence and commitment as a way to examine the situation. But they reinvestigated the styles of initiating structure and consideration, and there is no reframing of the concept of situation.

This paper suggests an advance in the situational approach by reframing the concept of "situations" that (a) views the context of leader behaviors as problematic, issue-ridden, or non-problematic, (b) is applicable to leadership at all different levels of systems addressed in various theories of leadership, and (3) recognizes leadership process as a continuous, purposeful and flexible prioritizing of task and human / emotional issues and problems to address and resolve as necessary at different levels of systems.

The Zero[th] P Framework

The Zero[th] P (ZP) framework (Khandekar, 2007) uses a a two by two matrix to define Problematic and Non-problematic situations (Figure 1). The P stands for problem-solving, and it is called the Zero[th] P in the tradition of four Ps of Marketing (McCarthy, 1964), or five Ps of strategy (Mintzberg, 1987). Problem-solving is the "Zero[th]" P because human-beings are constantly solving problems. For example, the autonomous systems in our bodies are constantly solving the gaps between actual body conditions and ideal conditions, e.g., body temperature.

Visualizing Problematic and Non-Problematic Situations

	What *is* happening	What *is not* happening
What *should be* happening	(Non-problematic Situation) **Quadrant Q1** **What is happening is what should be happening, therefore there is NO problem.**	(Problematic Situation) **Quadrant Q2** **What should be happening is NOT happening, therefore there is a problem.**
What *should not be* happening	(Problematic Situation) **Quadrant Q4** **What is happening should NOT be happening, therefore there is a problem.**	(Non-problematic Situation) **Quadrant Q3** **Some things should NOT happen, and they are NOT happening, therefore there is NO problem.**

Figure 1: Visualizing Problematic and Non-Problematic Situations (adapted from Khandekar, 2007)

The horizontal dimension separates our relevant reality between what IS going on and what is NOT going on. The vertical dimension describes a desirable or undesirable situation in terms of what SHOULD be happening, and what should NOT be happening. The matrix reveals four "types" of situations, two problematic and two non-problematic.

Quadrant Q1 and Q3 represent non-problematic situations. In quadrant Q1, *what is happening* in this situation is exactly what we believe "*should be*" happening. Thus, there is no gap between what exists and what is desired. For example, most of us would find no problem with a workgroup where everyone works hard, and people get along and have fun. Similarly, in quadrant Q3, things that *should not* happen *are not* happening, therefore there is no problem. A workplace where there is no theft or pilferage does not have that problem.

Quadrants Q2 and Q4 represent problematic situations. In Q2, something *should be* happening, but *it is not* happening, thus there is a gap between what is desired and what is going on, and hence it is a problematic situation. In quadrant Q4, something *is* happening that *should not* happen, thus indicating a gap between reality and what is desired. Therefore, this is a problematic situation too.

The ZP framework: Problems, and Issues as undefined problems			
	What is happening	**Unsure if this is happening or not**	**What is not happening**
What should be happening	(Non-problematic Situation) Quadrant Q1	**(Issues of ambiguity of information)** **Issue Quadrant I_{12}**	(Problematic Situation) Quadrant Q2
Not sure if this should or should not be happening	**(Issues of ambiguity of values)** **Issue Quadrant I_{14}**	**(Issues of ambiguity of values AND ambiguity of information)** **Issue Quadrant I_{360}**	**(Issues of ambiguity of values)** **Issue Quadrant I_{23}**
What should note be happening	(Problematic Situation) Quadrant Q4	**(Issues of unclearness of information)** **Issue Quadrant I_{43}**	(Non-problematic Situation) Quadrant Q3

Figure 2: The ZP framework – Problems, and Issues as undefined problems (adapted from Khandekar, 2007)

In some situations, information may not be available about what is happening or what is not happening. There are also times when either it is not clear, or there is disagreement, about what should or should not happen. The diagram in Figure 1 needs to be adapted to show how we should treat these unclear or undefined problems. These situations where problems may not be clearly defined may be termed "Issues" (See Figure 2). In the figure, the Issue Quadrants are named Ixy based on contiguous "Problem quadrants Qx and Qy".

An "Issue" exists when a problem cannot be clearly defined, because either the underlying reality i.e. the actual state of a system, or the desired situation, or both are not clearly described. In Figure 2, these quadrants are labelled I_{xy} where x and y denote the "problem quadrants" on each side of that issue. The centre quadrant is named I_{360} because in this kind of situation, the system (individual, relationship, group, organization etc.) has complete freedom or complete uncertainty in choosing an interpretation of the facts in the situation as well as in choosing a goal or what "should" happen.

Most problems in human experience begin as issues. Issues may be sensed and felt long before they become well-defined problems, because issues make people uneasy, even if they cannot put a finger on exactly why they feel it. But sensing an issue does not always mean someone will voice it. In fact, issues hang around for a long time without resolution precisely because they

don't get vocalized. A person may stay in a job for a long time even if the job does not fulfil the person's needs for autonomy and creativity. In relationships, couples hang around without any change because they cannot pinpoint what their problems are. At organizational level, a case like Johnson and Johnson: Hospital Services (Pearson and Hurstak,1992) illustrates very dramatically how the company could not come to a decision for almost fifteen years to change its internal structure because its culture was in conflict with needed strategy change due to changing competitive and industry environment. Managers could not come to a consensus whether J&J should centralize the distribution operations.

If there is ambiguity about facts, issue clarification will require fact-finding and factual clarification. If there is ambiguity on goals / values, it will require values / goal clarification. Both kinds of clarification may be required when there exist highly complex issues involving ambiguity of both information and goals.

Issue clarification helps define the situation either as a non-problematic situation, or as a problematic situation. If it is a problematic situation, clearly defined problems can be solved through individual, dyadic, team or organizational problem-solving processes. If the problem is known, solutions may already exist. If the problem is new, people can engage in a problem-solving process by researching alternatives and then choosing the most optimal solution. Thus, issue clarification is a leadership action in solving problems and attaining goals.

ZP Framework and Individual Level Leadership

Now we can substitute different levels of social systems in the ZP framework. If we consider the "system" to be a person, the problems and issues facing that person revolve round the question "Who am I and who should I be?" The answers to the question "Who am I?" can be defined in terms of "I am" or "I am not" or "Unsure if I am or I am not". The question "Who should I be?" can be answered similarly in terms of "I should be" or "I should not be" or "unsure if I should be or should not be". Some examples of problems and non-problems at the personal level are illustrated in Figure 3.

The first quadrant Q1 indicates no problem for the person because the person should be honest, and the person is honest. Quadrants Q2 shows a problem for this person because the person believes he or she should be hard-working but is not hard-working. In quadrant Q3 the person does not experience any problem because the person is not a thief and believes that he or she should not be a thief. In quadrant Q4 the person experiences a problem because the person is lazy but has been taught to believe that he or she must work hard. Q4 is also a "dual" of Q2 in this example – i.e. the choice of words can place a problem in either Q2 or Q4. These problems and the individual level can be solved by the person himself or herself, or with the help of someone who understands the nature of these problems.

Personal issues shown in the five shaded quadrants often reflect the doubts the person has developed about their actual situation or about the "shoulds" and "should nots". People conduct dialogs in their heads about their personal issues, but those dialogs can be endless without any resolution. People sound out their issues with friends, family and psychologists to get clarity.

Identifying Problems and Issues at Individual Level with the ZP Framework

	I *am* this	I am *unsure* if I am or I am not this	I *am not* this
I *should be*	Honest (NO PROBLEM) $Q1$	Intelligent (Someone may have called the person an "idiot") I_{12}	Hard-working (this implies that the person feels he/she is not what he / she should be, and this is a PROBLEM) $Q2$
I *should or should be* **Unsure if I**	I want to marry this person, but I am unsure if I should or should not. I_{14}	I am not sure if I trust this colleague, and I am not sure I should trust every colleague. I_{360}	I am not happy, but I am not sure if I should or should not stay unhappy. I_{23}
I *should not be*	Lazy (PROBLEM) $Q4$	Coward I_{34}	Thief (NO PROBLEM) $Q3$

Figure 3: Problems and Issues at Individual Level

In psychology, a person is defined as someone who thinks, someone who feels, and someone who acts. Therefore, the words "I am" and "I should be" in Figure 3 may be replaced by "I think (imagine, want)" and "I should think (imagine, want)"; or by "I feel" and "I should feel"; and "I do" and "I should do". These substitutions help us describe the typical psychological problems and issues of individuals – when a person "thinks thoughts that he/she should not think, or does not think what they should"; or when a person "feels what he/she should not feel" or "does not feel what he/she should feel"; or when a person "does what he/she should not do" or "does not do what he/she should do". Often these accusations are thrown at the person by authority figures such as parents, teachers, and later bosses. If these accusations were made during a person's childhood, these may become "psychological issues" that take years of therapy to resolve.

Trait theories assume that an individual is born with the traits that they exhibit. If this were true, leadership development would not occur. Leadership development works because an individual can solve his or her problems and issues at the individual level. The process may be called self-regulation, personal transformation, or personal growth. A person's "personal leadership" is in identifying his / her personal characteristics that are problematic and then changing them to improve his/her effectiveness. For example, leadership training programs may help leaders

identify their "styles" (e.g. what they do) and help them change those styles to something that research shows to be an "effective" style (i.e., what they should do) or allow them to figure out what they should do (this allows the participant to frame his / her own problems). It can be said that these programs implicitly apply the ZP framework to the Personal Level situation of the leader and help them solve their personal problems / issues.

ZP Framework and Group Level Leadership

If we substitute the word "group" for "system", we can examine problems at the group level (see Figure 4). In quadrant Q1, everything is great, and this is the leader's opportunity to celebrate the commitment shown by group members. In quadrant Q3, the absence of sexual harassment is a non-problem. However, the leader would be well advised to emphasize the group's values of safe work environments and set up sexual harassment training for group members so they can avoid it, or recognize if and when it happens.

The problem in quadrant Q2 in Figure 4 (of non-representation of group needs to the next level) shows that the leader in the group is not performing his / her duties. It is the leader's job to represent the group's needs to the next level and secure enough resources. In quadrant Q4, the leader may have to confront group members when they are sarcastic to someone else. If not confronted, the problem can fester and spread and affect the culture of the group towards an undesired place.

Identifying Group Issues and Problems with the ZP Framework			
	What is happening in the group	**Unsure if this is happening or not**	**What is not happening in the group**
What should be happening in the group	Group members always attend meetings. **(No problem)** $Q1$	Group members do not seem prepared for the meetings ahead of time. **(Issue, unclear if this is a problem or not).** I_{12}	Representing the group's needs to the next level of management. **(Problem)** $Q2$
Not sure if this should or should not be happening	Some group members are developing romantic relationships I_{14}	I_{360}	Group members do not have time to socialize outside of work hours. I_{23}
What should note be happening in the group	Group members are sarcastic to each other. **(Problem)** $Q4$	Group members are experiencing discontent. I_{34}	There is no sexual harassment. **(No problem)** $Q3$

F

Issues of romantic relationship and of lack of time for socialization arise out of ambiguity about what the group "should or should not" allow or require. The group will have to develop a consensus about, or upper management will have to clarify (based on legality and ethics), what should or should not be happening in these cases. The issue of "group members not being prepared" arises because the business / task process of the group may not require individual members to bring some product of their individual work. This creates ambiguity about their preparation for group meetings. The leader can fix the business process to generate necessary information about whether individual members prepare for the meetings (perhaps by asking to produce hard copy of individual work results / recommendations). The issue of group members feeling discontent is not as easy to deal with, but the leader may begin by confronting the issue and getting feedback from group members about what is causing dissatisfaction. Depending on the history of the group, the leader may have to devise a process of "anonymous" feedback to allow group members to express their concerns and / or make suggestions for improvement honestly without any chance of retaliation.

ZP Framework and Effective Leader Behaviors

Given the ZP framework examples, we may hypothesize about effective behaviors in each quadrant. These behaviors are represented in Figure 5.

Effective Leadership Behavior in Problematic, Non-problematic, and Issue-ridden Situations			
	What is happening	**Unsure if this is happening or not**	**What is not happening**
What should be happening	(Non-problematic Situation) **Gratitude, Celebration** **Q1**	(Issues of ambiguity of information) I_{12} **Factual Clarification / redesign of business processes**	(Problematic Situation) **Vision Innovation Planning** **Q2**
Not sure if this should or should not be happening	(Issues of ambiguity of values) I_{14} **Values / Goals Clarification / Development of Consensus**	(Issues of ambiguity of values AND ambiguity of information) I_{360} **Values / Goals and Factual Clarification / Bus. Process redesign**	(Issues of ambiguity of values) I_{23} **Values / Goals Clarification / Development of Consensus**
What should note be happening	(Problematic Situation) **Voicing, Confronting, Re-engineering, Opposing, or Rebelling** **Q4**	(Issues of ambiguity of information) I_{34} **Factual Clarification / redesign of business processes for information markers**	(Non-problematic Situation) **Boundary Clarification and Reiteration of Values / Goals** **Q3**

Figure 5: Effective Leadership Behaviors in Problematic, Non-problematic, and Issue-ridden situations.

In non-problematic situations such as Quadrant Q1 (where everything is happening as it should) or Quadrant Q3 (where nothing is happening that should not), the leader can reinforce the on-going, desirable behaviors and processes through expression of Gratitude and Celebration (Q1), or by EXPLICIT Boundary Clarification and Reiteration of Values and Goals (Q3). When there are things going on that should not be happening (Quadrant Q4), the leader must engage in Voicing the problem or Confronting the problem, Re-engineering of task processes, Opposition, or Rebellion depending on whether the leader is in power or without power. A leader in power must voice and confront the problems caused by behavior that should not be happening. When there are things that should be happening but are not happening, the leader can engage in Visionary Leadership by sharing his or her ideas about what they "see" should be happening. Visionary leaders, therefore, CREATE problems first and then lead by discussing ways to solve the problem, first through dialogue and later through action projects.

When people speak about lack of leadership, they often mention the following about managers who are supposed to be the leaders, essentially referring to the absence of effective leader behaviors. These complaints often are: (1) There are never any good words for our good work, never any recognition (i.e. lack of celebration). (2) They give us vague goals (lack of clarity on goals). (3) They never stand up for us, instead they will put us down (lack of confrontation with outsiders). (4) We are never given the whole picture; they never tell us what exactly is going on (lack of information about the situation). (5) The manager has no vision and no imagination (lack of vision or innovation).

Leadership Process

The ideal *leadership process* consists of a leader continually engaged in the following activities (a) sense and recognize the nature of situations as problematic, non-problematic or issue-ridden; (b) sift through problems and issues at different levels of systems, i.e., problems / issues of individuals in the situation, problems with relationships in that situation, problems faced by groups involved in that situation, problems of organizations and community / society; (c) figure out locus of problems, i.e., see if connections exist between various problems at various levels to pinpoint if one problem at one level causes problems at another level; (d) prioritize and reprioritize problems in each situation the leader is part of (physically or psychologically); and (e) respond appropriately, switching between all those behaviors mentioned in Figure 5 to explore issues to clarify them as problematic or non-problematic, keep multiple problem-solving processes at multiple levels of systems with multiple stakeholders in motion towards multiple goals. And the leader must always exercise personal leadership – improving himself or herself as a person and therefore as a leader.

When situations involve multiple stakeholders, their goals may conflict resulting in issues that the leader will face as shown in quadrants I_{14}, I_{360} and I_{23}. These issues exist because it is unclear what "should" happen, because the "shoulds" for various participants may have a built-in conflict. "Group level" or "organizational level" issues become complicated due to such multiplicity of goals.

Quadrant Q2 in the framework provides an interesting idea of "vision as identifying and voicing

problems that others may or may not see or imagine". This redefines a leader's job as first identifying or creating problems, and then solving those problems with people. Problem-solving processes require knowledge and multiple skills on the part of the leader. The leader's technical, interpersonal and conceptual skills (Katz, 1974) in managing tasks and change processes for individuals, relationships, and groups will determine effective achievement of goal or problem resolution.

An ability to do adaptive work (Heifetz, 1994) would be necessary for a Gandhi to transform the values of Hindu society into abandoning the caste system. Gandhi became a leader because he confronted Hindus with their cruelty to their own people, the so-called "untouchables", and challenged them to break down the caste system. He leveraged his knowledge of the Hindu society and its culture of devotion and hailed the "untouchables" as "Harijan" (or God's People). He set an example by living with them. Martin Luther King too confronted the American society with its racial injustice. But neither of these leaders resorted to violence in solving the problem. They used persuasion to create a different perspective on what "should" and "should not" be happening, to develop a new consensus in the society about these values. They solved the problems by sharing a new vision of what should happen (respecting the oppressed and the downtrodden) that was not happening and stopping of exploitation and oppression that should not happen. Thus, we find the ZP framework applicable at societal level as well.

Conclusion

This paper identified three patterns in the literature on leadership. First, all leadership theories address problematic situations. Second, leadership theories address problems at increasingly complex levels of social systems from individual to relationships to groups to organizations and finally societies, i.e., leaders work on problems faced by himself or herself as well as by others. Third, Leadership theories imply that an effective leader identifies, flexibly prioritizes, and accordingly acts on task and emotional problems confronting the system to ensure achievement of goals. Task processes evoke emotional issues in individuals because the task itself as well as other people involved in the task can give feedback to the individual about the individual's competence, likability, and values. These emotional issues trigger off emotional processes in the person as well as in the group. The leader must address both task and emotional problems, and shape the processes ensuing from these problems. This fact is evident in theories of group leadership where the leader addresses task and maintenance problems.

The paper utilizes the Zero[th] P framework to define problematic and non-problematic situations, as well as issues which are undefined problems. These problems may be task problems or emotional (people) problems and may exist at multiple levels of systems. The paper illustrates problems and issues at "individual" and "group" levels.

The paper hypothesizes leader behaviors that will be effective in problematic and non-problematic situations of at various levels of systems. For reasons of manuscript length, this paper does not depict examples of problems / issues and leadership in (1) a relationship as a system consisting of two individuals, (2) an organization as a system, and (3) society as a system.

From a future and empirical research perspective, the first step will require specifying the level of system where effectiveness of leadership behaviors is being investigated. For example, research may be done at the individual level, relationship level, group level, and so on. The second step would require choice of a domain of problems to be investigated. For example, it is possible to investigate how an individual exercises leadership behaviors when dealing with health issues. The domain of problems is then personal health. The third step would be to specify the theory or model of that system that provides us with various dimensions of health, the units that would measure the state of the system on these dimensions that define the domain, and a set of values that describe an ideal state of the system or provide the "shoulds" the individual may use.

It may seem intuitive that if the current state of a person's health on any of these dimensions measures at the ideal level, the person has no problem (Quadrant Q1). The most appropriate behavior for this person would be to give thanks for good health and celebrate it. If a person has no disease, and since a healthy person should not have disease, that individual has no problem (Quadrant Q3). The person will still have to avoid unhealthy, unhygienic, and risky behaviors such as frequently eating junk food, sleeping without brushing teeth, or unprotected and unsafe promiscuous behavior.

However, on the dimension of health maintenance, if a person does not engage in exercise, the person has a Quadrant Q2 problem. The person "should" exercise but "does not" exercise. In this situation, an appropriate behavior would be to envision / innovate how he or she can incorporate exercise in a busy daily routine. Some people begin parking their cars in the furthest spot in a parking lot from the entrance to buildings, taking stairs to office instead of taking the elevator, use a stand-up computer desk so they stand in front of the computer instead of sitting down. Others may join a gym, which may require reconfiguration of one's daily routine and reallocation of money resources for gym membership. On the other hand, individuals can find all kinds of excuses as to why they "cannot" engage in exercise. This would be "ineffective" behavior in "leading" their life.

People who are obese can be said to have a Quadrant Q4 problem. They have a weight to height ratio that is higher than they "should" have. Appropriate and effective behavior in such situation would be for the person to voice / vocalize / confront the problem, and rebel against oneself to engage in weight reduction program. Many people engage in these behaviors, and it will be found that others admire them for taking charge of their life, in other words, for leading their life towards healthy goals. On the other hand, some people crack jokes about their own obesity but never do anything for weight reduction. Others see such individuals as lazy, without any will-power, without leadership quality. These individuals turn the situation in to a joke, to be enjoyed, instead of rebelling against it. The emotional response of these individuals is humour rather than anger against the situation and one's own behavior.

Effectiveness of individual responses to individual level problems can be evaluated by "objective" measures of goal achievement over a period, as well as by "perceptual" measures of how others see the individual "leading" their life. At the individual level, a person may or may not be able to find "objective" facts about himself or herself without honest feedback about oneself. This is where issues and problems of forming authentic relationships come into play.

Thus, issues and problems at one level become connected to the next level of system. If this is the domain of "relationship problems", theories of relationships will be needed to evaluate effectiveness of behavior in forming and growing authentic relationships.

Last but not the least, it must be acknowledged that all the "shoulds" at all levels are derived from pre-existing theories and beliefs. When situations involve issues such as depicted by the I_{360} quadrant, where it is difficult to make sense of current situation or to make sense of exactly what should happen, it may be the birth of new theory for the leader / individuals involved in that situation. In a constantly evolving world, theories too evolve.

References

Andrews, Kenneth R. *The Concept of Corporate Strategy*, Richard D. Irwin, Inc. 3rd Ed., 1987.

Bartlett, Christopher A., and Anthony St. George. "Acer America: Development of the Aspire." Harvard Business School Case 399-011, January 1998. (Revised April 2001.)

Blake R.R. and Mouton J.S. 1964. *The Managerial Grid.* Houston TX: Gulf Publishing.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G.B., and Haga, W., 1975. A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership in formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 13, 46-78.

Drucker, Peter, 1993. *The Practice of Management* Harper Business, pp. 49 – 61.

Fiedler, F.E., 1964. A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) *Advances in Social Psychology*, 1, 149-190.

Fleishman, E.A., Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Levin, K.Y., Korotkin, L.A., & Hein M.B. (1991). Taxonomic efforts in the description of leader behaviour: A synthesis and functional interpretation. *Leadership Quarterly, 2(4), 245-287*

Heifetz, Ronald A. (1994) *Leadership without Easy Answers* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA,

Hayes, J. R. (1989). *The Complete Problem Solver,* 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hemphill J.K. (1950) *Leader Behavior Description* Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University.

Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K.H., (1969). Life-cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal,* 23, 26-34.

Katz, D., N. Maccoby, and N.C. Morse (1950), *Productivity, Supervision, and Morale in an Office Situation*, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center.

Katz, Robert L. (1974) *Skills of an Effective Administrator.* Harvard Business Review.

Khandekar R.P. (2007) Leadership and the Zeroth P, Proceedings of IBS Ahmedabad International Conference on Management (CD-ROM), Ahmedabad, India, Jan 5-7, 2007

Mann, R.D. (1959). A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 241-270.

McCarthy, E. J. (1964). Basic Marketing, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Mintzberg, H. (1987). The strategy concept I: Five Ps for strategy. California management review, 30(1), 11-24.

Northouse, Peter G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and Practice.* (6th Ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp 2-4.

Northouse, Peter G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and Practice.* (8th Ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, p. 102.

Pearson, Andrall E. and Johanna M. Hurstak, Johnson and Johnson: Hospital Services, Harvard

Business Review Press, 1992.

Schutz, W. C. (1958). FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. Oxford, England: Rinehart.

Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature, Journal of Psychology, 25, 35-71.

Stogdill, R.M. (1974). *Handbook of Leadership: A survey of theory and research.* New York: Free Press.

Thompson, G., & Glasø, L. (2015). Situational leadership theory: A test from three perspectives. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 36(5), 527-544. doi:10.1108/LODJ-10-2013-0130

Thompson, G., & Glasø, L. (2018). Situational leadership theory: A test from a leader-follower congruence approach. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 39(5), 574-591. doi:10.1108/LODJ-01-2018-0050

Tortorella, G., & Fogliatto, F. (2017). Implementation of lean manufacturing and situational leadership styles: An empirical study. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 38(7), 946-968. doi:10.1108/LODJ-07-2016-0165

Tuggle, F. Douglas. 1978. *Organizational Processes*. AHM Publications, pp 75-77.