Review of Organizational Leadership Theories

MITRA MADANCHIAN [a], NORASHIKIN HUSSEIN [a], FAUZIAH NOORDIN [a]
HAMED TAHERDOOST [b,c]
[a] Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA, MALAYSIA
[b] Research and Development Department, Ahoora Ltd | Management Consultation Group, MALAYSIA
[c] Advanced Informatics School, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM), MALAYSIA

Abstract: - Organization theory cannot be considering just an academic subject; it is a primary necessary for good leadership. The organizational leadership theories concentrated interaction, or influence of leadership on the development of effective organizations. This article reviews existing literature on organizational theories of leadership including: Humanistic Theories and Task-Relationship theories which has been categorized by Levine (2000). The objective of this paper is to analyze the review of literature on organizational theories of leadership over the past years and clarify how different leadership theories have emerged over a period of time and give more insights to leadership researchers.

Key-Words: - Leadership, Organizational Theory, Humanistic Theories and Task-Relationship

1 Introduction

As the review of the literature on leadership demonstrations that there is not only an general variety of leadership theories however also not only approved definition of leadership (Bass and Stogdill 1990; Rost 1993). As said by (Bass and Stogdill 1990) after 40 years of researchers attempt to come out with the meaning of leadership, Bass (1990) recognized more than 3,500 definitions and concluded, 'There are almost as many definitions of leadership as those who have attempted to define the concept'.

It can be concluded that there were writings of attention in leadership theories from early civilizations. Confucius (about 500 B.C.) is one of the earliest inclusive article on leadership composed (Ayman and Korabik 2010), moreover Plato, Plutarch, and Caesar in their writings argued leadership topics (Bass and Stogdill 1981). In the 16th century "The Prince" by Machiavelli is one of remains key works in the background of leadership theory (Machiavelli 1940; Machiavelli 1950).

Recently, leadership still is a topic of interest, as well as an issue of argument among many leadership theorists. Numerous different schools of thought have been successful in relation with leadership simultaneously from initial observations in this area of interest (Stogdill 1974).

According to Levine (2000), the majority of the early leadership theorists presented their findings based on information attained based on experimental observation as an alternative of statistical research. In his study he divided theoretically the leadership theories into groups. The groups of theories are:

1) *The Early Theorists*. In this group the leadership has been found as a product of a set of forces. These researchers did not consider the interaction between leaders and situations in relation to the leadership discussion. The offered theories in this section inclusive Great Man theories, Trait theories, and Environmental theories.

2) *The Interactive Theorists.* From the early to middle 1900's new leadership theories introduced to examine interactive relationships during leadership studies, in opposed to observing leadership traits as parted characteristics of individuals. These theories include the Personal-Situational theories, and Interaction-Expectation Theories.

3) *The Organizational Theorists.* The third section presented below includes theories that investigate the relationship between leaders and organizations. These theories contain the Humanistic theories, and Task-Relationship theories.

4) *The Modern Theorists.* Most recently explained theories outline leadership behavior in terms of the ways in which it influences follower's behavior. In the view of this point, the purpose of this article is to

review of the early theories of leadership which commences in the middle 1800s.

As said by Levine (2000), over the years the evolution of Leadership Theories is a complete study of leadership developments in many contexts and theoretical fundamentals. He calculated the history of early leadership theories, binges with the Great man theories to the environmental leadership theory to numerous leadership characteristics. In this study the researcher only focused on early theories of leadership.

2 Humanistic Theories

The Humanistic theorists were more concerned with the interaction, or influence of leadership on the effective organizations development. This theorists projected that to adjust the organization it is the function of the leader in order to provide authorization for each individual to understand his or her abilities while contributing on the way to the goals of the group (Levine 2000).

McGregor (1960) and (1966) developed two different sets of assumptions that influence leadership style. These findings are categorized by his Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X is in regards the assumption that people are passive and strong to organizational desires. He further clarified that leaders who operating under Theory X orders, would need to direct and motivate people to meet these desires. According to (Levine 2000) theory Y leaders keep the concept that people already hold self- motivation and a successful leader needs only to establish the effective environment to allow these individuals to achieve their own requirements while meeting the goals of the organization.

As said by Argyris (1976), another humanistic theorist, projected there is an vital conflict between the organization and the individual. He proposed that the individual's desires and the organization's requirements are often in disagreement. Argyris maintains that it is the leader's function to assist each individual in meeting his own needs for growth and self-expression, while making a contribution towards the organization.

Likert (1967) witnesses leadership as a process in which the leader must consider the potentials, values, and interpersonal skills of those with whom he is interacting. A good leader must involve followers in decision-making regarding their own welfare and work. Likert recommends that an effective leader covers group cohesiveness and stimulus by providing authority for decision-making and kindly creativity.

3 Task-Relationship Theories

According to Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid leadership style has two concerns: production and people (Megginson, Mosley et al. 1989). These researchers presented that leadership approaches can be viewed best in terms of a grid on which concern for production is designed on the horizontal axis and concern for people is designed on the vertical axis.

Blake and Mouton (1964) recognized, through the grid, five basic leadership styles. The first of these was the authority-obedience style, which indicates the leader who is highly concerned with production but has a low interest in people. At the other hand the leadership variety would be the country club leader, who demonstrates a primary concern for people, but a very low concern for production. The "middle-of-the-road" management style signifies the leader who shows some interest in both people and production. The leader who characterizes the "impoverished" management style is the poorest of all styles on the grid, (low people and low production), and has essentially uncontrolled the leadership role totally. Finally, the leader who is represented by the "team management" style, representing a high interest in both people and production is the most effective (Blake and Mouton 1978).

Those studies that supporting this standard have determined that leaders skilled in the "team management" style increased profitability of their companies by 400 percent (Blake and Mouton 1978). The interest created by the Managerial Grid was another indication of business leaders' desires to obtain clear, easily understood direction in improving management skills. According to (Fiedler 1967) another model developed during this time frame attended the same purpose in business. This was Fiedler's Contingency Model

In 1967, Fiedler developed the Contingency Model of situational leadership. The model was designed to integrate situational factors into the leadership equation. Fiedler established a scale of "situational control" based on three features determined to be present in any situation. These were:

1) leader-member relations, or the degree of trust and support which exists between followers and leaders;

2) task structure, which is the extent to which the goals and procedures for accomplishing the group's task are defined; and

3) position power, the degree to which the leader has authority to reward and punish followers.

Fiedler (1971) proposed Utilizing the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) instrument to gather data, leaders were asked, utilizing a list of 16-24 items, to describe a colleague who would be most difficult to work with. A low LPC leader who assigned primarily negative attributes to the colleague was viewed as task-motivated, while a high LPC leader was seen as relationship motivated. Unfortunately, while the model was found to be well investigated (Rice 1978), some insignificance remained regarding the meaning of the results.

Fiedler (1971) concluded LPC scores to be analytical of leadership style, but other researchers reported results in direct contrast to his findings (Nealy and Blood 1968; Stinson 1977). While the Task- Relations theories were gaining popular among management practitioners, another interpretation of leadership theory was also creating interest among educators in the leadership field.

4 Conclusion

As the history of leadership theory has been varied the current interest among researchers to define and test variables, which contribute to the definition of leadership, are suggestive of the importance which society has traditionally placed on these investigations. The extensive literature review concluded that a good leader moves their followers to action and help them realize their potential to accomplish a better objective. Understanding the theories of organizational leadership helps you grow and develop leadership skills and identify potential leaders during the employing process.

References:

[1] Argyris, C. (1976). Increasing leadership effectiveness, J. Wiley.

[2] Ayman, R. and K. Korabik (2010). "Leadership: Why gender and culture matter." American Psychologist 65(3): 157.

[3] Bass, B. M. and R. M. Stogdill (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research, New York: free press.

[4] Bass, B. M. and R. M. Stogdill (1990). Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications, Simon and Schuster.

[5] Blake, R. and J. Mouton (1978). "The new management grid." Houston: Gulf Publishing.

[6] Blake, R. R. and J. S. Mouton (1964). The new managerial grid: strategic new insights into a proven system for increasing organization productivity and individual effectiveness, plus a revealing examination of how your managerial style can affect your mental and physical health, Gulf Pub. Co.

[7] Fiedler, E. R. (1971). "Measures of credit risk and experience." NBER Books.

[8] Levine, M. F. (2000). "The importance of leadership: An investigation of presidential style at fifty national universities."

[9] Levine, M. F. (2000). The Importance of Leadership: An Investigation of Presidential Style at Fifty National Universities, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS. PhD: 134.

[10] Likert, R. (1967). "The human organization: its management and values."

[11] Machiavelli, N. (1940). "The discourses, trans." Harvey C. Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov (Chicago and London, 1996), bk. I: 29.

[12] Machiavelli, N. (1950). "The prince, and The discourses."

[13] McGregor, D. (1960). "The human side of enterprise." New York 21: 166.

[14] McGregor, D. (1966). "Leadership and motivation."

[15] Megginson, L. C., D. C. Mosley, et al. (1989). Management: concepts and applications, HarperCollins Publishers.

[16] Nealy, S. M. and M. R. Blood (1968). "Leadership performance of nursing supervisors at two organizational levels." Journal of Applied Psychology 52(5): 414.

[17] Rice, R. W. (1978). "Construct validity of the least preferred co-worker score." Psychological Bulletin 85(6): 1199.

[18] Rost, J. C. (1993). Leadership for the twenty-first century, Greenwood Publishing Group.

[19] Stinson, J. E. (1977). "The measurement of leadership." Leadership: The cutting edge: 111-116.

[20] Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature, New York: Free Press.

Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (Attribution 4.0 International, CC BY 4.0)