

## **Leaders and Leadership: Factors that Influence Leaderships**

Yaniv Shenhav

SWU “Neofit Rilski”

yanivshenhav@gmail.com

**Abstract:** The phenomenon of leadership has been observed and researched for roughly 100 years and various scholars have tried to explain its development as well as examine the tools that enable its advancement. This article provides a comprehensive overview and explanation of the leading approaches to leadership research today and covers the Personality Researches and the Trait Approach to Leadership, the Behavioral Approach and Leadership Development, Blake and Mouton’s Managerial Grid, the Situational Approach in Exploring Leadership, Reddin’s Four Style Model, Fiedler’s LPC Situational Dependence Model, Formative Leadership – Leadership’s Full Range Model.

**Keywords:** Leadership, leadership development, leadership research, approaches to leadership.

### **1. What is Leadership? A Review of the Leading Approaches to Understanding What Leadership is**

A literature review of leadership research in the past 100 years will suggest that the leadership research has mainly engaged in investigating leadership’s influence on subordinates’ views and performance. To this day, most research engaging in leaders’ development processes has relied upon leaders’ testimonies and biographies, as presented by historians who investigated the course of lives of the studied leaders. Most of those studies did not include an actual discussion of the leader’s psychological development, but rather, of the historical setting and circumstances which led to his rise. Other studies, which did discuss the leader’s psychological development, focused upon two main research components. The first component involves a discussion of those leaders who were explored by historians. The second component to those researches is a psychoanalytical examination and the psychological and developmental aspects pertaining to the leader (Amit, Popper et al., 2008).

Research investigation and the attempt to understand and draw insights from it may be categorized by the contexts of its development, effectiveness and efficiency, based upon a variety of approaches, views, or interpretations; in philosophical aspects addressing the leader’s role in relation to the society and the states, through personality or trait researches as well as

based upon approaches and studies examining leadership's effectiveness and efficiency, its sources of power and capability to influence the environment, and the environment it creates.

In the following paper, I will review the leading approaches in leadership research over the past five decades.

James Burns argues that leadership is one of the most extensively observed phenomena in every society, yet the least understood by those investigating it (Burns, 1978). We know much of leaders and their mode of action, but too little of the phenomenon of leadership. The way the term "leader" is defined relies, to a great extent, upon the definition of the term "leadership", namely, the leader will be the one to fulfill "leadership", in varying situations but in the same mode. Most articles on the subject matter seldom distinguish the concept of "a leader" from the concept of "leadership", since they are interconnected. Leadership is impossible without a leader, just as a leader may not exist without having fulfilled leadership, to some extent. However, there is a common categorization which attributes external phenomena to the concept of leadership, in association with its development – environmental, circumstantial, or historical, while the study of the concept of "leader" will seek to explore the leader as an individual, based upon personal development or innate qualities. Hence, leadership is the operation and fulfillment of the actual concept, while the leader will be the person in need, at a given time, to fulfill it.

## **2. Personality Researches and the Trait Approach to Leadership**

The Trait Approach, or "The Great Man Theory", originates from social psychology, constituting one of the oldest approaches in the field of leadership. It seeks to identify a set of leaders' qualities, according to which identification of certain qualities in an individual will indicate the presence of leadership. The approach maintains that this "set" of qualities consists of innate leadership qualities, which may be identified at a young age, distinguishing leaders from other people. Relying upon those basic assumptions, the researches sought and examined subjects' qualities such as initiative, proactiveness, achievement power motivation, masculinity, intelligence, extrovertness. Plus, the basic assumption states that a leader who possesses the qualities which characterize leadership will be a leader in any case. In other words, an individual who possesses the innate qualities set will become a leader at any social situation. This approach has also relied upon the Social Darwinism theory, which argues that the rules of the existence war in nature apply to human society as well. In society, as in nature, the most skilled and talented will survive. Among humans, too, those who possess the more powerful qualities, those associated with leadership, will become leaders. Hence, the process which aims to establish a structure to produce or train leaders will only be of assistance to those who possess innate leadership qualities.

That embarked the way toward the development of instruments for identifying and measuring leaders' innate qualities. The first scientific research attempting to identify leaders, particularly their qualities, was conducted in 1904. The basic assumption was that leaders who possess that

set of qualities will act as leaders at any stage. In order to identify those qualities, children groups and their coping in various social situations were investigated. Terman divided eight year olds into four groups, presenting them with memory, intelligence, and coping games. His research consisted of three stages:

- 1) Observing the children participating, attempting to identify the leader by examining innovativeness, leading, and the scope to which he served as a role model to the other group members.
- 2) The researchers approached the children's teachers, questioning them who they viewed as the leader.
- 3) The researchers approached the children, questioning them to whom, of the group members they would like to compare.

The analysis of data provided the researchers with evidence that those three dimensions fully correspond to one another. The children identified as leaders by the researchers, were viewed as such by the teachers and by their peers. The following qualities were found in the research: appearance and a higher degree of articulation, relatively to the other children. Thereafter, the groups were re-arranged, thus those who were perceived as leaders were replaced by others who possessed leadership qualities, hence other children would become leaders within the group. It may therefore be concluded that an individual becomes a leader for possessing a quality which the group perceives as leadership-related. The group is the one to determine the leader, and the leader, in turn, should possess a set of leadership qualities, which may facilitate that (Terman, 1904).

Until 1948, more than one hundred and twenty similar researches were conducted, investigating physical and mental qualities, as well as social skills. At this context, it will be interesting to point out that the various researches were not found to correspond, such that one research's results would sometimes contradict the results of another, and leadership qualities emphasized by one researcher, would not be emphasized by another. Stogdill (1948) was the first to question the Qualities Approach, which relies upon personality tests, after reviewing all researches which had been conducted and published by 1948. He came across the insight that leaderships was independent of a constant set of personal qualities, but upon different components deriving from the setting, time, need, place, and situation the leader faces (Lord, De Vader, Alliger, 1986). Christy and George also argue that the conclusions they drew may rely upon research methodologies which are not sufficient to prove that given qualities are associated with leaders. Zaccaro (2007) further states that the present research's results were influenced, to a great extent, by the parameters influencing the setting and the leadership which was formed within it.

In a later course, Stogdill (1974) even compiled another review of all researches which had been conducted, coining the term "traits" instead of "qualities", implying his professional view. Qualities are innate, and may not be learned, while traits constitute a set of instruments which may be acquired, learned, and practiced. Stogdill (1974) distinguished traits from "skills"

mentioning several components which are relevant to the development of learned and acquired leadership, such as intense striving for responsibility and task completion, vigor and perseverance in achieving goals, courage, and innovativeness in problem solving, drive to assume initiative in social settings, self-confidence, and sense of personal identity, ability to assume outcomes of a decision, willingness to tolerate interpersonal pressures, willingness to withstand frustrations and delays, ability to influence behavior of others, and skills of forming social connections for determined purposes.

Although the Trait Approach, or “The Great Man Theory” is not a typical approach, and has not been clearly and leadership-specifically proven, even in this day and age personality tests are implemented, and traits are examined within the framework of employment assessment structures, group dynamics, and observations, in an attempt to identify traits, attribute and predict successful performance in various management or leadership roles [1]. Perhaps those, similarly to Zaccaro’s definition (2007), maintaining that leadership may be more effectively examined by combining several traits and characteristics, in various situations, because the examined traits demonstrate a somewhat stable tendency to lead in different ways, as in organizations, or prove to stem from a broader context, such as an inner drive or moral motives (House, 1971).

In his book “Good to Great”, Collins (2001) presents to a greater extent the more modern dimensions of the Trait Approach to leadership, and its application in the business world as well. Similarly to other books he has written, such as “Built to Last” (Collins, 1994), and others, he investigated excelling business companies which succeeded to survive challenging business and economic conditions, in an attempt to characterize organizational and human traits which may account the organization’s survival capability. According to Collins, there are two situations which may bring about a company’s progress:

1) The “Subordinates” Dimension: referring to those employed in the organization. In this case, the successful leader does not establish a vision, but selects the suitable team, which bears the proper traits, and together with them, he establishes a vision, shaping the business and organizational path, leading to success. Thus, the leader’s skill is to select the individuals most suitable for the organization, who possess the most proper and decent traits for organizational success.

2) The “Leader” Dimension: This dimension seeks to present the process, or the traits which may facilitate the development the leader who is suitable for the organization, and in fact presents five stages. Organizations which survived in varying conditions were rewarded with what he refers to as “Fifth Stage Leadership”, hence those leaders possess traits and skills enabling the organization’s success at any case. Let it be emphasized that Collins assigns and portrays a different role to each organizational stage, and various dimensions to its development. A brief review may emphasize the following components of each stage:

Stage One: Portrays a talented individual, who owns knowledge and professionalism, from which he contributes for the organization’s success. He works individually.

Stage Two: The individual becomes a team member. At this stage, an interaction with people and partners who share the same goal occurs. An individual who invests his abilities in favor of the team's goal, and is able to work with a team, placing the team's goal before his own.

Stage Three: Referring to the skilled manager who has received a goal or an objective which he has not established, but succeeded in drawing and leading his subordinates to the goal and the process under his responsibility.

Stage Four: Referring to an effective manager, who possesses a vision. The effective leader will possess the ability to connect the employees to his vision and recruit the organizational environment in his favor.

Stage Five: An integrated, highest level manager, who possesses traits of humility and modesty on the one hand. On the other hand, he is resolute and charismatic, with an intense desire to fulfill the goals established.

Fifth stage leaders are those who do not view themselves and their own benefit as the focus of their interaction with the environment, but rather, the benefit of the organizational environment and its goals. They may be characterized as ambitious, but their ambition will not be channeled toward their own promotion, but first and foremost toward the organization and its success. The willpower is manifested by resoluteness and determination to promote the organization, where all employees are involved in its success, not only the one serves as its head, aside from humility and modesty, while assuming responsibility for lack of success, and when damages occur.

Collins states that there are some individuals who possess the traits to become Fifth Stage leaders, while some lack those components. Those who bear the potential to fulfill Fifth Stage leadership may develop it under the appropriate circumstances – introspection, conscious personal development, guidance by a leader of great stature, substantial life experience, and so forth. Thus, it may be concluded that even in this day and age and in the research of the field of organizations, the Trait Approach is still relevant and is further validated in management methods.

Often, the proper “set of trait” for leadership development and application is published in magazines and included in professional training proposals. For example, the American Management Association (AMA, 2013) published on its website “Six Skills That Will Make You a Leader” [2], offering a review and enhancement of traits which may be of assistance to the leader in fulfilling his ability. Some of the traits mentioned are:

- A. Leadership: Leadership content development programs.
- B. Communication: Message conveying skills, communication and the community, effective communication
- C. Leadership and Critical Thinking: Decision making, strategic thinking, and vision planning

D. Collaboration: How to achieve success and leadership through others; leadership by means of emotional intelligence, persuasion and influence techniques

E. Finances: Finances and investments management, budget planning, economic forecasts

F. Project Management: Employing Microsoft technologies, teamwork; project management – summary.

NSW government in Australia, in collaboration with the Australian Business Council developed training and practice courses for those employees who are interested in succeeding in their jobs and become promoted (Springall, 2008). Along with 150 leading employees, combined with research and academic literature, they formulated a list containing seven skills which are essential to develop in order to succeed at work and become promoted:

A. Communication Skills; which contribute to productive relationship with employees and customers.

B. Teamwork Skills, contributing work relations with other employees and customers.

C. Problem Solution Skills; which enhance productiveness of results.

D. Initiative and Leading Skills; inducing innovativeness and productive leadership

E. Independent Learning and Practice Skills; for personal responsibility, independent progress, and productivity.

F. Planning and Organization Skills; contributing to satisfaction within the business environment, managerial environment, and among the customers.

G. Technological Skills; for effective completion of tasks

Based upon those, the government developed courses and training programs for employees, managers, and leaders in a government training school [3] which encounters thousands of students who seek to acquire a set of instruments for success at their work and for a rapid promotion in the organization.

To sum up, the Trait Approach, or “The Great Man Theory”, addresses from its beginning to a set of traits which may not be truly learned or acquired, since they are innate, lasting traits, or present as a potential for an individual who has not yet fulfilled his ability to acquire them. The variety of researches conducted through the years have collected ten thousands of traits relevant to leadership, and the most common critique of this approach is probably the traits’ reliability and research consistency, namely, the traits defined as leadership traits did not repeat in different situations and different times. Furthermore, the “Great Man Theory” focuses on the traits of the leaders themselves, not addressing at all the organizational environment, and neither their subordinates. This approach to research has, in time, lost its dimensions, which were mentioned previously, particularly due to various studies [4], which were conducted early in the 20th century, referring to the environmental aspect and to the employees within sociological, managerial, and leadership processes. Combined together, those established the

foundation for a new, or an additional approach, which will allow to investigate the development of leadership based upon the individual's action, not only based upon his traits, also considering his organizational, human environment. This approach will be titled "The Behavioral Approach".

#### **4. The Behavioral Approach and Leadership Development**

The behavioral approach is based upon learning through conditioning, namely, a process of learning and adopting leadership skills and instruments, which are behavioral instruments, acquired through classical conditioning and operant conditioning, thus given the proper set of stimuli, namely, a positive stimulus, a negative stimulus, and a punishment system, leadership may be induced, molded, and taught. The approach maintains that the stimuli and responses are universal, thus the conditioning set given in the east and in the west do not differ from one another. Rather, the instruments will be available for leadership development in any case. At this point, let it be emphasized that this approach does not address the way leaderships are elected, but the way in which leadership occurs, while addressing leadership's effectiveness aspect.

In 1939, with World War II in the background, which also involved an ideological conflict between "democratic" and "autocratic" leaderships, three researchers, Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) established three working teams consisting of ten year olds. Each group included five boys who painted pictures. Each group was guided by an adult "leader", who was instructed to act according to the research's framework. In order to examine the long term effectiveness framework, the children's teamwork lasted several weeks. The leaders would work by three clear methods. In fact, each method emphasized another situation which allows the development of leadership:

1) The first leadership style was defined as an autocratic, authoritative leader; his leadership style was characterized by clearly establishing policy, work methods, and progress stages. He would even reveal only one step ahead, thereby preserving the vagueness. The authoritative leader was not actively involved at work, was rather dominant while facing the group, and personally provided positive or negative feedbacks. 45% of the statements he made, were orders; 11% were orders interrupting a wish or a child's act; abundant personal, negative, non-constructive criticism.

2) Democratic Style Leadership led the group through pleasant group processes. The decision making process involved all group members. The whole work plan involved the control components. The democratic leader allowed the group members to choose their working teams, as well as to establish the tasks. The nature of the feedback that leader provided were objective, and he made an effort to demonstrate availability and involvement in accomplishing the tasks and objectives determined within group. 24% percent of all behaviors included guiding suggestions; 16% of the behaviors were a manifestation of encouraging self-guidance; egalitarian

attitude toward all members, did not call attention to their leading position. The feedbacks he provided were objective in nature.

3) A “Laissez faire” leader took a side position, allowing the group to act as it wished. The leader allowed the group full freedom in establishing its policy and work methods, or choosing partners. The leadership style with the group merely included providing material and information when requested. The “Laissez faire” leader would not provide feedbacks on a regular basis, and responded by small, spontaneous comments on the boys’ work. 49% percent of the behaviors involved providing information, but not guidance.

The research’s results indicated significant differences in the boys’ behaviors among themselves and their attitude toward the leader. As for the outputs, two main aspects were considered; the output aspect, along with the long-term output aspect. The group output under the leadership of a Laissez faire leader was significantly lower than the outputs demonstrated by the two remaining groups, while the difference between the latter two groups was insignificant, yet tended toward the authoritative group. The matter was mostly manifested in the long term, as it was revealed that in the democratic group, the motivation level was higher, and the boys continued working even in the absence of the democratic leader. Their group consciousness was more developed than the other groups’. In the long term, the output, which increased, was most influenced.

On the other hand, in the group led by an authoritative leader, the boys developed a more dependent, submissive behavior than in the other group, surfacing hatred and hostility, including hostility against “scapegoats”. This hostility resulted in manifestations of self-destruction, work abandonment. The boys openly expressed their satisfaction when the work with the authoritative leader came to an end, and most boys obviously preferred to work with the democratic leader. Presumably, not only does a democratic leadership style affect the group atmosphere, but also on the outputs. Plus, the long term output of such a group may exceed the output of group acting under an authoritative leader.

Similarly to the research presented above, the organizational leadership researcher Likert (1967) investigated the leadership methods by four styles prevailing in organizations:

- 1) Exploitative-Authoritative leadership
- 2) Benevolent-Authoritative leadership
- 3) Consultative leadership
- 4) Democratic leadership

Likert found that the democratic leaders were the most effective ones, and ranking the highest in all of the following four aspects:

- 1) Granting the employees support, friendship, and attention
- 2) Group unity, encouraging opinion exchange, group work
- 3) Focusing upon the goal, encouraging to put forth effort, strictly abiding by standards

4) Encouraging employees as a group toward initiative, work planning and organization.

Exploitative-Authoritative leaders were found to rank the lowest in all parameters. Additional researches in economic, industrial, and even military organizations reinforced the conclusion that democratic leadership is most effective at the context of outputs, all of which yielding a series of organizational “democratic leadership” training programs for managers.

## **5. Ohio and Michigan Researches**

In the 1950's, two universities – Ohio State University, followed by Michigan State University, embarked on many leadership researches, which are perceived as pioneering studies in the behavioral approach research, also focusing in studying leadership aspects through the employees, rather than the managers. In the Ohio researches, subordinates in large organizations, civil organizations, and military organizations were investigated. They were requested to portray the leader's/manager's behaviors through questionnaires, which included portrayals of various behaviors (for example, the manager would inform his subordinates when they have done a decent job, or, for instance, conveys clear expectations, expresses concern for the employees as individuals, etc.).

1) Initiating Structure: Task-oriented, engaging in role determination, work arrangements, determining work relations and goal establishment; referred to, at times, as goal- or task-oriented.

2) Consideration: People-oriented, develops mutual trust, expresses respect for subordinates' ideas, concerned with their feelings, treats everybody as equal, assisting in resolving personal problems; referred to, at times, as “social” or “promotional”.

The earliest Ohio studies were satisfied with identifying leadership styles, and did not engage in the question who of those types will be more effective until a later course, when the researches investigated effectiveness dimensions, and were convinced of relevant differences. The consideration style was found to be more strongly connected to the individual. It was noticed that the considerate leader's subordinates were more satisfied with their position, were more motivated, and more respectful to the leader. However, when the group or organization effectiveness, or productiveness was examined, the initiating structure leader was found to be more effective. Hence, it may be concluded that both types are effective, but their effectiveness is manifested in different forms.

Simultaneously to Ohio studies, the Michigan studies were conducted, aiming at examining dimensions of effective leadership. Similarly to Ohio studies, the Michigan researchers identified two main leadership styles:

1) Task-oriented leader – similar in character to the Initiating Structure leader, as specified above.

2) People-oriented leader – similar in character to the considerate leader, as specified above.

Contrary to studies which preceded and followed Michigan studies, the latter revealed that the people-oriented leader is more effective also in the group productivity dimension and the satisfaction dimension. In other words, those studies identified a people-oriented leader's priority.

The studies attempted to address, among other questions, the question whether a leader may be both people- and task-oriented. At this context, the Ohio and Michigan studies were not consensual. The latter referred to both styles as two extremes of the same scale. Namely, a leader may not be both people- and task-oriented. The more task-oriented the leader is, he will be necessarily less people-oriented, and vice versa. In their opinion, the two styles are contradictory in terms of behavior, thus a leader may not be characterized as both. Ohio studies, on the other hand, referred to both styles is independent on one another, hence the leader could have attained high values in both dimensions, low values in both, or high values in one style and low values in the other.

## **6. Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid**

Following the Ohio team, and based upon them, two researchers, Blake and Mouton (1964) developed a leadership style analysis model, titled "The Managerial Grid", or "The Leadership Grid", which refers to two dimensions based upon Ohio researches, namely, people-focused or product-focused. Blake and Mouton divided each dimension into nine levels. Eventually, the combination of both dimensions yielded 81 prospective leadership styles. Each of the style's dimensions is divided into nine levels, forming a "net", or a "grid", containing 81 possible leadership types. The following lines will address a few;

The style 9.9 demonstrates a maximum interest on the manager's part both in output and concern of his subordinates. Managers who are characterized by this style integrate various types of power sources in their belief and behavior, so as to achieve maximum output, yet succeed to express utmost consideration to their employees, and sensitivity to their needs. An agreement between the manager and his subordinates, and his sensitivity toward human needs yield the development of mutual trust and respect. Blake & Mouton refer to this style as "Team Style";

A manager, who takes style 1.1, will express minimal interest in either output or people. A manager of that style will only act within the framework of minimum output requirements and human needs in his organization. This style is referred to as "The impoverished style".

Style 5.5 is referred to as "Middle of the road" style, expressing the manager's tendency to balancing organization's performance requirements and the need to be considerate of employees' morale and personal needs.

Style 1.9 expresses a minimal tendency to obtain outputs in the organization, along with a maximum tendency to fulfill human needs and expectation therein. Such a manager will devote most of his attention to his subordinates, and their satisfaction will be held as most important.

Blake & Mouton referred to that style as “Country club style”. A manager who is characterized by this style emphasizes the pleasant, positive atmosphere, radiates friendship, etc.

Style 9.1 implies a maximum tendency to aim at obtaining outputs and of a minimum tendency to tend to human needs and problems in the organization. A manager who is characterized by this style will demand compliance with authority, emphasizing that the core of group behavior is task performance and attaining satisfactory outcomes. For this purpose, he will induce working conditions which will facilitate effective executive behavior.

As suggested, the offered model eliminates the limitation posed by the styles continuum, which entails some compromise between them, when the presence of such a limitation causes a certain style to supersede another. The Managerial Grid refines the combination prospects of both styles, based upon the assumption which allows both dimensions a dynamic part.

### **7. The Situational Approach in Exploring Leadership: Reddin’s Four Style Model**

As opposed to the Traits Approach, which crowns the leader based upon his innate traits, and to the Behavioral approach, which portrays the condition process which the leader undergoes and conveys while inducing leadership and in social situations, which occur in group settings, the Situational Approach labels the leader, or portrays the prospect of leadership developing by the situation. In other words, it is the right person, at the right time, and in the right group. If an individual possesses the ability to interpret the situation, to be involved in it and modify his behavior according to the situation, he will be able maintain his leadership. When a leader is unable to interpret the given situation, he will fail (Fiedler, 1964, 1978; Friedman, 1992).

Behavior researcher William Reddin (1970) proposed a complex model, which addresses situational variables and leadership style variable. Reddin specified four basic leadership styles, constituting a consequence of placing of each leader on a continuum between two dimensions; the task orientation and the social orientation. Reddin argues that each of the basic styles may be either effective or ineffective, and there is importance not only to employing leadership style, but to matching the leader type to the led organization’s condition. Thus, there is no uniform, ideal leadership style for every place and every time. Rather, the set of traits is altered, and the style’s effectiveness is associated with the circumstances under which the leader acts. There are conditions which demand order fulfilling, such as crisis situations, where the task-oriented style is effective, or there may be situations where a task-oriented task may arouse resistance. Hence, Reddin presents a tri-dimensional theory, which examines leadership styles by the following three dimensions: task orientation, relationship orientation, effectiveness. Each of the above dimensions refer a continuum of traits, each standing by itself, thus a leader may be assessed differently in each dimension. An analysis based upon the three dimensions yields four leadership styles.

1) The “Dedicated” style – proves itself as an effective style; a leader who devotes most of his power to the task. As a “Benevolent Autocrat”, he is revealed as effective, thanks to his

determination, intensity, and initiative, but as an ineffective leader the dedicated leader will become an “Autocrat”. He functions ineffectively and does not win his subordinates’ sympathy and support, he is critical and threatening, does not consult while making decision, but decides independently and demands full compliance.

2) The “Related” style is associated with a leader who extensively relates to his subordinates. As a developer, he is revealed as an effective leader, who works with collaboration, thanks to which, the two-way communication, understanding his subordinates, nurturing their talent, and encouraging them to demonstrate initiative and trusting him. However, when such a leader appears as a “Missionary”, his leadership will not be effective, causing him to act ineffectively, since most of his power is channeled toward casting a positive impression upon the subordinates at any cost, and on the tasks’ accounts, rendering himself dependent upon them.

3) The “Separated” style – such a leader follows instructions, observes every detail, acts irrationally, and is viewed as responsible. A “separated” leader is known as one little relating to both subordinates and the task, as a “Beaurocrat”. He is an effective leader, because he demonstrates responsibility, honesty, fairness, and loyalty in connection to following instructions and the customary procedures. As a “Deserter”, he will be ineffective, as neither does he take initiative, nor does he apply any effort beyond the required minimum.

4) The “Integrated” style – an effective leader who makes decision in a team setting, who extensively relates to his subordinates and to the task. As an “Executive”, he avoids emphasizing his power, but encourages and motivates his subordinates toward achieving the goals. As a “Compromiser” he is ineffective, since he acts out of weakness, submits to pressures, demonstrating an unassertive behavior and inability to make decision, thereby arousing mistrust among his subordinates.

In Reddin’s opinion, leadership effectiveness is a consequence of proper, circumstance-appropriate implementation of a leadership style. In other words, there is more than one leadership style which applies to a given situation. The variable, therefore, is the leadership style’s effectiveness, which is, as stated, subject to the leader’s selection.

## **8. The Situational Approach: Fiedler’s LPC Situational Dependence Model**

Similarly to Reddin, Fiedler’s Situation-Dependence Model (1967), seeks to investigate who is the leader appropriate for a given situation, and what is the proper style by which the leader should act, according to his situation. According to Fiedler, there are two leader type groups. The former type is a “task-oriented” leader, aiming at performing the task at hand, and a “social” leader, who is oriented toward the relationships within the group. Both types constitute two extremes of a continuum, such that the highly “task-oriented” leader must be low in the social aspect, and vice versa. Those two patterns may be selected in accordance with the given situation. The Dependence Model assumes that the dependence of leader’s characteristics and the situation’s characteristics determines leadership effectiveness. Leaders of one type will be

effective in certain situations, while other leaders will be effective in situations of different natures.

For the purpose of characterizing the leader and his style, Fiedler developed the LPC questionnaire for managers, in which the manager was instructed to reflect on the employee with whom he faced the greatest difficulties and discomfort at work, throughout his professional history. The questionnaire presented a scale of values, in which the manager was instructed to rank his feelings at work toward that employee. The numerical values were ranked upon a seven or eight point scales, and the feelings to be ranked were associated with relationships; for example, pleasant/unpleasant; supportive/not supportive; friendly/unfriendly. The manager was instructed to compute the points, which yielded a numerical value for his leadership style. Although the manager describes the employee, the score in Fiedler's questionnaire is the manager's. In other words, the questionnaire examines the manager's attitude toward the employee, rather than the employee himself. In this questionnaire, the lower the manager's rank, namely the more negative his description of the employee was, Fiedler concludes the manager's LPC is low, and vice versa. The maximum score is  $16 \times 8$ , while the minimum score is  $16 \times 1$ . The significance of a high LPC implies people-orientation, while a low LPC indicates task-orientation. The questionnaire's and the numerical value's basic assumption is that a manager who was able to identify the positive parts of an individuals with whom he was facing difficulties at work was a person-oriented manager, while the manager who failed to identify the positive parts of his employee is, perhaps, task-oriented.

According to Fiedler, an individual's leadership style is constant. It is viewed as some personality trait whose modification is impossible, or very difficult. Therefore, if a leader does not serve a given situation, he may be replaced, or the situation might be altered, but the individual's leadership style may not be altered.

The Dependence Model consists of three dimensions, which facilitate investigating the effective leadership style:

A. The first dimension concerns the relationship of the leader and his subordinates; when the relationship is decent, the situation is convenient, but when the relationship is bad, the situation will be inconvenient.

B. The second dimension concerns the task structure. When the group's goal is well-established, and the means for its achievement are clear, the task is well-structured, and the situation, in turn, is to the leader's convenience. When the goal and the means for achieving thereof are vague, the task will not be structured, and the situation will be inconvenient.

C. The third dimension concerns the leader's power position. This condition refers to the leader's ability to reward his subordinates, or to penalize them. If he is able to either reward or penalize, he is in a strong position, and the situation will be convenient. If he is unable to do so, then he is in a weak position, and in an inconvenient situation.

Upon the foundation laid by the three dimensions, Fiedler formulated instruction as to the proper way of action in the various situations, suggesting when it will be proper to adopt a task-oriented leadership pattern, and when it will be proper to adopt a people-oriented behavior pattern. It is rightfully emphasized that an alteration in one of the dimensions alone requires a re-investigation of the proper leadership style and adoption of a situation-appropriate pattern.

- The required behavior when all three dimensions are marked (-); task-oriented leadership; in order to influence the employees, the leader is required to orient toward achieving the goal.
- The required behavior when all three dimensions are marked (+); task-oriented leadership; when the leader has already gained influence over his employees, he is to continue applying energy to the task.
- The required behavior in mixed situations (-, +); social leadership; in order to lead the employees, the leader is to support and care for the employees, connecting them to the task at hand.

## 9. Modeling Leadership

An early conception of Formative Leadership was formulated by Burns (1978), within the framework of a descriptive research of political leaders. In his work, Burns portrayed formative leadership as a process where “leaders and subordinates cause one another to rise to higher levels of values and motivation”. Those leaders seek to extend the subordinates’ awareness by addressing higher ideals and moral values, such as freedom, justice, equality, peace, and humanitarianism, rather than to lower emotions, such as fear, greediness, jealousy, or hatred. He described leadership as “a current of developing interaction, in which leaders constantly arouse motivation responses among the subordinates, altering their behavior when they encountered responsiveness or resistance, through a constant process of flow and counter-flow”. In his opinion, formative leadership may be viewed as either a process in which individuals influence one another, and as a high, or social level process of power recruitment, so as to alter social systems and heal establishments.

Bass (1985) proposed a formative leadership theory, which complements Burns’ (1978) more primal ideas. He maintains that the extent to which a leader is formative, is first and foremost measured in terms of his influence on his subordinates. A formative leader’s subordinates feel trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect toward the leader, and they are motivated to act than they expected to begin with. The leader molds and motivates subordinates in the following ways:

- 1) Enhancing subordinates’ awareness as for the importance of the task’s outcomes.
- 2) Persuading his subordinates to rise above their personal interests, in favor of the organization or the team.
- 3) Employing their higher-order needs.

Bass argues that formative leadership consists of three components; charisma, intellectual arousal, and consideration toward the individual. Charisma was described as a process through which influences subordinates by arousing intense emotions and identification with the leader, encouragement and developmental experiences.

A recent amended version of the theory added another formative behavior, called inspiration (or inspirational motivation), which is defined as the extent to which the leader conveys a vision in a heart-moving mode, implements symbols in order to focus his subordinates' effort, demonstrating proper behavior. This version is presented in detail hereunder.

### **10. Formative Leadership – Leadership's Full Range Model**

Bass and Avolio developed the Leadership's Full Range Model which discusses the relationship of leadership style and effectiveness (Bass, Avolio, 1990). The model suggests that each leader, in his behavior, employs different leadership styles, which are placed on a continuum ranging from laissez faire, through rewarding leadership, to transformational leadership. Those leadership behaviors form a constant continuum in terms of effectiveness and leader's activity. Leadership-characterizing transformational leadership is more effective and active than behaviors which characterizing rewarding leadership or laissez faire leadership.

The innovation in the proposed model is the hypothesis that transformational leadership complements rewarding leadership, enhancing leader's effectiveness. It may not be effective on its own. Without rewarding leadership's skills and behaviors, even highly inspirational transformational leaders will not be able to achieve their goals. However, according to the model, leaders' ability to sweep their subordinates to demonstrate efforts and accomplishments beyond personal profitability stems from the transformational leadership. The hypothesis, upon which the model is based, is that leadership may be ranked by the scope of its influence's effectiveness and activeness. Many researches found organization managers' leadership styles to be correlated to those organizations' level of performance. Apparently, the higher the manager's/leader's scale of formative leader is estimated, the higher the levels of performance of the organization he leads. The model consists of four main categories; Laissez Faire, Management by Exception – Passive and Active; Rewarding Leadership, and Formative Leadership. Those four categories are divided into eight different factors on a processive continuum.

1) Laissez Faire Leadership Style: The most prominent characteristic to that leader's behavior is avoidance of taking a stand, making decisions, and, in fact, any action. As a matter of fact, this non-active type of leadership abolishes any attempt to influence. This leader's subordinates, who receive no guidance or support, will usually demonstrate indifference and non-involvement, tending to focus upon their own goals, even if they contradict the organization's or the group's goals. However, this type of leadership will also allow the development of alternative leaders from among the participants themselves.

2) Management by Exceptions- Passive: This leadership, in fact, consists of identifying mistakes and their modification. Those leaders strongly believe the statement “if it ain’t broke – don’t fix it”. They only focus upon putting out fires, namely, superficial solving of problems, making no effort to establish new, enhanced standards. The subordinates’ of a passive management by exceptions will be mainly motivated by the concern with the leader’s harsh response to any case of failure. Consequently, they managed to maintain the existing standard, at best, but will not exceed it.

3) Management by Exceptions – Active: This leadership style also focuses upon identifying exceptions, deviations, and failures to maintain the existing level. This leader actively follows potentially hazardous areas, where problems have aroused, or are about to arouse, attempting to identify and amend them as swiftly as possible. Subordinates of such leaders do not usually demonstrate high-level performance. Worse yet, leaders who dictate a policy “do not dare change lest you spoil” are risking by their employees’ avoiding basic risks and will show no initiative and “thinking out of the box” in their work.

4) Contingent Reward: A leader who extensively employs leadership on a contingent reward basis, emphasizing in his behavior the exchange aspects of leadership. That type of a leader will clearly establish goals, objectives, and set the reward for achieving thereof. The very establishment of objectives may be one-sided, on the leader’s part, but may also be based upon a negotiation of the leader and his subordinates. In this instance, the leader is active while performing the task, provides a constructive feedback, when his subordinates deserve it. The main motives underlying the subordinates’ willingness is profitability, the expected reward’s attractiveness, or, alternately, the scope of deterring from penalty.

The four stages presented above are capable of inducing collaboration with the leader on the subordinates’ part, based upon profitability considerations and meeting the required level of performance. However, reflecting upon ideal leadership figures, capable of guiding their subordinates toward levels of performance exceeding the basic requirements, stemming from inner commitment, rather than profitability considerations, entails examination of the following four model components, which refer to the Formative Leadership.

5) Individual Consideration: In this instance, the leader extensively implements individual consideration and attention, responding to his employees’ needs by means of guidance and mentoring. His underlying idea is supporting the employee to risk and attempt, without fear of being mistaken. The leader demonstrates understanding to his subordinates’ personal concerns, insisting on treating each as an individual with unique needs, rather than another small screw. The individual consideration reduces employees’ frustration, enhancing willingness to collaborate and the desire to contribute and grow.

6) Intellectual Stimulation: In this case, the leader’s approach is to question basic assumptions which guided the mode in which problems were handled previously. Rather, the subordinates are encouraged to inquire a problem from several points of view, not to handle the problems on behalf of the employee, but to provide the proper critical tools, which will facilitate them in

solving the problem. A leader who employs intellectual consideration encourages his subordinates to question, to express openness to criticism, and to demonstrate utmost innovativeness in their solutions.

7) Inspirational Stimulation: A leader who motivates and inspires his subordinates by presenting a prospect for a different future. The implication of investing in the “here and now” is conveyed through a message suggesting a more attractive future, with which the subordinates profoundly identify. Plus, the leader conveys a message of his confidence in his ability to achieve that future, and great faith, enhancing their own expectations from themselves.

8) Idealized Influence: This leadership establishes a moral, behavioral model. Such leaders will demonstrate power, confidence, consistency, and tenacity. They are willing to sacrifice personal interests in order to assist others. They do not hesitate to take risk whenever necessary, and will not avoid assuming full responsibility for their subordinates’ actions. They employ power only if the task calls for it. Such a leader will be fully trust by his subordinates. They adopt his values, and his vision becomes their own. Bass and Avolio maintain that the leader employs the full range of behaviors. The very ability to fully employ that range distinguishes the effective leader from the non-effective leader, as leaders who frequently employ the formative leadership range will be the most effective leaders, while those who will frequently employ the rewarding leadership range will be less effective.

In conclusion, the phenomenon of leadership has been observed and researched for roughly 100 years and various scholars have tried to explain its development as well as examine the tools that enable its advancement. This paper provides a comprehensive overview and explanation of the leading approaches to leadership research.

## Notes

[1] For example; public service’s admission tests and psychological characterization in various assessment employment structures.

[2] Originally titled “Six skills that will make you indispensable”.

[3] Information regarding the school and the courses offered: <https://www.tafensw.edu.au/>.

[4] For example, Carey 1967.

## References:

Amit, K., M. Popper et al. (2008). Leadership Development: A Comparative Study of Non-Leadership Leaders. // Trends, Vol. 45, No. 3, 464-488 [in Hebrew].

Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership and Performance, New York: Free Press.

- Bass, B.M., B.J. Avolio (1990). The Implications of Transactional and Transformational Leadership for Individual, Team and Organizational Development. // *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Vol. 4, 231-272.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Carey, A. (1967). The Hawthorne Studies: A Radical Criticism. // *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 32, No. 3, 403-416.
- Collins J., J.I. Porras (1994). *Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*, New York: HarperCollins.
- Collins. J. (2001). *The Wheel of Momentum: From Good to Great*. Tel Aviv: Pecker Publishers.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1967) *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1978). Recent Developments in Research on the Contingency Model. // L. Berkowitz (Ed.). *Group Process*. New York: Academic Press.
- Friedman, A. (2012). *Crony Capitalism in Israel: Committee Report* [in Hebrew].
- House, R. J. (1971). A Path Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness. // *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 3, 321-339.
- Lewin, K., R. Lippitt, R. K. White (1939). Patterns of Aggressive Behaviors in Experimentally Created Social Climates. // *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 271-299.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lord, R. G., C. L. De Vader, G. M. Alliger (1986). A Meta-Analysis of the Relation Between Personality Traits and Leadership Perceptions: An Application of Validity Generalization Procedures. // *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 71, No. 3, 402-410.
- Reddin, W. J. (1970). *Managerial Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Springall, J. (2008). *Keys to Work: A Teaching Kit for Developing the Employability Skills of CALD Learners*. Melbourne: Adult Multicultural Education Services.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. // *The Journal of psychology*, Vol. 25, No. 1, 35-71.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: Free Press.
- Terman, L.M. (1904). A Preliminary Study in the Psychology and Pedagogy of Leadership. // *The Pedagogical Seminary*, Vol. 11, No. 4, 413-483.
- Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-Based Perspectives of Leadership. // *American Psychologist*, Vol. 62, No.1, 6-16.