

## Chapter 2

# What is Leadership?

The concept of leadership seems to be a fluid one, as there is a range of variety on *what* leadership is (Kort 2008). Regardless of the paradigm, or the perspective, there is one core problem that seems to be persistent (to date) in leadership studies: its definition (Kramer 2003; Northhouse 2010).

Depending on the paradigm (Jing and Avery 2008), leadership seems to be defined differently under the auspices of various perspectives with an assortment of nuances by a range of scholars with a diverse departure points, such as, philosophy of management, sociology, economics, psychology and political science (Stogdill 1974; Ciulla 2002; Rost 1991; Bolden 2004). The practitioners adopt a view and interpret leadership in a way which does not always coincide with the theoretical framework by scholars constructing leadership.

Some 30 years ago, Stogdill (1974) wrote:

*... [there are] almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept (pp. 259).*

Traditionally, leadership studies had their focus on attributes and personal qualities of leaders; in other words, explaining leadership from an individual perspective in terms of traits, describing what a leader is or should be (Bryman 1992; Yulk 1999). With leadership under such approach the researchers were seen as individuals, who possessed attributes, such as, a clear sense of mission, providing vision, motivation of others, creativity and innovation (particularly as entrepreneurs), good communication skills possessing strength and so on (Gill 2009). Such approach is known as ‘Traditional Leadership Studies’ (Avolio 2008).

However, in recent years and especially under the modern leadership paradigm—dominated by transformational leadership (Burns 1978; Bass 1985; Buciuniene and Skudience 2008) and other related theories such as authentic leadership (Kernis 2003; Illes et al. 2005; Walumbwa et al. 2008) and ethical leadership (Treviño and Brown 2004; Northhouse 2010)—leadership is defined in a more holistic way (including other stakeholders, such as, the followers as part of the construct of leadership

and the definition of a leader) indicating that leadership and followership are an integral parts of each other.

Such shift in the outlook upon the phenomenon of leadership has led to the emergence of the ‘New Genre Leadership Theory’ (Avolio 2009) and ‘New New Leadership Paradigm’ (Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe 2005), which presented and investigated leadership as a process, attempting to explain the phenomenon in a socio-psychological context. Under such a paradigm, then, leadership can be defined as ‘*a process whereby an individual influences a group or individuals to achieve a common goal*’ (Hailey 2006, pp. 6). This is more or less in line with the definition provided by House et al. (2004) stipulating that leadership is ‘*...the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members*’ (p. 15). Following the same notion then a leader is defined as, the ‘*one person getting other people to do something*’ (Ciulla 2002, pp. 340).

## 2.1 The Development of Leadership Studies

Studying the discourse revolving around leadership all the way back from antiquity to the Middle Ages and to our modern times, one can be certain that the notion regarding the study of leadership is not new. Even in its modern scholarly narrative, pointing to the fact that leadership studies are in one form or another, whether scientific or philosophical, has been a process stretching over time.

In modern leadership studies, under the traditional leadership paradigm, the continuation from the past took a less philosophical and more normative form with an emphasis of organizational effectiveness with focus on traits and attributes of a leader. The rationale behind such view was, as Avolio et al. (2009) posit, that leadership was looked upon as rational processes and a leader’s behaviour were seen as a result in the inherent existing traits in a leader. Thus a leader’s traits functioned as a nexus, from which leadership behaviour, such as, leader–member exchange (LMX), transactional behaviour, power of influence and charisma was studied. This view is also shared by Ciulla (2004), who posits that

*by the early twentieth century the emphasis on moral character shifted to an emphasis on personality (pp. 117).*

In lieu of such views, leadership studies were conducted on a deficit-reduction model strategy, where one discovered what was wrong with a leader and then worked to correct deficits in terms of focusing on the leader’s development (Avolio and Luthans 2006; Avolio et al. 2009; Avolio 2007; Yukl 2006).

At the outset of modern leadership studies under the traditional leadership paradigm, the problem of lack of consensus among scholars as to who shall be regarded as a leader emerged; a problem that still today seem to be persistent. For instance, under the auspices of transformational leadership theory, servant leadership and ethical leadership, where altruism, ethics and servitude are the very foundation constructing such theories, it would be difficult to regard despotic rulers as leaders with

the classic of Hitler. Where, some regard Hitler as an amoral leader, other dismisses him as a leader altogether with the arguments underpinned in the core building blocks in transformational and servant leadership.

In lieu of such argumentation, it seems that the way we construct leadership phenomenon and regard individuals as leaders depends largely on the way we interpret as to what leadership is and who can be regarded as a leader, in the context of the prevalent worldview. Ciulla (2004) proposes that

*Leadership is largely a social construction based on the values and events of the times. The idea of a leader is shaped by what people in a culture think a leader ought to be (pp. 116).*

Conversely, depending on the perspective opted for interpreting various leadership theories, it would then be possible to view despotic rulers as leaders. As an example, under leadership theories, such as, transactional and autocratic leadership, where the definition of a leader is anyone who directs others towards a goal and achieves an aim (fully or partially), regardless of the goal's inherent morality or lack thereof, through reward and punishment, then Hitler would very well be regarded as a leader.

Arguably, by stepping outside such interpretative and theoretical compartmentalized way of reasoning, one would go beyond the view of a leader as an agent of change *only* with a focus on the end result, prompting one to look at a leader's actions and general moral reasoning beyond the context of achieving a certain goal.

For instance in his book, *There is no such thing as business ethics*, Maxwell (2003) maintains that one cannot or ought not compartmentalize set of behaviours, values and attitude in different boxes as a leader, family man, constitute or friend; meaning, either one is ethical or not. And if ethical, then one should be ethical regardless of the context or the environment in which one operates. However, Ciulla (2004) asserts that in modernity, we do exactly that, meaning we do separate the 'inner person' from the 'outer person' (pp. 120).

Case et al. (2012) further argue that this disconnect has historical and paradigmatic roots:

*The tensions between theoria and theory, between philosophy/theology as a way of life and philosophical/theological discourse, between apophaticism and cataphaticism, between depth and disenchantment, are also reflected in the traditional distinction within Christianity between two forms of living: the contemplative life, the vita contemplativa, and the active life, or vita activa. In the same way that modern discourses have marginalized, even excluded, theoria, modern approaches to work and organization have also tended to exclude the contemplative in favour of a very particular understanding of the active (p. 352).*

In recent years, aforementioned views have resulted in a shift of looking at leadership and leaders; whereby, taking the discourse past the trait theory, which has delivered other concepts, such as, 'New Leadership Paradigm' (Avolio et al. 2009). Leadership studies under the 'New Leadership Paradigm' (Avolio et al. 2009) and the 'New New Leadership Paradigm' (Alimo-Metcalfe 2005) has relocated its focus in a manner, which does not only treat the individual alone, but makes an effort to look at the phenomenon in a more holistic way. Supported by Yukl (2006), Avolio et al. (2009) assert that

*... the field of leadership focuses not only on the leader, but also on followers, peers, supervisors, work setting/context, and culture, including a much broader array of individuals representing the entire spectrum of diversity, public, private, and not-for-profit organizations, and increasingly over the past 20 years, samples of populations from nations around the globe. Leadership is no longer simply described as an individual characteristic or difference, but rather is depicted in various models as dyadic, shared, relational, strategic, global, and a complex social dynamic (p. 422).*

However, even though under this paradigm there is an attempt to bring an innovative and fresh methodology in understating leadership. It is arguable that such methodology can be successful for the simple reason that it emerges from the already cemented way leadership studies have been conducted in the past. Such assertion is based on the argument that these two new leadership paradigms are still focused on the way leaders and followers *construct* leadership with some fundamental anchors in the past—all the way to the Early Academy in Greece and religious texts for example the Old Testament, where essentially, primary elements of power, charisma, semi-divine abilities, such as, possessing vision are still at the core of the construct of leadership which ‘New Leadership Paradigm’ and the ‘New New Leadership Paradigm’ have their departure points in.

Subsequently, it could be proposed that these paradigms are still captives of a worldview, which inherently does not accept leadership as a social process, but views it as a personal and individualized phenomenon, pursuing the leaders’ and that of his or her community’s (small or large) goals—regarding leadership as simply a tool, which beyond its own sphere of operation and agendas may be void from social responsibility, lacking an innate spirit of inclusivity.

Hence, it appears that the new terms and names chosen for various leadership practices are simply a modern spin on cemented and generally accepted values that are held true about leadership. This argument will then further encourage us to speculate whether or not it is the very core of these new movements under which leadership is being investigated. It would prevent us to succeeding in addressing some leadership toxicity, which appears to be enactments of failures in ethics and leadership from a philosophical perspective, manifested at both the macro and micro levels.

As a case under consideration, it is worth considering the power by which kings in the past (or in the present, for that matter) would assert their authority, demanding obedience. Traditionally, it was believed that this power was given to the kings by God and maintained by their lineage through inheritance and birthright. The King’s decision and decrees were not to be questioned, since they were doing ‘God’s work’ with an inherent divine authority. It appeared that the only body of authority that the kings would be answerable to was again God and his representatives—the higher clergy, which would anoint and approve of the king’s actions.

Such approval would be based on the interpretation of the religious books (the Bible and the Quran), such as, decisions concerning going to war, as it was the case with the Crusades, the conquests of Muhammad’s followers and later on the conquistadors. Since these actions were done in the name of God, then their ethicality could not be questioned. Hence the leadership was defined and seen as phenomenon which was manifested in an individual, with an unlimited power vested in the individual by God.

Such view of leadership, the individual (the leader) and the tools used to achieve goals such as exerting power, seem to have become an intrinsic and integral part of the narrative defining leadership, deeply rooted in our psyche and accepted social norms (Conger and Kanungu 1998; Jacobsen and House 2001; Sankowsky 1995; Howell and Avolio 1995), making it (power) as a taken for granted and inseparable part of our construct of leadership. Subsequently, a critical discourse allowing a ‘sense of doubt’ may not be possible under such taken-for-granted view, which would make it possible to de-construct the cemented construct of leadership, enabling us to go back to the very root in order to revisit the way our perception of leadership has evolved.

For instance, is power vested in leadership positions something that is necessary and thus a leader must possess in order to lead others and be regarded as a leader, or is it so that traditionally individuals with strong egos seeking the euphoria of controlling others (Ciulla 1998), claimed leadership positions and in time made power the second nature of leadership? Walton (2007) claims that

*if an executive is to survive and prosper in the business world, then position and power, personal standing, status and influence become important factors to secure (p. 22).*

So the question would then be, do we *have* to take power as an imperative of leadership, or could leadership be de-coupled power from?

Another question that immediately present itself, when considering the construct of leadership in the context of and as a social process, is whether leadership roles are to be entrusted to people with the highest degree of expertise in their respective fields and in relation to the task at hand (Yeaky 2002), for the purpose of achieving the highest degree of productivity, or is the primary function of leadership as a phenomenon more about keeping a group of people together, making expertise in the field secondary? Such questions lead one to novel ideas, such as, leadership rotation as it prioritizes power of expertise (Green 1999; Bal et al. 2008) above all other forms of power being exerted, since different situations may call for different set of expertise that *one* leader may not possess. This is an important question as almost all leadership theories find their essence in the ability of motivating others, whether it is through transactions—transactional leadership (Bass 1990)—or through rhetoric, playing on peoples’ emotional and psychological soft spots, such as, fear, patriotism and etcetera (Yukl 1989).

Viewing the use of power, rhetoric and persuasion as imperatives of leadership among leaders who have a relaxed attitude to ethics, could potentially cause harm to the followers in specific and the general attitude of the society at large about equality. Hence, the question would be what can be done to arrive to a leadership narrative, which would define ‘good leadership’. In other words, what is ‘good’ leadership?

## 2.2 Ethical Leadership

Ciulla (2004) equals good leadership with ethical leadership. By ‘good’ leadership she means ‘*the use of the word good here has two senses: morally good and technically good (or effective)*’, encompassing a leader demonstrating care, humility, being

participative and supportive (p. 116). Such behaviours identified as dimensions of leadership under various theories, such as, 'Level 5 Leadership' theory, 'Transformational Leadership Theory' and 'Servant Leadership Theory'.

Even though theories, such as, 'Toxic Leadership' (Reed 2004; Lipman-Blumen 2005; Walton 2007), and pseudo transformational leadership (Bass 1999) previously attempted to identify the ethics in leadership, still it appears to be the Ethical Leadership Theory (Treviño and Brown 2004; Northhouse 2010) that seeks to get to root of the problem. Ethical Leadership Theory does so through attempting to address various aspects and dimensions of the calamities that followers experience caused by unethical behaviour expressed in toxic acts both on a macro and a micro level.

Hence the starting departure point of what an ethical leader is postulated as:

*... ethical leaders are seen as principled decision makers who care about people and the broader society.* (Brown and Treviño 2006, pp. 597)

Considering the existing body of literature on leadership encompassing various theories with their corresponding dimensions, it is argued here that the most suitable leadership theory closet to function as a context for addressing the object of the investigation at hand, 'Why some managers and executives act unethically towards their followers?' is identified as the ethical leadership theory.

### **2.2.1 Definition of Ethical Leadership**

Brown and Treviño's (2006) definition of ethical leadership, which seems to be somehow accepted by the majority of scholars, states:

*The demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making.* (Brown et al. 2005, pp. 120)

Ethical leadership as a main leadership theory appears to be new in the sense that it not only exclusively focuses on the ethical aspects of a leader's behaviour, but has ethics as its nexus and foundation. Ethical leadership is expressed in humility in the leader to call for help, being participative, supportive, avoiding toxic acts among other behaviours.

Traditionally, work on business ethics study has been within the realm of corporate social responsibility (CSR; Moore et al. 2008; Cook 2008) at a macro level. However, recently some scholars have begun the work on ethics on a micro level (human resource management). Brown and Treviño (2006) note that prior to the development of ethical leadership as a mainstream leadership theory, scholars developing and working on various leadership theories would discuss the role of ethics as just *one* aspect under the auspices of their theory. In 'Transformational Leadership' for instance, aspects such as democratic decision making, empowerment as ethical elements are mentioned. The same state of affairs was prevalent in the construct of 'Authentic Leadership Theory' mentioning relational transparency, moral courage and, integrity or in 'Level 5 Leadership Theory', humility (Collins 2001) while

in ‘Spiritual Leadership Theory’, care (Pruzan 2004) were all part of the building blocks of respective theory but not their nexus.

However, more and more attention was assigned to the ethicality of leadership and ethical behaviour in a leader. This trend was reinforced by the occurrence of some major scandals in the corporate world, such as, the case of Enron at its height in the 1990s (Gini 2004) resulting in Sarbanes–Oxley Act of 2002 (Cohen et al. 2006). Since then, there has been much work, asserting that ethics in business not only curbs a company’s competitiveness, but *may* also enhance it. There are numerous examples, such as, the Tylenol case in 1982, which indicate that ethical behaviour in a leader increases the organization’s profitability.

*In the famous Tylenol case, manufacturer Johnson & Johnson actually increased sales of Tylenol by pulling the product off the shelves after some Tylenol had been poisoned. The leaders at Johnson & Johnson were effective at boosting sales of Tylenol because of the ethical way that they handled the problem.* (Ciulla 2004, p. 119)

There is evidence that by adhering to a set of strong ethical values, a firm is able to increase its intangible assets and thus use it as a strategy to gain competitive advantage in a global business milieu (Azmi 2006), which increasingly is scrutinized (Ciulla 2004) by the public. According to Verhezen (2005), since corporate culture is a mirror of a firm’s strategy and values, a good reputation creates trust in the firm while contributes to a closer emotional and intellectual tie to its stakeholders.

This argued view, in tandem with the emerging trend that not only the society at large demands corporations to pay more attention to ethics (Walton 2007; Ciulla 2004), but also our societies, in an explicit fashion, are showing symptoms of the social maladies that unethical leadership expressed in toxic leader behaviour in the corporate world seems to have contributed to, for instance, from employee suicides and depression to outright employee molestation and killing, subsequently resulting in revolts and kidnapping of executives (Chrisafis 2009) as an act of revenge, which provided additional thrust to the ‘Ethical Leadership Theory’.

Nevertheless, many of these discussions were taking place within a deficit-reduction and normative frame; meaning: finding out what is wrong, and then recommending solutions as to how to rectify these deficiencies. This is while there were voices asserting that ethics and moral values need to be instilled in individuals already during their childhood, by parents, teachers and the society at large (Winston 2005; Avolio et al. 2009), pointing out to the need of a value alerting measure, as opposed to a deficit-reduction strategy in dealing with failures in ethical behaviour.

## 2.3 Becoming an Ethical Leader

In developing ethical leaders, research points to the view that many parties must be involved and play a role (Bass 1999; Freeman and Steward 2006); from parents to schools to universities as well as the organization at which individuals are entrusted with leadership roles. This view is also supported by Mintzberg (2010) postulating that fostering leaders begins at an early age:



*People can be developed. Not as leaders, but as human beings, in their beliefs and behaviours, their thoughtfulness and self-respect. But that probably happens mostly in the early years, at home and in school (pp. 9).*

He further mentions the *context*, pointing out to the organization as well as the managerial practice as other contributing factors in developing leaders. In the same line, Allio (2005) argues:

*Character is the foundation for ethical leadership behavior. It includes dimensions of integrity, courage, honesty, and the will to do good. Most developmental psychologists assert that character forms as a result of early training and exposure to appropriate role models. Moral training later in life (during leadership programs) has limited impact on innate moral bias (pp. 1073).*

There are, however, many important challenges in that all these forces, which are to play a role in contributing and promoting ethical values and behaviours, seem themselves entangled with dilemmas and ethical problems. Callahan (2006) provides the example of when teachers who teach ethics, themselves fail to adhere to ethical behaviour, giving the students an impression of ethics of being of rhetorical nature than anything else. Warren and Rosenthal (2006) further make a note of the minuscule amount of ethics training provided in business schools not only being insufficient but also give the impression that ethics is something that one only talks about and is one of a lesser important aspects of conducting business.

One of the suggestions to address these challenges is a call for a comprehensive ethical training, making it part of each discipline taught at the universities, sending the message that ethics is not only about corporate social responsibility as a measure to avoid lawsuits or amassing corporate goodwill but also about developing the attitude that ethics is an intrinsic part of any business activity and should be included in the corporate strategy from the top of an organization to the activities of the smallest business unit. The problem with such solution, however, as Allio (2005) postulates is that

*Most leadership training initiatives fail to produce leaders. Typical programs teach leadership theory, concepts, and principles; they promote leadership literacy but not leadership competence (pp. 1071).*

At this stage Buciuiniene and Skudiene (2008) highlight the vital role the companies play in formulating their organization culture, which ought to be anchored in strong ethical values. For, if the leadership style deployed in an organization is solely based on a transactional account, then the corporate leaders will pay attention to ethics only so far that it would help the bottom line to improve or to avoid legal costs. However, if ethical consideration is the bedrock of the leadership culture in an organization, the executives not only will instil ethical behaviour in the followers through role modelling (Brown and Treviño 2006) but also help to form ethical procedures, boards and protocols.

It has been asserted that academics ought to join forces with practitioners (Mroz 2010), by providing them with state of the art research, identifying underlying reasons for obstacles to ethical behaviour, and suggest preventing measures for those obstacles. Such strategy may enable the leaders to not only take measures in preventing the occurrence of a fertile ground for unethical behaviour manifested in



toxic acts but also to encourage and empower ethical attitude, thinking and actions in their followers.

Revisiting the initial argument that the role of parents, teachers and leaders in the organization in fostering ethical behaviour is of significance, one ought to also explore the impact of socialization (Clausen 1968) on individual's understating of ethics formulating his or her value system, with that rationale that all these factors may have a role in leaders acting ethically or unethically.

## 2.4 Unethical Leadership and Toxic Behaviour

Reed (2004) mentions three parameters, which identify an unethical leader:

*1. An apparent lack of concern for the wellbeing of subordinates. 2. A personality or interpersonal technique that negatively affects organizational climate. 3. A conviction by subordinates that the leader is motivated primarily by self-interest (pp. 67).*

Unethical leadership expressed in narcissistic, aggressive disruptive and coercive—with an excessive focus on the 'end'—which is symptomatized in toxic enactments (whether intentionally or unintentionally) is manifested in behaviours, such as, corruption, hypocrisy, criminal acts abrasive and abusive behaviour, self-serving behaviour, lack of respect, discrimination, nepotism, intimidation and bullying, lying, manipulation, playing on people's needs and fears, obstructing justice, disempowering of followers and peers, playing individuals against each other, breaking the unity through creating a feeling of 'us versus them', taking credit for other's achievements are only a few examples of an inexhaustible list (Reed 2004; Walton 2004; Ciulla 2004; Lipman-Blumen 2005; Lipman-Blumen et al. 2005; Kofodimos 1990).

Reed (2004) provides the following case as an example:

*In his best-selling book Band of Brothers, Stephen E. Ambrose provides an example of a toxic leader—the detested commander of Easy Company, 506th Parachute Infantry Regiment 6, Ambrose writes, "Anyone who has ever been in the Army knows the type. [He] was the classic chickenshit. He generated maximum anxiety over minimum significance." He had poor judgment, but his style was what generated resentment. He "could not see the unrest and the contempt that was breeding in the troops. You led by fear or you led by example. We were being led by fear." Superiors took no action and characteristically, no soldier officially complained to the chain of command, but the soldiers considered taking matters into their own hands and discussed shooting him when the company got into combat (pp. 67–68).*

Coccia, (1998) in Appelbaum and Roy-Girard (2007) reports of the following 'rules' that toxic leaders generally follow:

*the leader must be in control of every aspect of the organization at all times; when problems arise, immediately find a guilty party to blame; do not make mistakes; if you do, cover them up; never point out the reality of a situation; never express your feelings unless they are positive; do not ask questions, do as you are told; do not do anything outside your role; do not trust anyone; nothing is more important than giving to the organization; and keep up the organization's image at all costs (pp. 18–19).*

Such behaviours are rooted in a number of character and personality qualities, which encompasses lack of integrity, narcissism, limitless ambition, arrogance, an unsatisfying drive for power and wealth and disregard of the costs of their acts among others (Lipman-Blumen et al. 2005) with profound implications for followers.

## 2.5 Toxic Leadership Behaviour and Its Implications

Beside the damage, which unethical leadership manifested in toxic behavioural tactics causes the organization they operate in (Tepper 2006; Ciulla 2004; Reed 2004; Walton 2004; Lipman-Blumen et al. 2005), such as inability to achieve operation goals and commitments, poor internal communication, huge amounts of waste that result from poor decisions, and lots of rework and interpersonal relationships that are driven by manipulative and self-centred agendas. This in turn effect the organization and its performance negatively as feelings of despair, anger, low morale and depression among employees causing substandard performance, high absenteeism as well as increased employee turnover (Bacal 2000; Brett and Stroh 2003).

Perhaps the most negative impact of unethical leadership manifested in toxic behavioural tactics is felt by the employees with a variety of symptoms such as depression. Hammond et al. (2010) conducting a study in a multi-ethnic sample of hospital employees report of an increase in workplace discrimination in the USA resulting in severe depressive symptoms among employees. This report is consistent with findings by Canady et al. (2008) who indicate similar situation. Other symptoms include psychological effects, such as, *'impaired judgment, irritability, anxiety, anger, an inability to concentrate and memory loss'* (Appelbaum and Roy-Girard 2007, pp. 17). Additionally, causing some physiological effects, such as, *'changes in blood pressure and/or cholesterol levels, increases in muscle tension and irritability and anxiety'* (Appelbaum and Roy-Girard 2007, pp. 22).

## 2.6 Reasons Behind Toxic Behaviour

Exploring failures in ethics, at this level, gave rise to other questions, such as, whether or not unethical behaviour in leaders is intentional; whereby, the leader deliberately injures and takes advantage of others and the situation for enhancing his or her advantage (Lipman-Blumen et al. 2005), or is unintentional, referring to some leader's careless and reckless actions, including incompetency contribute to negative effects and toxic actions (Arbinger 2006; Tenbrunsel et al. 2009). Such view is also in line with the concept of 'Moral Luck' (Ciulla 1998) postulating that sometimes it is beyond the leader's control to act in any other way that may be perceived unethical. Later on, she develops the idea of 'Moral Luck' and adds 'stupidity' and 'incompetency', rather than an intentional toxicity, both of which may result in unethical behaviour expressed in toxic acts.

Why Leaders Fail Ethically

A Paradigmatic Evaluation of Leadership

Batmanghlich, C.A.

2015, XII, 144 p. 1 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-12732-3