

The Jezebel Spirit: A Case Study in Subversive Leadership

David Mavin

School of Management
Marist College
3399 North Road
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601
USA

&

John Mavin

School of Management
Marist College
3399 North Road
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601
USA

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we examine the Jezebel Spirit, a biblical example of subversive leadership and its implications for leaders of any organization. First, the historical explanation of the Jezebel Spirit is presented. This explanation is then applied to a case study conducted in a small rural protestant church in the Northwest, near the Canadian border. Using an instrument that measures emotional intelligence, the personalities of the pastor and the assistant pastor are compared and the elements of the Jezebel Spirit are revealed. Finally, the paper evaluates a possible example of the Jezebel Spirit in a corporate setting through an examination of the process behind the 1999 ousting of Jon Corzine as leader of Goldman Sachs.

Keywords: Ethics, leadership, management.

Introduction

Throughout history people have marveled at the talents of effective leaders. Stories of Abraham Lincoln leading the country through the Civil War or George Washington motivating his troops through the harsh winter at Valley Forge have inspired leaders for centuries. Only recently have we tried to truly understand what makes a great leader great. Modern social science leadership research only dates back to the early 1930s (Bass, 1990). During that time we have evaluated leadership from many different aspects in an attempt to understand the process.

Leadership Theories

House & Aditya (1997) offered a comprehensive review of leadership research. According to this work, the first foray into leadership theory was referred to as Trait

Theory: the search for individual characteristics that universally differentiated leaders from non leaders. Most of this early research was a theoretical and examined personal characteristics such as gender, height, and appearance, as well as psychological traits such as intelligence, need for achievement and need for power. At the time, these initial investigations provided little empirical evidence of universally accepted leadership traits. However, this limitation was due, in large part, to limited understanding of personality theory and valid measurement instruments (House & Aditya, 1997). This early trait theory provided the foundation for a resurgence of trait-based leadership theories in the early 1980s which do have some empirical support. The next phase of leadership research focused on the behaviors of leaders. Beginning in the mid-1950s, studies in this paradigm were based almost exclusively on observing behaviors of leaders in a laboratory setting or going into the field and asking subordinates to describe the behaviors of supervisors (Schriesheim, House & Keer, 1976).

Like trait theory, all effective leaders were assumed to share universal beliefs. Behavioral research lacked a theoretical base and was largely inductive (House & Aditya, 1997). This research led to the acceptance of two primary constructs of leadership: task oriented-leaders and person-orientated leaders. Measurement limitations also restricted the early success of this research. The final historical paradigm of leadership research was Contingency Theory. Contingency theories such as Fiedler's Contingency Theory (Fiedler, 1967; 1971) and Path Goal Theory (House, 1971; House & Mitchell, 1974) were developed to examine how situational variables affect the traits and behaviors examined in the earlier paradigms. Although these contingencies theories were grounded in empirical studies, they, like the earlier theories, received criticism for inconsistent empirical findings (Schriesheim & Kerr, 1977). Recently, new theories of leadership have appeared such as Leader Member Exchange (LMX) (Graen & UhlBien, 1995). This theory takes a micro perspective and examines individual dyadic relationships between superiors and subordinates. LMX and the other more recently developed theories are attempting to address some of the theoretical and measurement limitation experienced by earlier theories. While LMX and other new theories have improved on the methodology and measurement issues of earlier research, there are still have many limitations.

Leadership Capabilities

Regardless of which leadership theory you may support, most theories agree that emotional intelligence capabilities are an important aspect of leadership. Daniel Goleman defined emotional intelligence as "the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships" (1998, p.317). Chermis and Adlet (2000), in defining emotional intelligence, added "that emotional intelligence is the basis for personal qualities such as realistic self-confidence, personal integrity, knowledge of personal strengths and weaknesses, resilience in times of change or adversity, self-motivation, perseverance, and the knack of getting along well with others" (p.1). In 1998, Goleman added the term emotional competence to the emotional intelligence literature. Emotional competency can

be defined as a capability or ability (Boyatzis, 2008). Emotional intelligence is the foundation for emotional competency, which leads to highly effective workplace performance (Goleman, 1998).

Goleman (1998) suggested four emotional competency areas: self awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management and posited that much of one's success in work and life may be directly related to one's emotional competencies. In the area of self-awareness, the competencies include: emotional self-awareness, self-assessment accuracy, and self-confidence. In the area of social awareness, the competencies include: empathy, organizational awareness, and service to others. In the area of self-management, the competencies include: self –control, transparency, optimism, adaptability, achievement orientation, and initiative. Finally, in the relationship management area, the competencies include: developing others, leadership, influence, communication, change catalyst, conflict management, building bonds with others, and teamwork/collaboration (Webb, 2009; Dearborn, 2002). The most important work of the leader is dealing with people. Failure to successfully work and deal with people will cause poor performance in all other areas of leadership (Cangemi, Burga, Lazarus, Miller, and Fitzgerald, 2008). The importance and role of emotional intelligence in leadership is becoming more evident. For instance, Warren Bennis (1989) suggested that emotional intelligence was much more powerful than IQ in identifying people with strong leadership potential.

Roger Gill (2002) suggested that while managers must be able to plan, organize, and control; leaders, on the other hand, must have emotional intelligence and behavioral skills. Finally, Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) have suggested that the higher a person rises in an organization, the more important that person's emotional intelligence becomes to their success. In the corporate organizational setting, the board members must also have a certain level of emotional intelligence. Dulewicz and Higgs (2003) suggested that boards of directors need high levels of emotional intelligence in order to properly supervise the top management team members. Specifically, the board needs to provide appropriate rewards, sanctions, and training to management as well as communicate to management about their successes and failures. Additionally, the board needs to effectively communicate with all stakeholders (Dulewicz and Higgs, 2003).

Influences on Leadership

In their review article, House and Aditya (1997) acknowledged the value of the early trait and behavioral approach and credited them with developing the foundation for the current, more complex theories. While we know much more about the phenomenon of leadership, there is still much to learn. One of the major limitations of this body of knowledge, House and Aditya recognized, was that it is based almost exclusively on our Western Culture. They suggested expanding this assumption base to develop a more universal understanding leadership. One suggestion for extending leadership research beyond the limits of strict American culture was to examine the role variables such as asceticism, religion or superstition may play in process of leading. While we do not

examine the influence of personal religion on leadership in this paper, we do examine an example of leadership presented in the Bible. For centuries, our primary examples and ideals of great leaders have come from military, political and biblical arenas. We not only learn from the examples of successful leadership but we also learn equally as well from those examples of failure. One example of a threat to effective leadership is the story of Jezebel (1 Kings 21). It is the story of how a dyadic relationship between an overly tolerant leader combined with an excessively ambitious subordinate can lead to the destruction of an organization.

The Story of Jezebel

This account from the Bible took place in approximately 850 B.C. and was about Ahab and his wife Jezebel. It is the story of how one ambitious person, hiding behind the leadership of another, can promote his or her personal agenda through subversion and misdeed. This often occurs at the detriment of the leader and his or her organization. The sixth king of Israel, Omri, desired to enlarge his kingdom by allowing his son Ahab to marry a foreign queen, Jezebel. The marriage would create a political alliance between Israel and Tyre. The arrangement would also require Israel to submit to the religious and political practices of Tyre. This violated the most basic teachings of Israel because Tyre worshipped Baal while Israel followed the commandments of God. Ahab was described as a very tolerant king. When the king of Aram, Ben-hadad, decided to attack Ahab's kingdom, Samaria, he sent couriers to discuss surrender before commencing the attack. The couriers demanded that Ahab surrender his silver and gold, wives and promising sons. Without hesitation, Ahab complied. Ben-hadad then sent word that he would also send his servants to ransack Ahab's house and the houses of his servants. Ben-Hadad's servants would be instructed to take away whatever they considered to be valuable. Following his elder's advice, Ahab refuses to comply with the new demands.

When the couriers reported back to Ben-Hadad, the king ordered his army to prepare to attack. Although seriously outnumbered, Ahab defeats Ben-Hadad's army because God's favor was upon him, as foretold by the prophet. The prophet also proclaimed that Ahab was to totally destroy both Ben-Hadad and his kingdom. In keeping with his tolerant nature, Ahab sets Ben-Hadad free. Jezebel, on the other hand, was described as very intolerant: she would do anything to get her way. She will use treachery, murder, and seduction to achieve her goals. For instance, Jezebel has no problem murdering God's prophets or using another person's authority to manipulate subordinates into doing her bidding. She wanted to dominate and control the kingdom. One story that illustrated Jezebel's treachery concerns a landowner by the name of Naboth. Ahab, Jezebel's husband, decided that he wanted some land adjacent to his palace. He approached the owner, Naboth, and offered to purchase the land or swap it for other property. However, Naboth declined the offer because the land had been in his family for many generations. The encounter left Ahab depressed and unable to eat.

However, Ahab took no further action to acquire the vineyard. When Jezebel discovered the cause of Ahab despondency, she criticized him for his weakness. Then she

assured him that she would take care of the problem and obtain the land. Using her husband's name and royal seal, she wrote letters to the elders and nobles living in Naboth's city. She told them to proclaim a fast and set Naboth at the head of the people. Then she ordered them to have two scoundrels make false accusations against Naboth saying that he had cursed God and king. Next, she commanded that Naboth be taken out of the city and stoned to death. The elders and nobles did just as Jezebel commanded. Naboth was taken outside of the city and stoned to death. After hearing of Naboth's demise, Jezebel told Ahab to take possession of the land. When Ahab went to take possession of the vineyard, Elijah, speaking on behalf of God, accused Ahab of murdering Naboth and seizing his land. Elijah informs Ahab that death and destruction are about to befall both him and Jezebel, along with his descendants. Even though Jezebel initiated the actions that led to Naboth's death, God was holding Ahab responsible because he was king (and leader) of Israel.

While this biblical story occurred almost 3,000 years ago, we believe that this type of relationship exists in many organizations today and presents a serious threat to leaders and ultimately their organizations. We identified Jezebel's actions as an example of subversive leadership. Jezebel was willing to stoop to treacherous manipulation to achieve her goals. She thought nothing of destroying others to get her slightest demand satisfied. She also was willing to risk her husband's leadership position to get her way. A modern day example of subversive leadership occurred in a small protestant church in the rural northwestern part of the United States. The following are the events that occurred as a result of the intervention of a management consultant.

The Subversive Leader

Overview

The senior pastor had just returned from a three-month continuing education leave. He had left his associate pastor in charge and expected little, if any, change to occur during his absence. But he was wrong. Upon his return, there were significant changes underway and the effects would linger for years. If the senior pastor could have anticipated these changes he would never have left in the first place. What he found on his return was his entire church staff with very low morale and feeling very discontented. One employee told him that work had become very negative under the associate pastor's leadership but far worse than the staff's morale was the attitude of the church members. The senior pastor began to sense that he had lost his church or at least a significant part of it. In particular, a group of older, wealthy members had suddenly turned against the senior pastor and were ready to throw their support behind the associate pastor. The senior pastor was totally shocked and bewildered.

Unfortunately, he had no idea of how to handle the situation. A management consultant was contacted and asked to evaluate the situation and make recommendations. Before meeting with anyone personally, the consultant ran emotional intelligence profiles on both the senior pastor and the associate pastor. When he obtained the results, he knew exactly where the problem lay and what needed to be done. The Simmon's Personal

Survey is an emotional intelligence profiling tool. Developed in 1974, it is widely known as an accurate measurement of a person's emotional intelligence. Through the use of an adjective checklist, the person being profiled describes him or herself. A report is created that allows the person to understand their emotional intelligence in the areas of energy, stress, optimism, self-esteem, work ethic, attention to detail, desire for change, courage, direction, assertiveness, tolerance, consideration, and sociability. When two people's emotional intelligence profiles are compared, areas of compatibility or incompatibility are easily identified.

Likewise, emotional intelligence flaws, or destructive behavioral tendencies are also easily discussed. This allows the person to become aware of and, if desired, address the negative behavioral tendencies. Before making his recommendations, the consultant met with the four member executive committee and discussed their observations of the situation. Until that meeting, the members of the committee had never shared their observations and feelings regarding either pastor. After listening to the executive committee, the consultant recommended that the associate pastor be terminated immediately. Without hesitation, the executive committee agreed unanimously. While this brief overview of the situation seems simple and easily handled, the ramifications of the eighteen months the associated pastor spent in this church would be long-term. To fully understand what had taken place within the church over that time, a more detailed account is necessary. Included in this account, we offer an examination of the elements of the Jezebel Spirit present in the associate pastor and the elements of Ahab found in the senior pastor.

Elements of the Jezebel Spirit

The senior pastor had been in place for ten years. He had been successful at growing the congregation. When he arrived, there were only 100 members in the 92-year-old church. Under his leadership, the congregation had grown to five hundred members. What makes this growth more impressive is that the town's population is only four thousand. Due to the growth of the congregation, it became evident that the senior pastor needed help to properly care for its members. The board searched for and hired an associate pastor. At first, the associate pastor seemed to be the right person for the job. He and the senior pastor began to split the pastoral duties between them. The senior pastor continued in the leadership role while the associate pastor assumed more of the shepherding duties, which included leading small Bible study groups. This arrangement allowed the associate pastor to develop personal relationships with the church members, and it was these relationships that the associate pastor used to begin to undermine the senior pastor and his leadership of the church. Upon returning from his sabbatical and realizing that he was about to lose his church, the senior pastor called in a consultant to assist him. The consultant listened to the senior pastor's concerns and immediately created an emotional intelligence profile of the senior pastor and the associate pastor.

The senior pastor's profile depicted a very hard working individual, and his profile also showed strong leadership qualities. He was a courageous individual willing to

take the necessary and appropriate risks needed to effectively run the church. He had a strong sense of direction and goals that enabled him to be a visionary leader. He also had a creative tendency and a desire to initiate new projects aimed at developing and improving the organization. Although he was not considered a forceful, controlling, or pushy leader, he was able to speak his mind when needed. He could be sociable when necessary but among new people, he could be private and distant. His profile also showed someone under great stress and his energy level was rapidly becoming depleted. Worst of all, his sense of self-worth was eroding to the point of him labeling himself as a victim. This, of course, was starting to affect his leadership role within the church. The associate pastor's profile was in sharp contrast with the senior pastor. The first contrast was his work ethic, which was very low. The associate pastor was also very cynical, pessimistic, critical, and fault finding of other people. He enjoyed initiating new projects but rarely had the persistence and fortitude to stay at them until completion. He was very assertive and outgoing, enabling him to engage in conversation with the church members and could persuade them to his way of thinking. Unfortunately, he was not very considerate of the needs of others. To him, his needs came first and foremost.

Finally, the associate pastor had very high self-esteem, to the point of being prideful and defensive. The behavior observed by other church members was that regardless of what happened, the associate pastor was never at fault. Fault always lay on someone else. The sources of conflict depicted in the emotional intelligence profiles centered around optimism, self-esteem, work ethic, attention to detail, direction, and sociability. The senior pastor was moderately optimistic, positive, and encouraging. He had low self-esteem and was self-critical. His work ethic was very strong and he had a tendency to be careful, accurate, and precise in his work. He had a strong sense of direction, could make decisions easily, and could set meaningful goals. Finally, although he could be sociable, he felt somewhat uneasy around new people. The associate pastor was highly pessimistic, critical, and faultfinding. His high self-esteem caused him to feel superior to others and become prideful and defensive. He had a very low work ethic with no desire to accomplish anything of substance. He paid little attention to detail and was careless and disorganized. He was indecisive and he did not have meaningful goals. Finally, his strongest trait was his sociability. He was very talkative and loved to communicate with others.

When the consultant realized that the emotional intelligence profiles of the two pastors were in complete conflict, he knew what his recommendation would be. He recommended that the associate pastor be terminated immediately. When this recommendation was first presented to the governing board, they were shocked. At first, they resisted the thought of terminating anyone. They had hired the associate pastor and were not about to admit that they had made a mistake. Further, they were unaware of any problems between the senior pastor and the associate pastor. Even in a town of four thousand, some things can remain covert. After hours of dialogue, the board finally began to identify what was revealed in the emotional intelligence profiles. It started with one small comment about how the work ethic of the senior pastor was very strong and almost

non-existent in the associate pastor. One of the board members claimed that just one week before, his wife had made the exact same observation. As the board began recounting their observations of the associate pastor's behavior, they identified all of the emotional intelligence profile traits. Little did they realize just how bad the situation really was for them and the entire congregation. Once the board began to investigate the actions of the associate pastor, they became more and more convinced that he had to be terminated. They discovered that the associate pastor was gaining special favor with the older, wealthier church members. Using his gift of gab, he easily struck up conversations with people who enjoyed socializing.

He developed these relationships by meeting the member's needs for fellowship. He was also turning these key members against the senior pastor. Over time, these key members began to voice concerns about the senior pastor and the leadership of the church. The associate pastor was not about to directly challenge the church leadership. Instead, he let the members do it for him. It became evident that the associate pastor was seeking to take control of the church and oust the senior pastor. Only after learning that the associate pastor was influencing the church members did his motives become known. He was starting rumors designed to destroy the senior pastor's reputation and personal life. Intimating that the senior pastor was having an affair would have easily destroyed him. Likewise, suggesting that the senior pastor was overworked meant that the associate pastor deserved more responsibility. The associate pastor was also attempting to turn the church against the senior pastor's wife and family. The board discovered that certain church members had publicly shunned the senior pastor's wife, causing her grave concern and embarrassment. When the senior pastor went on a three month sabbatical, the associate pastor's efforts went into high gear that almost culminated in the destruction of the entire church. Without anyone to notice his activities, he felt totally free to do as he pleased.

However, his lack of true leadership skills was quickly causing major problems. In addition to attempting to create new problems directly related to the senior pastor, the associate pastor was dredging up wounds from twenty to thirty years ago. Hurtful feeling, long buried, were becoming new sources of discord among the church members. In an atmosphere of disharmony, people felt compelled to voice their concerns regardless of how long ago the events occurred. A background check into the associate pastor's job history was ordered and the truth was beginning to emerge. The background check revealed that in the four years prior to being hired by the board, he had been at four different churches. Although he gave an excuse for leaving each of the churches, the board now realized that the reasons for leaving were hardly valid and definitely lacking credibility. He survived at his latest assignment for eighteen months, something of a tenure record for the associate pastor. It was easy to identify how the church's leadership failed during this situation. First, the board failed to conduct a background check on the associate pastor. If they had conducted a background check, they probably would have never initially hired this individual. However, once that error was committed, they further failed to properly supervise and effectively deal with the problems as they arose. They

also failed to monitor and check the pulse of the members. Surveying and listening to their members might have alerted them much earlier before the problem grew. It was this tolerant, permissive, head-in-the-sand leadership that allowed the Jezebel spirit to grow.

The senior pastor also shares in this culpability. He failed to properly supervise his associate pastor. He also failed to monitor what was going on. His very strong work ethic allowed him to get so caught up in his own activities that he failed to see the true activity of his subordinate. If he had done more supervision and fewer tasks, he possibly would have uncovered the plot to overthrow him. By becoming so focused on his own activities instead of monitoring his subordinate's activities, the senior pastor almost lost everything. Throughout the associate pastor's eighteen-month tenure, no one realized his true intentions. Just like the Jezebel depicted in the Bible, he wanted to take control of the organization. He was willing to use any means possible to achieve his goal. First, he would develop strong ties with influential members. Second, he would take control of small groups within the organization. Third, he would weaken the leadership by starting rumors or pointing out areas of weakness. This would not be done directly to the leadership but, rather, to the organization's members. The associate pastor's methods were very much like that of a virus that attacks the human body. Upon his hiring, he was introduced to the organization. Then he began to slowly infect the members in small groups. Eventually, he infected the larger, more influential members of the organization. Since no remedy was forthcoming, soon the entire organization was sick and ready for emergency treatment. The associate pastor's attacks were very subtle.

When he approached the church members, he did not directly attack the senior pastor or the board. Instead, he would use concern for the senior pastor or the congregation to begin his influence toward his own motives. For instance, he told members that the senior pastor was overworked and needed to delegate more responsibility to him. The members, in turn, would take up the cause, seemingly to relieve the senior pastor's burden, and suggest that the senior pastor delegate more. In another instance, the associate pastor told church members how the senior pastor and his female assistant were working late at the church. Again, he couched it as concern for the pastor's well being. Unfortunately, he was also fueling the idea that maybe something romantic was going on between the senior pastor and his assistant. The associate pastor never attacked the leadership directly. He used subtle attacks through the church members to destroy the senior pastor's power and authority. The attacks took the form of suggestions that could have easily passed for positive concern for the senior pastor and the church members. To the unsuspecting person, these comments expressed true concern.

To those with worldly views, these same comments carried very destructive undertones. Spreading comments about two people working "late at the office" would send negative-minded folks into gossip frenzy. Once the board took stock of the crisis they were facing, a plan was enacted to properly terminate the associate pastor. First, the associate pastor was summoned to the church office. Two members of the board informed him that his services were no longer required. The board members selected for

this task were of strong character and countenance. Their task was to make sure the message was heard and understood by the associate pastor. Immediately following this meeting, two church counselors met with the associate pastor to offer counseling on his new circumstances. The board wanted to give the associate pastor an opportunity to be heard if he wanted to say anything regarding the termination. Next the associate pastor was given a reasonable severance. Although it was under no obligation to do so, the board wanted to financially help the associate pastor during this transition. A letter was sent to every church member informing them of the board's decision. The message was straightforward without placing blame.

However, because a number of the church members were already involved, the board wanted to be open about its decisions and actions regarding the termination. The board members who handled the termination reported that the actual interview went very well. The associate pastor handled the news calmly and without any show of emotion. In fact, the board members were somewhat surprised at how easy the termination seemed to go. While the termination occurred without incident, the associate pastor's response actually started when he returned home. He began telephoning the older, wealthier, and influential church members that had become his unofficial supporters. He also contacted the people to whom he had conducted regular in-home Bible study. These were the members who had developed close relationships with him. When pressed to choose between the senior pastor and the associate pastor, these members rallied behind the associate pastor. Many of these members called the church board to complain about the termination. The board received emails for months after the termination saying that they had fired the "wrong person." Initially the church lost about 100 members, 20% of their membership, and donations went down significantly after their departure. Some of these departing members continued to harass the senior pastor for six months before they finally left.

However, the result of the board's actions was that the atmosphere within the church became positive again. The members became happy about the church leadership again and donations became better than before the termination.

Subversive Leadership on Wall Street

The idea of subversive activity within a business organization is not a new concept. History is full of presidents and CEO who were ousted by disgruntled stockholders or boards of directors. What also was prevalent yet not so obvious are those top leaders who lose their position to supposedly loyal, trusted second in commands: power hungry subordinates who seem to embody support for the leader yet undermine their vision and authority at every turn. One such example was the resignation of Jon Corzine from Goldman Sachs in early 1999. While it is impossible to truly know or understand the motives of Henry Paulson, it is no less true that Paulson used his power and influence, along with two other members of Goldman's executive committee, to force Corzine's resignation (Spiro, Silverman & Reed, 1999). Jon Corzine began his career at Goldman Sachs in 1975. By 1994, he had risen to take over the top position as

chief executive. His promotion to this position was seen by some as a less than optimal choice (Raghavan & Zuckerman, 1999). Corzine was a trader, not an investment banker like the rest of the executive committee, and his performance managing the trading arm of Goldman was not the most stellar. By many accounts, Corzine had done a wonderful job leading Goldman through some of the difficult times in the mid and late 1990s (Spiro et al., 1999)).

However during the last year of his tenure, the differences between the trader and the bankers began to explode. Corzine began to push the idea of taking Goldman public. This idea was opposed by several of the executive board, including Paulson. At this time the executive committee consisted of six people: Corzine's plan supporters Vice-Chairman Roy Zuckerberg and Vice-Chairman Robert Hurst; and his detractors: Paulson, investment banker John Thornton, and John Thain, CFO. The three-three tie was broken when in a trade off, Paulson agreed to support the IPO in exchange for being promoted to equal status with Corzine as co-chief executive. The deal was struck and Corzine announced in June of 1998 that the firm would go public (Spiro et al., 1999). This announcement was rescinded in September after Goldman lost an estimated \$500 million to \$1 billion when the market cratered during the summer. During the next several months two events weakened Corzine's position. First, Roy Zuckerberg retired, leaving the executive committee with five voting members instead of six. Second, Goldman was hit with huge trading losses during August and September. With this change, Paulson, Thornton, and Thain saw an opportunity to advance their position. In January 1999, the three senior bankers forced Corzine to resign (Raghavan & McGeehan, 1999).

Although many may have supported the removal of Corzine as top executive at Goldman Sachs, it was not his actual removal but the process used to force his resignation that is the focus of this paper. Regardless of the outcome, the subversive nature of the executive committee members seems to be a viable example of the Jezebel spirit in corporate America. We do not have the luxury to know the personality details of any of the principle players in this scenario but the roles each played seems fairly obvious. Should the same decision have been made? Quite possibly. Should the process have been handled differently? We believe so.

Conclusion

In our world today, few individuals trust the decisions being made in large companies. The stock market is suffering, as is our economy in general, because investors lack confidence in those organizations and the men and women who lead them. With disasters like AIG and Lehman Brothers fresh in our memory, we are turning to our leaders to create more ethical and moral organizations. Asking corporate executives to have integrity and run their organizations with the same moral fiber is a tall order. However it becomes even more difficult when faced with the possibility of not only external threats but internal threats as well. By exploring the idea of the Jezebel spirit, we hope to bring to light one more facet of leadership phenomenon. Recognizing this most interesting relationship between a leader and his or her subordinate or group of

subordinates will enable executives and scholars to recognize and hopefully study the process. It will, we hope, offer one additional insight into the very complex process of leadership.

References

- Bass, B.M. 1990. Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, research and managerial application. (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bennis, W. (1989). On Becoming a Leader. London: Hutchinson.
- Boyatzis, R. (2008). Competencies in the 21st century. Journal of Management Development. 27(1); pp. 5-12.
- Cherniss, G. And Adlet, M (2000). Promoting Emotional Intelligence in Organizations: Making Training in Emotional Intelligence Effective. ASTD Press, Alexandria, VA.
- Cangemi, J., Burga, B., Lazarus, H., Miller, R., Fitzgerald, J. (2008). The real work of the leader: A focus on the human side of the equation. Journal of Management Development. 27(10), pp. 1026-1036.
- Dearborn, K. (2002). Studies in emotional intelligence redefine our approach to leadership development. Public Personnel Management. 31(4), pp. 523-530.
- Dulewicz, V. and Higgs, M. (2003). Leadership at the top: The need for emotional intelligence in organizations. 11(3); pp. 193-210.
- Fiedler, F.E. 1967. A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fiedler, F.E. 1971. Validation and extension of the contingency model of leadership effectiveness: A review of empirical findings. Psychological Bulletin, 76: 128-148.
- Gill, R. (2002). Is Britain being led astray? In Simms, J. (Ed.), The Director, January.
- Goleman, D. (1998). Working with Emotional Intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., and McKee, A. (2002). Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence. Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA.
- House, R.J. 1971. A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16: 321-338.
- House, R.J. and Aditya, R.N. 1997. The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? Journal of Management, 23 (3): 409-473.
- House, R.J. and Mitchell, T.R. 1974. Path-goal theory of leadership. Journal of Contemporary Business, 3: 81-97.

- Jackson, J.P., 2002. Unmasking the Jezebel Spirit. Streams Publications: North Sutton, NH
- Raghavan, A. and McGeehan, P. 1999. Corzine resigns as CO-CEO at Goldman Sachs. The Wall Street Journal, January 12, 1999, p. C1.
- Raghavan, A. and Zucherman, G. 1999. How discord led to Goldman's shakeup. The Wall Street Journal, January 22, p. C1.
- Schriesheim, C., House, R.J., and Kerr, S. 1976. Leader initiating structure: A reconciliation of discrepant research results and some empirical tests. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15 (2): 297-321.
- Schriesheim, C. and Kerr, S. 1977. Theories and measures of leadership: A critical appraisal of present and future directions, pp. 9-44. In J.C. Hunt and L.L. Larson (eds.) *Leadership: The cutting edge*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Spiro, L.N., Silverman, G., & Reed, S. 1999. The Coup at Goldman. *Business Week*, January 25, pp. 84-90. The New American Bible, 1979. 1 Kings 21. Thomas Nelson Publishers: Nashville, TN.
- Webb, K. (2009). Why emotional intelligence should matter to management: A survey of the literature. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*. 74(2), pp. 32-42.