

Leadership

Mandela Oniemola, Professor Olalekan Asikhia

MPhil. Business Administration (Strategic Management), Babcock University, Nigeria

Abstract: - This article examines and evaluates major leadership theories, as well as summarizes findings from empirical leadership research. Major topics and controversies include leadership versus management, leader traits and skills, leader behaviour and activities, leader power and influence, situational determinants of leader behaviour, transformational leadership, the importance of leadership for organizational effectiveness, and leadership as an attributional process. This article attempts to provide some clarity on the major topics mentioned above. Over time there have been several writings about the importance of leadership in driving change, achieving organizational goals, and facilitating appropriate responses to many other life challenges however stakeholders have also argued that strong leadership is required, particularly during difficult times such as conflicts, economic meltdowns, or flu pandemics. What leadership means, what competencies are required to be a leader, and what role the application of leadership plays in successfully responding to challenges are all unclear in this dialogue. These questions are pertinent to the advancement of an institution, nation or a discipline and profession. The consensus among many academics and practitioners is that the growth of thinking over time has created a perception that leadership is a fluid developmental process, with each new piece of research building on and extending earlier studies rarely ignoring anything that came before it completely. Main conceptions that arose in the 20th century are the Great Man Theory, Trait Theory, Process Leadership Theory, Style and Behavioral Theory and Laissez Faire, transformational, and transactional leadership theories.

I. INTRODUCTION

At the heart of leadership is the attribute of credibility, which is typically earned through demonstrated ethical and transparent approaches to practice. Leaders take calculated risks and speak up, when necessary, against the status quo and step forward to take responsibility and show initiative when needed. This type of in practice, behaviour necessitates strategic thinking interpersonal communication abilities and emotional intelligence, we all exhibit and require leadership abilities to be effective in our daily practice. Leadership can be defined in a variety of ways, but at its most basic, it is concerned with the ability to influence others to achieve goals. The process and characteristics needed to effectively influence others are central to understanding leadership. There is a well-established literature that describes the personal characteristics of leaders such as having a big picture vision that is effectively shared and making clear and decisive decisions based on an assessment of available information. Leaders are committed to building capacity and empowering others, are respectful and consultative, but are also willing to make difficult decisions when necessary. Leadership can also be described as the ability of an executive to direct, guide, and influence the behaviour and work of others to achieve specific goals in each situation.

A manager's ability to instil confidence and zeal in his or her subordinates is referred to as leadership. The human factor is what holds a group together and motivates it to achieve its goals. One of the classic definitions of leadership is that "Leadership is the quality that distinguishes great managers from good ones.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Leadership Styles

Leadership styles, according to Bass and Avolio (1993), are behaviours or processes that leaders conduct or participate in that enable extraordinary things to be done in or by the organization. To succeed, businesses require skilled, knowledgeable, and dedicated team members. Interactions between colleagues and leaders, on the other hand, have had a significant impact on employee commitment. Commitment is complex and ongoing, requiring employers or managers to find ways to improve their employees' work lives (Meyer et al., 2004; Avolio et al. 2004). Failure by leaders to ensure this can result in the loss of valued employees who place a premium on the organization's success. Thus, the commitment of capable employees is critical to the organization's success. Leadership theories had primarily focused on increasing production and improving operations to make operations more efficient. According to Bass (1985), in leadership theories, employee motivation is only a means to an end. Furthermore, Vroom's expectancy theory (1982) demonstrates that receiving rewards and avoiding punishment motivates employees. Employees thus linked their level of effort to the expected outcome. As a result, transactional leaders understood their employees' needs and how to meet those needs in exchange for the appropriate level of effort, according to Bass (1985). Researchers, on the other hand, observed situations in which individuals were led by visionary and charismatic leaders who helped their organizations achieve more than was previously thought possible (Bass, 1985; House, 1977; and Bryman, 1992). However, these findings aided in the development of transformational and transactional leadership theories, which were later expanded to include the full range of Leadership theories which transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire leadership styles. According to the number of papers on the subject, transformational leadership is one of the most popular models, and it has sparked global interest, as evidenced by numerous doctoral theses around the world. Political leaders eager to reform their educational systems considering international league tables, such as the Programme for International Student Assessment, have also adopted the concept (PISA). It implies a powerful influence process in which (often charismatic) leaders persuade followers to adopt

certain behaviours to effect what the leader sees as beneficial change. The central concept here is 'vision,' and followers are encouraged to seek a 'better' future for the organization and to commit to pursuing the goals that result from the vision however, the vision is not always shared, which can have negative consequences. Izhak Berkovich investigates three widely held beliefs about transformational leadership. First, transformational leadership behaviours of principals are more prevalent in restructuring national contexts. Second, transformational behaviours outperform transactional behaviours in terms of effectiveness and finally, principals can be transformational or transactional however in terms of the number of papers published in three leading journals, including EMAL, he demonstrates that transformational leadership is second only to instructional leadership. The author demonstrates that the literature does not support the three commonly held beliefs. For example, transactional models may be complementary to transformational behaviours rather than contradictory, and principals may exhibit both sets of behaviours, not just one. He concludes that leadership concepts vary depending on context, task, and complexity.

Transactional leadership focuses solely on everything in terms of explicit and implicit contractual relationships such that employees' self-interest in their jobs is emphasized because of various employment conditions, disciplinary codes, and benefit structures, as well as all job assignments. Employees generally work less collaboratively because they prefer to work independently most of the time however, transactional leadership allows leaders and followers to collaborate rather than work separately. Furthermore, followers are rewarded if they meet goals or meet performance standards (Trottier et al., 2008; Bass et al., 2003). These types of leaders communicate with their subordinates to explain how a task should be completed and to assure them that there will be rewards for a job well done (Avolio et al. 1991). Transactional leadership provides more benefits and prioritizes meeting specific goals or objectives established by the leader (James & Collins, 2008; Sosik & Dinger, 2007) thus the leader can identify followers who should be rewarded based on their performance.

Managerial leadership on the other hand is an alternative and long-lasting model and this is especially true in centralized systems, where school principals are seen as part of a larger administrative hierarchy tasked with enforcing externally prescribed policies. According to Stanley Semarco and Seokhee Cho, Ghana's principals are expected to be "managerial leaders with administrative oversight." Excessive managerial leadership can lead to managerialism, in which adherence to bureaucratic procedures is valued more than educational goals. Stephanie Chong, Alan Geare, and Roger Willett investigate the impact of managerialism and collegiality in a New Zealand university, concluding that increasing managerialism threatens collegial decision-making. According to Hallinger, instructional and transformational leadership are two of the most important and long-lasting leadership models (1992). They do, however, differ in one important way. Because of its emphasis on improving teaching and learning,

instructional leadership is primarily concerned with the direction of leaders' influence (Bush, 2011; Bush and Glover, 2014). The processes that lead to improvement are secondary to this orientation. Transformational leadership, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with how leaders influence their followers. Leaders are thought to inspire their followers to become more committed to organizational goals (Leithwood et al., 1999). A link between instructional and transformational approaches is possible if organizational goals are centred on learning, but it is far from certain.

2.2 Theories of Leadership

A. The Great-Man Hypothesis

The search for common leadership traits has lasted centuries because most cultures require heroes to define their successes and to justify their failures. In the best interests of the heroes, Thomas Carlyle stated in 1847 that "universal history, the history of what man has accomplished in this world, is at the bottom of the history of the great men who have worked here." In his "great man theory," Carlyle claimed that leaders are born and that only men endowed with heroic potential could ever become leaders. He believed that great men were born rather than made. Sidney Hook, an American philosopher, expanded Carlyle's perspective by emphasizing the impact that could be made by emphasizing the difference between the eventful man and the event-making man (Dobbins & Platz, 2004). (1986).

He proposed that the eventful man remained complex in a historical situation, but that he did not really determine its course. On the other hand, he maintained that the event-creating man's actions influenced the course of events, which could have been very different if he had not been involved in the process. The event that established man's role as the result of "outstanding capacities of intelligence, will, and character rather than distinguished actions. However, subsequent events revealed that this concept of leadership was morally flawed, as was the case with Hitler, Napoleon, and others, calling the credibility of the Great Man theory into question. These great men became irrelevant, and as a result, the growth of the organizations was stifled (MacGregor, 2003). "The passing years have given the coup de grace to another force, the great man, who with brilliance and foresight could preside with dictatorial powers as the head of a growing organization but slowed democratization." Leadership theory then progressed from the dogma that leaders are born or destined by nature to be in their role at a specific time to a reflection of certain traits that indicate a potential for leadership.

B. Traits Theory

Early theorists believed that born leaders possessed physical and personality characteristics that distinguished them from non-leaders. Leadership traits were assumed to be genetic or acquired, according to trait theories. Jenkins identified two types of traits: emergent traits (traits that are heavily influenced by heredity), such as height, intelligence, attractiveness, and self-confidence, and effectiveness traits (based on experience

or learning), such as charisma, as a fundamental component of leadership (Ekvall & Arvonen, 1991).

Max Weber defined charisma as "the greatest revolutionary force, capable of producing a completely new orientation through followers and complete personal devotion to leaders they perceived as endowed with almost magical supernatural, superhuman qualities and powers." This initial emphasis on intellectual, physical, and personality traits that distinguished non-leaders from leaders foreshadowed a study that maintained that only minor differences exist between followers and leaders (Burns, 2003). The failure to detect the traits that every single effective leader shared resulted in the development of trait theory, as an inaccessible component, falling out of favor. Scholars studied the traits of military and non-military leaders in the late 1940s and discovered the importance of certain traits developing at specific times.

C. Theories of Contingency (Situational)

According to contingency theories, no leadership style is precise as a stand-alone because the leadership style used is dependent on factors such as the quality, situation of the followers, or a variety of other variables.

"There is no single right way to lead, according to this theory, because the internal and external dimensions of the environment require the leader to adapt to that particular situation." In most cases, leaders change not only the dynamics and environment of the organization, but also the employees within it. In a broad sense, theories of contingency are a type of behavioral theory that contends that there is no one best way of leading/organizing and that the style of leadership that is employed in some situations is ineffective. Contingency theorists assumed that the leader was the focal point of the leader-subordinate relationship, whereas situational theorists believed that the subordinates were crucial in defining the relationship. Though situational leadership focuses primarily on the leader, it emphasizes the importance of group dynamics. "These studies of group dynamics and leadership have led to some of our modern theories of group dynamics and leadership." According to the theory of situational leadership, leadership style should be matched to the maturity of the subordinates (Bass, 1997). "The situational leadership model, first introduced in 1969, theorized that there was no unrivaled way to lead and that effective leaders must be able to adapt to the situation and transform their leadership style."

D. Behavior and Style Theory

The style theory recognizes the importance of certain necessary leadership skills that serve as enablers for a leader who performs an act while drawing parallels with the leader's previous capacity prior to that particular act while suggesting that each individual has a distinct style of leadership with which he or she feels most contented. One style, like one size does not fit all, cannot be effective in all situations. Yukl (1989) defined three types of leadership styles. Employees serving with democratic leaders demonstrated a high level of satisfaction, creativity, and motivation; worked with great enthusiasm and

energy regardless of the leader's presence or absence; and maintained better connections with the leader in terms of productivity, whereas autocratic leaders did not. Autocratic leaders were primarily concerned with increasing output. In the past, laissez faire leadership was only considered relevant when leading a team of highly skilled and motivated individuals with a proven track record.

E. Process Leadership Theory

Other process-oriented leadership theories include servant leadership, learning organizations, and principal leadership. Others emerge each year, such as centered leadership and charismatic leadership. Greenleaf introduced the servant leadership in the early 1970s in the early 1990s, there was a resurgence of interest in servant leadership. Servant leaders were encouraged to pay attention to their followers' concerns and to sympathize with, care for, and nurture them. The leadership was given to someone who was naturally a servant. "The servant leader is concerned with the needs of the followers and assists them in becoming more autonomous, free, and knowledgeable." The servant leader is also concerned about the "have-nots" and regards them as equals (Greenleaf, 1996). Leaders in leading organizations are to be stewards (servants) of the organization's vision rather than servants of the people within the organization. Leaders in learning organizations clarify and nurture the vision, which they regard as greater than themselves. The leader aligns himself or herself

F. Transactional Theory

By the late 1970s and early 1980s, leadership theories had begun to diverge from the specific perspectives of the leader, leadership context, and follower and toward practices that focused more on the exchanges between followers and leaders. Transactional leadership was defined as leader-follower relationships based on a series of agreements between followers and leaders (House & Shamir, 1993).

The transactional theory was "based on reciprocity, in which leaders not only influence followers but also are influenced by them." According to some studies, transactional leadership differs in terms of the level of the leader's action and the nature of the leader's relationships with the followers. Transactional leadership was defined by Bass and Avolio (1994) as "a type of contingent-reward leadership that had active and positive exchange between leaders and followers whereby followers were rewarded or recognized for accomplishing agreed upon objectives." These rewards may include gratitude from the leader for merit increases, bonuses, and work achievement. Positive reinforcement for good work could be exchanged, as could merit pay for promotions, increased performance, and cooperation for collegiality. Instead, the leaders could concentrate on errors, avoid responses, and postpone decisions. This is known as "management-by-exception," and it can be classified as passive or active transactions. The timing of the leader's involvement determines the distinction between these two types of transactions. The leader in the active form constantly monitors performance and attempts to intervene.

G. Transformational Theory

Transformational leadership distinguishes itself from the rest of the previous and contemporary theories by entails involvement of followers in processes or activities related to personal factor towards the organization and a course that will yield certain superior social dividend. Transformational leaders increase the motivation and morale of both followers and leaders (House & Shamir, 1993). Transformational leaders are thought to "engage in interactions with followers based on shared values, beliefs, and goals." This influences performance, which leads to goal achievement. Transformational leadership, according to Bass, "attempts to induce followers to reorder their needs by transcending self-interests and striving for higher order needs." This theory is consistent with Maslow's (1954) higher order needs theory. Transformational leadership is a path that focuses on beliefs, values, and attitudes that enlighten leaders' practices and their ability to lead change.

According to the literature, followers and leaders set aside personal interests for the benefit of the group. The leader is then tasked with focusing on the needs and input of the followers in order to transform everyone into a leader by empowering and motivating them (House & Aditya, 1997). The emphasis on previously defined leadership theories, as well as the ethical dimensions of leadership, further distinguishes transformational leadership. Transformational leaders are defined by their ability to identify the need for change, gain others' agreement and commitment, create a vision that guides change, and embed the change (MacGregor Bums, 2003).

These leaders treat their subordinates as individuals and strive to develop their consciousness, morals, and skills by making their work meaningful and challenging. These leaders present a convincing and encouraged vision of the future. They are "visionary leaders who seek to appeal to the better nature of their followers and move them toward higher and more universal needs and purposes" (MacGregor Bums, 2003).

2.3 Leadership Style

Efforts to inspire followers are made using several leadership philosophies however there is no "one size fits all" approach to leadership.

The right leadership style is chosen and modified to match different types of organizations, circumstances, groups, and people. Therefore, having a good awareness of the various leadership styles is beneficial since it broadens the range of tools at our disposal.

2.3.1. Autocratic Leadership Style

This is an extreme version of transactional leadership is autocratic leadership, in which the leader has total control over the workforce. Even if the proposals are for the benefit of the team or organization, staff and team members rarely get the chance to make them. The advantage of autocratic rule is that it is very effective. Decisions are taken swiftly, and effort to put them into action can start right away. Most of the employees dislike being treated in this manner, which is a drawback. The

best times to adopt autocratic leadership are frequently during times of crisis when choices must be taken fast and without debate.

2.3.2. Bureaucratic Leadership Style

Bureaucratic executives strictly adhere to the rules and make sure that their personnel do the same. When dealing with machinery, poisonous materials, or at heights where there are major safety dangers, or when there are significant financial stakes, this leadership style is acceptable. In businesses where employees perform routine duties, bureaucratic leadership is also beneficial (Shaefer, 2005). This style of leadership has the downside of being unsuccessful in groups and organizations that value adaptability, creativity, and innovation (Santrock, 2007)

2.3.3. Charismatic Leadership Style

What to anticipate from both leaders and followers is described by charismatic leadership theory. Although charismatic leadership is recognizable, it may be viewed as less tangible than other leadership styles (Bell, 2013). Charismatic leaders, also referred to as those with transformational leadership styles, excite their teams and are enthusiastic about inspiring them to act. Teams' resulting enthusiasm and dedication are a huge help in terms of productivity and goal achievement. The level of trust put in the leader rather than in followers is a drawback of charismatic leadership. If the leader leaves, there is a chance that a project or possibly the entire organization could fail. A charismatic leader may also start to think that they are perfect, even when they are not.

2.3.4. Democratic/Participative Leadership Style

Democratic leaders consult the team before deciding, but they also make the final call. They promote creativity, and team members frequently take a very active role in choices and initiatives. The advantages of democratic leadership are numerous. Because they are more involved, team members typically have high levels of job satisfaction and are productive. Additionally, it aids in the skill development of workers. Team members are inspired by more than just monetary compensation since they feel that they are a part of something bigger and more meaningful. Democratic leadership poses a risk because it can sputter in circumstances where promptness or effectiveness are crucial. For instance, acquiring information during a crisis can cost a team crucial time. Team members without the skills or knowledge necessary to deliver high-quality.

2.3.5. Laissez-Faire Leadership Style

Laissez-faire leadership could be one of the finest or worst types of leadership (Goodnight, 2011). Let's leave this to be, when used in relation to leadership, the French expression "let it be" defines managers that enable employees to work independently. Laissez-faire leaders shirk their duties and stay away from When making judgments, they can grant teams total discretion to set their own timelines and complete their work. Laissez-fair Typically, leaders give their subordinates the

authority to Choosing what to do at work (Chaudhry & Javed, 2012). If necessary, they offer teams resources and counsel, but aside from that, they stay out of it. If the leader routinely evaluates team members' work and provides feedback, this leadership style may be successful. The fundamental benefit of laissez-faire leadership is that it can result in high job satisfaction and enhanced productivity by giving team members so much autonomy. When team members lack the knowledge, abilities, or motivation to complete their work efficiently, it can be detrimental. This kind of leadership can also manifest itself when supervisors lack effective staff control (Ololube, 2013).

2.3.6. Transactional Leadership Style

This leadership approach is predicated on the notion that team members sign employment agreements promising to follow their boss. In exchange for their work and compliance, team members are typically paid by the corporation. If a team member's work falls short of the required standard, the leader can discipline them. It is based on this transaction (effort for income) that the basic working relationships that develop (between employees and managers or leaders) are built. Transactional leadership consists of three elements: contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception (passive) (passive). A transactional leader uses the contingent rewards scheme to explain performance expectations to followers and values good performance. Leader's regard contractual agreements as primary motivators (Bass, 1985) and employ extrinsic rewards to boost followers' motivation. According to the literature, the "transactional style retards creativity and can have a negative impact on employee job satisfaction." Management-by-exception explains how leaders act in terms of detecting deviations from expected follower behaviour.

2.3.7. Transformational Leadership Style:

Transformational leadership is associated with positive outcomes on both an individual and organizational level. These types of leaders inspire followers to pursue higher-order needs such as self-actualization and self-esteem (Bass, 1985), and they are influential in directing followers' motivation toward "self-sacrifice and achievement of organizational goals over personal interests" (Bass, 1995). Leaders with idealized influence demonstrate increased concern and awareness of their followers' needs, as well as a sense of shared risk-taking" (Jung et al., 2008). Inspirational Motivation provides a cradle of encouragement and challenges followers to achieve the goals set, whereas intellectual stimulation inspires followers to be more creative and innovative in their problem-solving abilities. Advocates of transformational leadership believe that past arrangements should not be used to guide future decisions. They believe that successful transformational leaders develop clear and compelling future visions. Transformational leaders devote their energies to vision, long-term goals, aligning and changing systems, and developing and training others. According to Bass, such leaders also exhibit transactional behaviours. They believe that great men were born rather than

made however, as time passed, it became clear that this concept of Leadership was morally flawed, as was the case with Hitler, Napoleon, and others, calling the Great Man theory into question. This initial emphasis on intellectual, physical, and personality traits that distinguished non-leaders from leaders foreshadowed a study that claimed only minor differences existed between followers and leaders.

III. CONCLUSION

Though these leadership focuses primarily on the leader, it emphasizes the importance of group dynamics. These leadership styles included telling others what to do (autocratic), involving others in conceptualizing, planning, and implementing (democratic), and giving complete freedom of action with little or no direction to others (laissez-faire). The servant leader is concerned with the needs of the followers and assists them in becoming more autonomous, free, and knowledgeable." Positive reinforcement for good work could be exchanged, as could merit pay for promotions, increased performance, and cooperation for collegiality. Transformational leadership, according to Bass, "attempts to induce followers to reorder their needs by transcending self-interests and striving for higher order needs. Leadership's function is to produce more leaders, not followers that is a leader can change a follower's perspective or psychology, inspiring them to want to be a leader as well. This implies that leadership should, at the end of the day, be elevating and inspiring. Leaders should push those they lead to new heights, allowing them to develop into the people they know they can be. Transformational leadership is a critical psychological perspective for leaders to study and comprehend if they are to truly influence and impact others. In order to build best leadership practices in a changing volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous environment, strategic leaders in organizations must employ situational and transformational leadership theories.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Amabile, T. M., Schatzel, E. A., Moneta, G. B., & Kramer, S. J. (2004). Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 5–32.
- [2]. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [3]. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1997) *Full range leadership development: manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*, Mindgarden, Palo Alto, Calif.
- [4]. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1997) *Full range leadership development: manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*, Mindgarden, Palo Alto, Calif.
- [5]. Burns, C., & West, M. A. (2003). Individual, climate, and group interaction processes as predictors of work team innovation. *Small Group Research*, 26, 106-117.
- [6]. Dess, G. G., & Picken, J. C. (2000). Changing roles: Leadership in the 21st century. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29 (4), 18–33.
- [7]. Dobbins, G. H., & Platz, S. J. (1986). Sex differences in leadership: How real are they? *Academy of Management Review*, 1, 118-127.
- [8]. Ekvall, G., & Arvonen, K. (1991). Change-centered leadership: An extension of the two dimensional model. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 7, 17–26.

- [9]. Feidler, F., & House, R. (Eds.). (1994). Leadership theory and research: A report of progress. 10. Greenleaf, R. (1996). On becoming a servant-leader. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- [10]. Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power & greatness. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- [11]. House, R. J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. M. M. Chemers, & R. Ayman (Eds.), Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and direction, 81–107.
- [12]. House, R. J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. M. M. Chemers, & R. Ayman (Eds.), Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and direction, (pp. 81–107). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- [13]. House, R., & Aditya, R. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo Vadis? Journal of Management, 23, 409-474.
- [14]. Jung, D.I. (2001): Transformational and transactional leadership and their effects on creativity in groups. Creativity Research Journal, 13:185-195.
- [15]. Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper and Row.
- [16]. McGregor, D. M. (2003). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [17]. Ryan, J. C. & Tipu, S. A. (2013). Leadership effects on innovation propensity: A two-factor full range leadership model, Journal of Business Research, 66, 2116 – 2129.
- [18]. Samad, S. (2012). The influence of Innovation and Transformational Leadership on Organizational Performance. Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences, 57 (2012) 486- 493.
- [19]. Yammarino, F. J. (1999). CEO charismatic leadership: Levels-of-management and levels-of analysis effects. Academy of Management Review, 24, 266-286.