

4-5-2001

# A Case Study of Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton's Leadership

Jim L. Kline  
*Augsburg College*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://idun.augsburg.edu/etd>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Kline, Jim L., "A Case Study of Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton's Leadership" (2001). *Theses and Graduate Projects*. 551.  
<https://idun.augsburg.edu/etd/551>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Idun. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Graduate Projects by an authorized administrator of Idun. For more information, please contact [bloomber@augburg.edu](mailto:bloomber@augburg.edu).

A Case Study of Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton's Leadership

Jim L. Kline

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirement for the degree of  
Master of Arts in Leadership

AUGSBURG COLLEGE  
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

2001

## **ABSTRACT**

A Case Study of Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton's Leadership

Jim L. Kline

April 5, 2001

Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton was an Antarctica explorer who was not a well known person in the United States until the past two or three years. The reason for his recent rise back into prominence is because of the leadership example he displayed while leading the famous Endurance expedition from 1914 to 1916. The expedition did not achieve its objective of being the first to walk across Antarctica. The interest in Shackleton by students of management and leadership is because he rescued and led this expedition for almost two years, while they lived on the ice and a small island, with no contact to the outside world. The fact that there was no loss of life makes this an amazing story. This story and the man are at the center of this paper because it is felt that much can be learned about leadership, which can apply to leaders today.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

ABSTRACT	2
INTRODUCTION	4
SECTION I: Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton	6
SECTION I: The Endurance Expedition	7
SECTION II: James MacGregor Burns	12
SECTION II: Burns' Leadership Theory	12
SECTION III: Linking Shackleton & Burns	14
Conclusion	25
References	27

## A Case Study of Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton's Leadership

### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this case study is to determine what type of leader Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton was during his expedition to the Antarctica from 1914 to 1916. Another way to state the purpose is by asking two questions: How did he keep twenty seven men alive for twenty two months during the winter in Antarctica? What type of leadership did he use to accomplish this heroic task? To answer these questions, James MacGregor Burns' theory of leadership and his two types of leaders (transactional & transforming) will be used to indicate what type of leader Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton was during this famous expedition. This will be done by analyzing his behavior and methods, then comparing them to James MacGregor Burns' theory. It is intended that this analysis can act as an example to be emulated by those leaders and managers who wish to improve their leadership skills. For the remainder of this paper, Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton will be referred to as Shackleton, James MacGregor Burns as Burns, and the 1914-1916 expedition as the Endurance expedition.

The inspiration for comparing Shackletons' behavior and methods to Burns' theory came from a newspaper article in the Minneapolis Star Tribune. The author wrote, "He has been called "the greatest leader that ever came on God's Earth, bar none," even though he never led more than a small crew and is better known for failures than achievements" (Capparell, 2000, p. 9B). This quote was the cause for further reading and mental comparison to Burns' theory. Burns was a World War II combat historian and has written many books about famous

leaders, such as Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy, who lead in times of crisis. His background and life experience provided the framework and data for his theory. Burns' studies of leaders who led during crisis creates a link to Shackleton's behaviors and accomplishments during the crisis of the Endurance expedition. Further inspiration came from the books titled, Leading At The Edge, by Dennis N. T. Perkins and The Endurance by Caroline Alexander. It is information from these two authors and other research that link together Shackleton and Burns.

This paper will contain three sections followed by a conclusion. The first section will discuss Shackleton as a person and some of the background that may have helped him develop his leadership type. The Endurance expedition will also be discussed in this section. Section two will discuss Burns as a teacher and writer, and his theory of leadership. Section three will explain how Shackleton's behavior and Burns' theory apply in today's world. Also, in section three, a brief analysis of Shackleton's leadership and Burns' theory will be made in relation to Robert K. Greenleaf's servant-leadership theory and Margaret J. Wheatley's new science leadership theory. The conclusion will provide a summary of key points and essential elements along with personal views and examples of how Shackleton's leadership and Burns' theory may apply to a manufacturing environment.

## SECTION I

### SIR ERNEST HENRY SHACKLETON

Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton was born in 1874 in County Kildare, Ireland, the oldest son of a Quaker doctor. His family moved from Dublin to London when he was very young, and this is where he spent his childhood. Shackleton attended Dulwich College in London, England for three years, and then at the age of sixteen he went to sea as a merchant marine for the next eleven years (Encarta Encyclopedia [EE], 2000). It is felt that the essence of his character can be found in the values transmitted by his family, and not what he learned at sea. The family motto was the Latin phrase *Fortitudine Vincimus* (by endurance we conquer). Shackleton used this motto as his rallying cry during the Endurance expedition, which put the motto to a real test (Perkins, 2000, p. 3).

After serving the eleven years in the British Merchant Navy as a third officer with a prestigious merchant service line, he volunteered for the National Antarctic Expedition. This expedition was led by the British naval officer Robert Falcon Scott. The purpose was to reach the south pole, which did not happen. Scott, Edward Wilson and Shackleton reached latitude 88°23' south, in 1902 the farthest south anyone had been (EE, 2000, p. 2).

Upon return from this expedition in 1904, he married Emily Dorman, the daughter of a well-to-do lawyer. Since polar explorations appealed to both his poetic nature and his romantic ambitions, and now with a wife, he obviously needed to make a name for himself and secure his future. According to Alexander (1999), he was a handsome, charming man who ventured into

journalism, business and politics, which all ended in failure (Alexander, 1999, p. 6-7).

## SECTION I

### THE ENDURANCE EXPEDITION

Early in 1907 Shackleton received the seed money he needed for a new expedition to the South Pole. Shackleton and three companions pioneered a route through the Transantarctic Mountains to the pole plateau by way of the Beardmore Glacier. On January 9, 1909 they had reached latitude 88°23' south, 111 miles from the South Pole. This was the farthest southern latitude reached, and for this Shackleton was knighted in 1909 by the British monarch Edward VII (EE, 2000, p. 2).

The South Pole was finally reached in 1911 by a Norwegian explorer Roald Amundsen, and five weeks later by Scott, whose entire party died on the return trip. Because someone else had reached the South Pole, Shackleton now turned his attention to crossing the Antarctica (EE, 2000, p. 2), something no one had done up to this time. This would be a way for him to establish a name for himself, and improve his financial situation. Shackleton's purpose for the expedition was clear, commanding, and visionary. In the expedition's prospectus he writes the following (Alexander, 1999, p. 9):

From the sentimental point of view, it is the last great Polar journey that can be made. It will be a greater journey than the journey to the Pole and I feel it is up to the British nation to accomplish this, for we have been beaten at the conquest of the North Pole and beaten at the conquest of the South Pole.



There now remains the largest and most striking of all journeys—  
the crossing of the Continent.

Shackleton clearly had an idea of what he wanted to do and why he wanted to it.

The next step was to develop a plan and then execute it.

In August of 1914, the British Imperial Trans-Antarctic Expedition sailed from England with the goal of crossing Antarctica from the Weddell Sea to the Ross Sea by way of the South Pole. The Aurora, another ship, also left England with the mission of landing on the opposite side of the continent from Shackleton and depositing supplies at various depots along the way for Shackleton's party (Marchetti, 2000, p.1). The crew of the Aurora or the Ross Sea party became known as Shackleton's Forgotten Men, which is the title of a book written by Lennard Bickel. In the forward of this book, the Rt. Hon. Lord Shackleton, Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton's son, writes a very good, brief description of what happened to the Ross Sea party. He writes,

After the Ross Sea party, under the Captain Aeneas Mackintosh, had landed, their ship the Aurora was torn from her moorings, leaving the expedition literally marooned without any of the essential supplies and equipment for their southern journeys. Using Scott's old bases at Cape Evans and Hut Point, they scrounged enough supplies to prepare for their arduous depot-laying journeys, imperfect and inadequate though the equipment was (Brickel, 2000, p. viii).

Three members of the party died during this expedition, and it took two years before the survivors were rescued.

The *Endurance*, with its crew, and Shackleton's party did not fare much better. In January 1915, before reaching the Antarctica, it became trapped in the Weddell Sea in pack ice. It remained stuck in drifting ice for ten months before it was crushed and sank. Shackleton's party of twenty-seven men and sled dogs abandoned the ship before it sank. For the next six months they lived on floating ice, drifting north. In three small boats taken from the *Endurance* they headed for South Shetland Islands. Seven days later they reached the uninhabited Elephant Island.

Shackleton and five members of the party took one of the small boats and sailed for the whaling station on the island of South Georgia, eight hundred miles across the open South Atlantic Ocean. It took them sixteen days to reach the island, only to find themselves on the opposite side of the whaling station. Shackleton and two others then hiked for thirty-six straight hours before reaching the whaling station. There are two very important points about this last part of the journey. First, sailing in a twenty-three foot boat from Elephant Island to South Georgia, was one of the greatest feats of navigation history. Second, the thirty-six mile hike across the island of South Georgia island was the first time anyone had crossed the mountainous interior of the island.

It took Shackleton another four months to rescue his men. He finally returned to Elephant Island on August 30, 1916 in a tugboat lent to him by the government of Chile. Frank Wild, Shackleton's second-in-command was left in charge while he went for help, and did an excellent job of taking care of the men. This was

truly the amazing feat of the expedition, no member of the Endurance expedition lost his life (EE, 2000, p. 2-3).

In 1921, "The Boss", as Shackleton was referred to by his men, died of a heart attack aboard another ship while leading another expedition to Antarctica. He is buried in the whalers' cemetery at Grytviken, South Georgia.

In order to try to establish the character and type of person Shackleton was it is helpful to look at what others have said or written about him. According to Encarta Encyclopedia (2000) Shackleton was, "A tireless worker with a charming, forceful personality, he inspired fierce loyalty and admiration from his men, who called him "The Boss" (EE, 2000, p. 3). Michael Kimmelman (1999) wrote, "Shackleton must have been an amazing, charismatic man. Like a character out of Robert Louis Stevenson or H. G. Wells, he was a dreamer, a chaser of quick fortune, a determined optimist, unbelievably steady and indomitable in adversity, an instinctual judge of men, whose total loyalty to him was based on the fact that he stopped at nothing to save them when the going got bad" (p.1-2). In his book review of Leading at the Edge Fred Andrews (2000) writes,

Dr. Perkins offers us Ernest Shackleton as the model leader, a captain obsessed with the welfare of his men. Cautious or daring as circumstances required, Shackleton was a rock. An inventive and insistent cheerleader, he refused to let the enfeebled company give up. He insisted on maintaining equity and mutual respect, and he saved the most onerous tasks for himself (p. 2).

Further insight into Shackleton the man is offered by Capparell (2000) when she writes, "Shackleton's brilliant strategy kept his crew hopeful and focused on

survival for more than a year and a half. It's no wonder that various leaders today look to Shackleton for ideas on how to hire, how to get a diverse group to pull together, how to inspire unity and loyalty, how to get above-average performance from workers and how to become adaptable enough to handle any situation" (p. 9B). She goes on to write that, Shackleton's optimism was never foolhardy. It was borne of his confidence in his own abilities and those of the men he picked and trained" (p. 9B). One more quote from Capparell's (2000) article helps us to understand Shackleton even more when she writes, "Shackleton always looked ahead and kept his eyes on the big picture. He was quick to abandon a strategy that wasn't working and replace it with a better one" (p. 9B).

In summary Perkins (2000) describes Shackleton plainly when he writes, "Particularly under conditions of stress and discouragement, visible leadership can mean the difference between success and failure. Shackleton understood this well. He knew just how important it was for the crew to see him as leader—and to outline the work to be accomplished with unmistakable clarity" (p. 29-30). Based on these comments it is clear that Shackleton was a leader. Now it is appropriate to investigate what type of leader he was and to see how others can learn leadership from Shackleton. In the pursuit of this it is useful to compare his behavior and methods to James MacGregory Burns' leadership theory.

## SECTION II

### JAMES MACGREGOR BURNS

First, in order to better understand and add credibility to James MacGregor Burns' theory, it is important to know of his background, therefore, a brief biographical sketch of him follows: He is a professor of political science, writer (winner of the Pulitzer prize), and historian. In addition to his Ph.D. from Harvard he has experience as a congressional assistant and a U.S Army historian during WW II (Peacock, 1999, p. 87). His study and interest of leadership studies began mid-career after completing his books about Franklin Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy and Ted Kennedy. In 1978, he published the book Leadership, which is still one of the most influential books in the field of leadership studies today (Sorenson, 2000, p. 3). It is from this book the two types of leaders, transactional and transforming, come from, which is at the core of his theory.

## SECTION II

### Burn's Leadership Theory

The general principle of Burns' leadership theory is based on two dimensions of leadership; leadership is relational and the motivation of the leaders and followers are key to understanding leadership and change (Sorenson, 2000, p. 6). In other words, it is based on the relationship of leaders and their followers. To further illustrate and aid in understanding of his theory he defines leadership in the following words, "Leadership over human beings is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to

arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers” (Burns, 1978, p. 18). Burns clearly states that leaders have an obligation to their followers—to help them grow to their fullest potential as future leaders.

Using this definition he writes that there are two types of leaders. The essential elements of the two types differ greatly. According to Burns (1978), “The relations of most leaders and followers are transactional—leaders approach followers with an eye to exchange one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions” (p.4). Transactional leadership puts a heavy emphasis on a reward system for compliance. Performance goals are spelled out clearly (so the follower understands what it takes to receive the reward). Finally, dissent in this type of style isn’t tolerated. According to Kouzes and Posner (1997), “The transactional leader closely resembles the traditional definition of the manager” (p. 321). In explaining transforming leadership Burns (1978) writes, “Transforming leadership, while more complex, is more potent. The transforming recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower” (p. 4). He goes on to explain the result of this type which, “is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents” (Burns, 1978, p. 4).

Illustrations of some practical examples of these types are as follows. First, transactional may equal the military environment (promotion for clearly defined expectations), politics ( a vote for a road), a sales organization (money for obtaining order) or an expedition (be a member of the team or perish). Second, a transforming example is one where the leader creates a positive change by

creating a new organizational culture resulting in benefit to all members of the organization. These benefits may be ongoing educational programs, products or services for all of society, or in the case of an expedition, something good for all members of the party. An excellent example of a modern day transforming leader is Mahatma Gandhi of India. During India's quest for independence of British rule he aroused and elevated the hopes and demands of millions, whose lives and personalities were enhanced in the process. Gandhi threw himself into a relationship with his followers, which makes him an excellent example for all leaders who wish to be transforming (Burns, 1978, p. 20). In summary, Burns considers transforming and transactional leadership to be relationship based and polar opposites. It is also important to note others postulate that leaders could be both (Judge & Bono, 2000, p. 751). Additionally, Burns' theory has contributed greatly and been very useful to the study of leadership according to several researchers. Judge and Bono (2000) write, "In the last 20 years, considerable progress has been made in addressing leader effectiveness according to one theoretical perspective, transformational leadership theory (also know as charismatic leadership). The concept of transformational leaders dates to Burns' (1978) Pulitzer-Prize-winning book on leadership" (p. 751).

### **SECTION III**

#### **LINKING SHACKLETON AND BURNS**

In this section, Shackleton's behavior and methods during the Endurance expedition and Burns theory will be compared. The purpose of comparison will be to determine what type of leader he was during the expedition. Shackleton's

behavior and methods will then be analyzed and compared to Burns two types of leaders (transactional & transforming). The ten strategies for leading described in Perkin's book, Leading At The Edge, will be used to conduct the analysis.

Also, as stated earlier, a brief linkage will be made to servant-leadership and the new science leadership theory. This is being done for three reasons. First, to assist in building the relationship between Shackleton and Burns by seeing if other theories apply. Second, to investigate if Burns' theory relates to two more current theories, and last, to discuss how together they may be applied to leaders in a manufacturing environment.

What type of leader was Shackleton, transactional, transforming or at times both? Before this question is answered, another basic one must be asked: Was Shackleton a leader according to Burns' theory? As stated earlier according to Burns, leadership occurs when a person with certain motives and purposes mobilizes other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of the followers. He clearly states that leaders have an obligation to their followers and that is to help them grow as future leaders (Burns, 1978, p. 18). He continues with these thoughts by adding that leadership is a process and not a person, and that leadership is relational and the motivations of leaders and followers are keys to understanding leadership and change (Sorenson, 2000, p. 6). Burns was asked by Georgia Sorenson to express his views on the relationship between leaders and followers, and he responded by saying, "Well, it's obvious, isn't it? that leadership is a process of mutuality between people?" (Sorenson, 2000, p. 6).



Grounded with this information it is clear that Shackleton was a leader. This is clear because he developed a relationship with his crew through a process of being there for them and inspiring them to push on in all kinds of adversity. In order to understand this comment, one must refer to diary entries made by two members of the crew. Alexander Macklin, one of the two surgeons in the crew, wrote about Shackleton in his diary after it was determined the ship was packed in ice and they were stuck. He said, "Shackleton at this time showed one of his sparks of real greatness. He did not rage at all, or show outwardly the slightest sign of disappointment; he told us simply and calmly we must winter in the Pack, explained its dangers and possibilities; never lost his optimism, and prepared for Winter" (Alexander, 1999, p. 44). The main message in this statement is that Shackleton spoke of the facts and optimism.

Another crew member, Frank Wild, who was second in command for the Endurance expedition wrote the following about Shackleton. According to Wild, Shackleton was "always calm, cool or collected, in open lanes or in tight corners he was just the same; but when he did tell a man to jump, that man jumped pretty quick" (Alexander, 1999, p.13). In this statement the key phrase is calm or that Shackleton was in control of himself and the followers. Both these statements support the idea that Shackleton was a leader because they illustrate how Shackleton focused on his followers by displaying honesty, calmness and being in control of the situation. This satisfied followers because it addressed the mutual goal of survival. Further support for this thought comes from Cecil Johnson's recent article in the Minneapolis Star Tribune. He offers the following

summary of what Shackleton did according to two other authors, Margot Morrell and Stephanie Capparell. Johnson (2001, p. D2) reports,

- Picked people whose skills, talents and personalities complemented one another and who could be depended upon to be loyal to him and to the mission.
- Democratized all work, making the professionals pull their weight in menial tasks and share the available luxuries.
- Disciplined misconduct fairly and proportionately to the offense.
- Assured that the men had state-of-the-art equipment and supplies and paid attention to nutrition.
- Provided entertainment and other diversions to keep up morale during trying times.
- Led by example, doing the same work and exposing himself to the same dangers as the other men.

Clearly, Shackleton's leadership addressed his followers. He chose the right people for the job. He dealt with fairness via discipline and making democratic assignments, provided for their needs (supplies, equipment & entertainment), and showed the way by setting a good example. Therefore, Shackleton was a leader according to Burns' theory.

The next question is what type of leader is Shackleton? The answer to this question may be found by analyzing Shackleton's behavior. This will be done by comparing Perkins ten strategies for leading to examples of Shackleton's behavior and/or actions. Listed below are the ten strategies with paraphrased examples of those given by Perkins (2000).

1. Strategy: Vision and Quick Victories: Never lose sight of the ultimate goal, and focus energy on short-term objectives. Meaning: Because of changing conditions leaders must be able to shift both long-term and short-term goals without clinging to the past. Shackleton Example: Clearly

- aware of his responsibilities, Shackleton had to let go of his original mission and devote himself completely to the new mission of survival. He had to instill in the others a belief that they all would reach safety (p.16).
2. Strategy: Set a personal example with visible, memorable symbols and behaviors. Meaning: Strategy 1 stressed the importance of keeping focused on changing goals because of changing conditions. Number two provides tactics for mobilizing the new energy through setting examples, using the correct words and being visible to the followers. Shackleton Example: When the Endurance began to sink Shackleton gave a calm, confident and reassuring speech to the entire crew. It became apparent when the ship sank that personal items had to be disposed of because they could not carry the extra weight caused by them. Shackleton set the proper example by throwing away a gold watch, a gold cigarette case and several gold sovereigns. Going to Elephant Island in three small boats during rough seas Shackleton made a point of standing erect in the stern showing that he was keeping vigil and inspiring the men (p. 29-37).
  3. Strategy: Instill optimism and self-confidence, but stay grounded in reality. Meaning: The leader must remain optimistic in the face of daunting adversity, to convince others that the leader is right when the odds of success are impossible. This creates a question concerning the ego of the leader. Does he/she maintain this optimism because of ego or the facts? Shackleton Example: Faced with odds of survival Shackleton was

able to prevail because of his dogged optimism and his skill of spreading a positive outlook. (p. 40-41).

4. Strategy: Take care of yourself: Maintain your stamina and let go of guilt. Meaning: The leader must take care of himself/herself, focusing on both mental and physical health. Also, the health of the team must be addressed. Shackleton Example: Shackleton was not a healthy man but he placed great importance on the physical and psychological needs of his men. He was always looking out for the well-being of his men, making sure they ate well and kept them as warm as possible. For example on sunny days he would make them get up from their sleeping bags and put them in sun. He did the same with their clothing. Shackleton always looked for ways to make them more comfortable (p.56-58).
5. Strategy: Reinforce the team message constantly: "We are one—we live or die together." Meaning: Challenges can be overcome with a unified effort by all members of the organization. Shackleton Example: The ability of each member to work together was on Shackleton's mind from the beginning. He looked for people who could work together (p. 70-71).
6. Strategy: Minimize status differences and insist on courtesy and mutual respect. Meaning: The leader must minimize status difference and special privileges, and insist on mutual respect and courtesy between all members. Shackleton Example: "Frank Wild was known to remind the crew that, Shackleton later put it, "a little thanks will go a long way". And

so will “please”, “excuse me”, and the other familiar phrases that lubricate social interaction” (p. 95).

7. Strategy: Master conflict—deal with anger in small doses, engage dissidents, and avoid needless power struggles. Meaning: The proactive leaders can skillfully use conflict to their advantage which must be done by managing conflict in productive ways that strengthen team members. Shackleton Example: Shackleton clearly understood that dealing with hurt feelings would prevent anger or resentment from building. He picked individuals whose attitudes or behavior could not adversely affect morale. Also, he kept potential dissent and troubled members close to him, seeking their thoughts on major decisions (p. 98-108).
8. Strategy: Find something to celebrate and something to laugh about. Meaning: Leaders that have the ability to lighten up in tough spots, celebrate, and laugh can make a difference in the morale of the team. This type of behavior can bring about creativity and stop depression. Shackleton Example: He always grasped any excuse to celebrate. Shackleton created celebrations on Empire Day, Midwinter Day, and they celebrated the day they departed from South Georgia which could have been a day of depression (p. 113-114).
9. Strategy: Be willing to take the Big Risk. Meaning: Leaders must balance risk and return, and then have the courage to step up to those calculated risks that are worth taking. Shackleton Example: Leaving Elephant Island was a huge risk but something had to be done because the party was

running out of supplies. Shackleton balanced all the odds and sailed for South Georgia. The very difficult trip and decision was successful (p. 125-137).

10. Strategy: Never give up—there’s always another move. Meaning: When times are hard the leader must be innovative and solve problems with creativity. Shackleton Example: Upon reaching South Georgia Shackleton and his party of two needed a way to help climb in icy conditions. They took screws from the boat they had sailed in and put them point down through their boots. The makeshift crampons were very important for their journey. They did not give up and used their creativity to help achieve their goal (p. 139-149).

The next step in the process will be to determine what type of leader Shackleton was during the expedition. This will be done by comparing the above stated examples to Burns transforming and two types of leaders, transactional and transforming. To conduct this comparison the matrix type chart below will be used. The first column represents one of the ten strategies described. Column two will represent the transactional type of leadership and “X” in this column means it was used. If an “X” is entered in the third column, then it is felt that transforming leadership was used by Shackleton. The fourth column will be filled in if it is believed that both types were used.

<u>STRATEGY</u>	<u>TRANSACTIONAL</u>	<u>TRANSFORMING</u>	<u>BOTH</u>
1. Vision		X	
2. Set Example		X	

3. Optimism	X
4. Stamina	X
5. Team	X
6. Values	X
7. Conflict	X
8. Lighten Up	X
9. Risk	X
10. Creativity	X

Based on the result of the above evaluation Shackleton was a transforming leader. Of the ten strategies, all were marked transforming for the following reasons. First, it is felt that Shackleton did not exchange one thing for another with his followers. He was a very complex man and/or leader who looked in advance for the motives and needs of his followers. It is also clear that he needed his followers and his followers needed him in order to survive. Second, they remained moral and ethical in dealing with each other. There is no reported crime or treachery or mean behavior by any member of the party. Therefore, the conclusion is that Shackleton was a transforming leader and that Dr. Perkins' ten strategies, if followed, illustrate a transforming leader.

Further support for this opinion is depicted by the action or the things Shackleton did which were described earlier by Johnson. In summary, he said Shackleton did the following things: he picked people with the correct skills for the expedition. He was fair and equal to all when giving work assignments, disciplined fairly and kept morale up by providing diversions and entertainment for the men. He led by setting a good example (working the same as all and exposing himself to the same dangers), and made sure they ate and had state-of-

the-art equipment and supplies (Johnson, 2001, p. D2). Again, all of these actions point to the definition of Burns' transforming leader. However, this does not make Shackleton perfect, he had his flaws, which will be discussed in the conclusion.

As mentioned earlier, a brief linkage to two other theories would be made in this section. They are Robert K. Greenleaf's servant-leadership theory and Margaret J. Wheatley's new science leadership. The first interesting link is between Greenleaf and Shackleton. They both have the same Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) background. This fact helps one understand why Shackleton's transforming style and servant-leadership are very similar. In order to better understand this link, servant-leadership must be defined. Spears (1998) writes, "Servant-leadership emphasizes increased service to others, holistic approach to work, promoting a sense of community, and the sharing of power in decision making" (p. 3). This bonds nicely to Burns' theory and Shackleton's leadership type because they address service to others or the followers. Being aware of the followers and giving the needed attention is what links Burns and Greenleaf together. Spears (1998) summarizes this linkage idea precisely when he writes, "At its core, servant-leadership is a long-term, transformational approach to life and work—in essence, a way of being—that has the potential for creating positive change throughout our society" (p. 3). Based on this, it may also be said that Shackleton was a servant-leader because he had a transformational approach to his work and life. There are however, characteristics in Shackleton which are to be questioned later.



The second linkage is between Shackleton's leadership and Burns' theory, with Wheatley's new science leadership theory. The major point of her theory is that there is a link between certain scientific perspectives and organizational phenomena. The scientific perspectives referred to come from the disciplines of physics, biology, chemistry, and theories of evolution and chaos. It is this that she refers to as the new science, or a new way of thinking about organizations. She believes that by applying her theory, leaders can begin to understand an organization's true nature and therefore improve their effectiveness.

Wheatley's theory has three major sub-themes. The first is that the relationship between the system and the individual is critical (quantum mechanics). Second, self-organizing or self-renewing systems are those that reconfigure themselves so that they deal with new information or change. The third sub-theme deals with chaos and the shape of wholeness, which means leaders should study their organization as a whole system rather than focusing only on tasks (Wheatley, 1999). Burns' theory is also based on relationships and interdependence, and Shackleton's leadership was too. Also, she is dealing with change or evolution, which ties into Shackleton's leadership and the fact that he had to change goals because of his new chaotic conditions. In conclusion, Shackleton's type of leadership, and Burns', Greenleaf's and Wheatley's theories all link together. This demonstrates that the Burns' older theory still applies thirty years later, and there is much to learn from Shackleton's behavior even though it occurred over eighty years ago.

## CONCLUSION

The key points of this case study have been to analyze Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton's leadership during his expedition to the Antarctica from 1914 to 1916. The purpose of this study was to compare his leadership to James MacGregor Burns' leadership theory with the intent of finding out if Shackleton was a transactional or transforming leader. The conclusion reached is that Shackleton was a transforming leader because he led his followers by engaging them as whole men, looking for their motives and always seeking to satisfy their needs. He was a moral person who tactfully passed his values on to his men. It must be mentioned that Shackleton was also compared to the servant-leadership and new science leadership theories. This was interesting because of the span of time between Shackleton and the development of these two theories and that they applied to him in his day and his actions apply to a modern day leader. In conclusion, Shackleton was a transforming leader, a more complex but more potent leader than any other type, and perhaps this is why he did not lose any of his men and that people are studying his methods over eighty years later.

Additionally, Shackleton's approach to his followers applies to the manufacturing leader of today. In fact his approach applies to any and all modern day leaders. Change in business is a daily if not hourly occurrence, and how this is dealt with is very important. Also, high employee turnover is very costly and emotionally draining on an organization. Therefore, how employees are treated is very important not only for the moral and ethical issues. Perkins' ten strategies are very enlightening and will be useful in the manufacturing environment. Just

like Burns' theory, they all deal with the relationship between the leader and the follower, and if a manufacturing company is to be successful in the modern day environment, employees must come first. This is what made Shackleton successful: he put his men first knowing if he did not, any of them would survive. It is the same today in a manufacturing company: if the employees are not put first the company will not survive. The theories of Greenleaf and Wheatley repeat the same thing Burns wrote about in 1978 and Shackleton practiced in 1914-1916. These theories and/or ideas are timeless and basic.

In conclusion, this case study creates more questions than provides answers. The largest and main one is centered around Shackleton's values. He was a moral man, but one could question his values. They could be questioned because of his relationship to his wife and family. No where does he mention his wife and family in either of his books, The Heart of the Antarctic and South. One would think this would be a common topic, if he truly cared about them, maybe he did, but perhaps in those days it was common practice not to discuss one's personal life, so he did not. Another question concerns Shackleton's ego was he driven by it or the need to help mankind? The evidence is weak concerning his desire to help the good of mankind; therefore his ego must have been the driving force. If this is true, then was he a real transforming leader or a leader who just fits the transforming leadership model?

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, Caroline. (1998). The Endurance. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Andrews, Fred (2000, May 28). Will Managers Relate To This Gripping Tale? The New York Times, pp. 6.
- Bickel, Lennard (2000). Shackleton's Forgotten Men. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press and Balliett & Fitzgerald.
- Burns, James MacGregory (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Rowe Publishers.
- Capparell, Stephanie (2000, December 26). Shackleton on Leadership. Star Tribune. pp. 9B.
- Cuto, Richard A. (1997). Social Capital and Leadership. Prepared for the Transformational Leadership Section of the Kellogg Leadership Study Project of the Center for Political Leadership and Participation at the University of Maryland, (Copyright 1998-2001, The James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership, University of Maryland. Updated January 4, 2001).
- Hacker, Diane (1997). A Pocket Style Manual. Boston: Bedford Books.
- Headlam, Bruce (2000, April 6). Retracing an Ill-Fated Shackleton Expedition. The New York Times. pp. 3.
- Johnson, Cecil (2001, March 2). Leaders can take a cue from Antarctic explorer. Star Tribune, pp. D2.
- Judge, Timothy A., & Bono, Joyce E. (2000). Five-Factor Model of Personality and Transformational Leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 85, 751-765.

Kimmelman, Michael (1999, April 9). Photography Review; Art and Courage

Forged in a Cauldron of Adversity. The New York Times, pp. 35.

Kouzes, James M., & Posner, Barry Z. (1997). The Leadership Challenge. San

Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing.

Marachetti, Donna (2000, June 18). Two Striking Sagas of Survival From

Antarctica to Mt. Everest; Stories Reveal Men's Courage When At Odds With

Nature. The Plain Dealer, pp. 101.

Shackleton, Ernest Henry (2000). The Heart Of The Antarctic. New York: Penguin

Putnam Inc.

Shackleton, Ernest Henry (1998). South. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, Inc.

Sourenson, Georgia (2000, Aug. 31-Sept. 3). An Intellectual History of

Leadership Studies: The Role of James MacGregor Burns. Paper presented at

the 2000 Association, Washington, D.C. (Copyright 1998-2001, The James

MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership, University of Maryland, Updated

January 4, 2001).

Spears, Larry C. (Ed.). (1998). Insights on Leadership. New York: John Wiley &

Sons, Inc.

Peacock, Scot. (Ed.). (1999). Contemporary Authors, Volume 78, 87-91. Detroit:

The Gale Group

Perkins, Dennis N.T. (2000). Leading At The Edge. New York: American

Management Association.

Wheatley, Margaret J. (1999). Leadership and the New Science. San Francisco:

Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Augsburg College  
Lindell Library  
Minneapolis, MN 55454