UNDERSTANDING OF LEADERSHIP THROUGHOUT HISTORY

Author: Zornica Dimitrova

PhD Student, Industrial Business Department, zornica.e.dimitrova@gmail.com

Abstract

In order to understand the actual meaning of today's terms Leadership and Leader, there has to be a clear view on what there meaning and form were in different eras. Every era, has different needs and accordingly it grants the terms directing, leading, managing, handling and etc. with a specific meaning. Theory in general is created accordingly to specific needs in order to explain them and put them in a frame, so based on those assumptions, they can be developed for every upcoming generation.

Keywords*: leader, leadership, history, management, organization, people.*

From the beginning of civilization there is room to speak and study about leadership and the way it evolves with time. Even from prehistoric herds of dinosaurs or every other animal that you can think of, through Neanderthals, Egyptian rulers, Greek heroes, and biblical patriarchs, up until today's politicians, general managers, sport players and family members. All of them have something in common and that is the leadership – the effort of influence and the power to induce compliance. This short sentence includes a simple definition of the none defined term for leadership. The term in general has at least a thousand definitions and still, even today, there are more and more upcoming such, based on the mentality and the changes of time.

The organizational focus of the leader has evolved over this same period. The evolving is in terms of completely changing the approach towards peoples understanding of leadership and how it should be used. Starting from early organizations where authoritarian leaders had the belief that employees were intrinsically lazy, have evolved the term, into a way to make work environments more conducive, efficient and effective in order to increase the productivity rates of the company. Today, organizations are transforming fast, into places where people are empowered, encouraged, and supported in their personal and professional growth throughout their careers.

It is natural for the term and understanding of leadership to change constantly, simply because of different aspects of time and what now requests and is searching for. For example, two thousand years ago, the qualities for being a figure that you can follow, were completely different, then the once needed now. Starting from strength, courage and other physical and mental qualities like running fast, hitting or biting hard, we have come to

being smart and adaptive, diplomatic and charismatic, talkative and understanding, in order for people to look up to you and follow the path that you have chosen. Accordingly to the needs of the period of time, appeared a couple of similar terms to the leadership – like management - witch formed the development and progression of the leadership theory. Early Leader Studies the Industrial Revolution shifted America's economy from an agriculture base to an industrial one and, thereby, ushered in a change in how leaders would treat their followers. The Industrial Revolution created a paradigm shift to a new theory of leadership in which "common" people gained power by virtue of their skills (Clawson, 1999). New technology, however, was accompanied and reinforced by mechanization of human thought and action. So from here one it can be said that the main focus is developing the management and leadership theory. For that a major contribution has Max Weber, a German sociologist who observed the parallels between the mechanization of industry and bureaucracy of administration. He noted that the bureaucratic form routinized the process of administration in the same manner that the machine routinized production. By fact his observation didn't affect the theories for "classical management theory"" and "scientific management". Classical theorists focused on the design of the total organization while scientific managers focused on the systematic management of individual jobs.

In contrast to Weber, classical theorists such as Henri Fayol and F. W. Mooney, , devoted their energy to identifying methods through which this kind of organizational structure could be achieved (Bass, 1990; Morgan, 1997). Collectively, all of these theorists set the basis for many modern management techniques, such as management by objectives and leading by example.

On the other hand, scientific management, an approach heralded by Frederick Taylor, was technological in nature (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996). Taylors focus in on the perspective of an engineer into management with a strong emphasis on control, ruthless efficiency, quantification, predictability, and de-skilled jobs. He initiated time-and-motion studies to analyze work tasks to improve worker productivity in an attempt to achieve the highest level of efficiency possible. Consequently, he has been accused of viewing people as instruments or machines to be **manipulated** by their leaders. In this period of time when theories were formed, the most important thing is the understanding of what is needed for fast growth in general (economic, political, geographic and etc.). If what is needed is "strong" and "ruthless" manipulation, then this is going to be the definition of leadership and management. So accordingly to the needs the function of the leader under scientific management theory was to establish and enforce performance criteria to meet the set organizational goals. Therefore, the focus of a leader was on the needs of the organization and not on the individual worker. Although there is a big difference between the scientific and the classical approach and understanding, the end goal is exactly the same. There has to be a perfect balance between the organizations and the rational systems, because they must operate in the most effective and efficient way possible, in order to achieve the highest level of productivity. Funny fact is that both theories use the machine metaphor and failed to recognize organizations as complex organisms by under minding the human aspect and pushing for a mechanization of jobs witch is proved more productive. In this case hierarchical bureaucracy remains a big factor that can't be forgotten or removed. So

emerging theorists encouraged leaders to recognize the fact that humans are not machines, they could not and should not be treated as such.

Researchers began to examine the relationship between leader behavior and follower satisfaction level and organizational productivity and profitability. Again the time changing, requires a different point of view, so at this time the focus was on what do people need in order to be lead.

In mid-1940s, a post-bureaucratic shift moved the thinking towards the understanding that everybody takes responsibility for the organization's success or failure. Hawthorne, Maslow, and Herzberg, focused on overcoming the outcomes of classical and scientific schools of management theories. Elton Mayo's Hawthorne Studies focused on the work situation and its effect on leaders and followers, indicating that the reactions of human beings influence their work activities as much as the formal design and structure of the organization. A new theory of organizations and leadership began to emerge based on the idea that individuals operate most effectively when their needs are satisfied. "Once a worker's physiological, security, and social (intrinsic) needs were met, productivity would only be possible if the employee's ego and self-actualizing (extrinsic) needs were also met. Leader focus became redirected toward worker needs" (Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs posited that). Herzberg's Dual Factor Theory, the evolution of intrinsic and extrinsic needs, furthered Maslow's work stating that employees' intrinsic and extrinsic needs could, and should, be met simultaneously. Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory furthered the work of Maslow by providing insights into the goals and incentives that tend to satisfy a worker's needs. Herzberg concluded that people have two categories of needs, which he termed hygiene and motivators. According to Herzberg, an employee's intrinsic and extrinsic needs could and should be addressed simultaneously.

Chester Barnard, for example, identified an effective organizational leader as one who determined objectives, manipulated means, initiated action, and stimulated coordinated effort (Bass, 1990, p. 31). His work focused on the functions of the executive. His work and studies were of great importance in including behavioral components in the organizational leadership. The theorists of this age argued that it is crucial to address human affairs in order to find the most efficient technological methods to improve the organizational output.

McGregor is the next person who is still studying the correlation between leadership and what people need in order to let somebody lead them. What he has brought to the studies of leadership and management are the Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X assumes that most people prefer to be directed and lead, without having and interest in taking responsibility, and want safety above all else. Accompanying the Theory X philosophy is the belief that people are motivated by money, fringe benefits, and the threat of punishment. With this theory literature goes far away from leadership and gets more in to the term of management, because it doesn't include any kind of qualities that somebody should poses in order to be naturally able to lead. In matter of fact Theory X states that some people need to be directed so there is no need of leadership. What is needed is the wright set of instruments that can be used in order to satisfy a need that has been individually created. Somebody with given a directing position, who only needs to have the tools and use them accordingly. Directors or managers who are in favor of Theory X assumptions, attempt to

structure, control, and closely supervise employees. Although McGregor himself questioned whether Theory X was an accurate view of human nature, the assumptions persisted for a long time in leadership theory circles because it explained some, of human behavior within the organizations.

Management needed practices based on a more accurate understanding of human nature and motivation, so the resulting concept is Theory Y. According to Theory Y individuals are not, by nature, lazy and unreliable. People can be self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated. Therefore, an essential task of management is to unleash this potential of every individual. Consequently, the goal of effective leadership was evolving and moving away from the earlier concepts of the classical and scientific management theories that treated workers as machines. Respectfully what changed between the theories is that already the world is looking for leaders not for directors and people with skills, not who can only use tools. The new assumption is that employees are far more complex than the trait and behavioral theories of leadership assumed and that their complexity and the leaders' response to that complexity would affect how and whether the leader and followers worked in tandem to reach mutual organizational goals. The point is that this correlation has an effect over the effectiveness of the organization in general. Theory Y assumed individuals would exercise self-direction and self-control, accepting and seeking responsibility. The essential concept McGregor and other behaviorists proposed was that organizations are interacting groups and that leaders are a part of those groups. The leader's interaction and relationship with the employee must be a supportive relationship so all members of the organization feel the organization's objectives and their achievement, are of personal importance to them. Leadership becomes a more behaveioral term which is starting to contain a lot more personal qualities instead of instruments.

The definition of leadership by Weathersby captures exactly what - what it is to be a leader and later on, what qualities a person should poses in order to be a successful one: "Leadership focuses on the creation of a common vision. It means motivating people to contribute to the vision and encouraging them to align their self-interest with that of the organization. It means persuading, not commanding".

Zaccaro asserts that leadership focuses on people and involves exerting personal influence over the project members in order to obtain the desired results. Influence can be exercised in many different ways, but the most common procedures to exercised leadership are through communication, and making certain of the presence of members' commitment, motivation and control.

The initiative in leveling the playing field for leaders and followers, slowly is moving from those who do the work to those who know how to organize work. Society actually started understanding that the known up until this moment methods of leadership, were plain following of rules that can be applied only in cases valid according the Theory X, and they were no longer effective. The companies in the informational age are unsuccessfully trying to implement the leadership theories from the industrial age, so the only thing that follows if somebody was aiming for actual success is change in the understanding of what is needed for this era but this time from the deeper point of view of society.

Researchers defining the situational/contingency theory of leadership acknowledged that leaders did more than simply "act"–they often had to "react" to specific situations in

order to be followed. Hersey and Blanchard proposed a contingency/situational theory - leaders have poses and behave a certain way based upon two maturity factors: 1) job maturity– having relevant task and technical knowledge and skills, and 2) psychological maturity–the subordinate's level of self-confidence and self-respect. For example whenever an employee has higher level of job and psychological maturity, he doesn't need a lot of supervision and on the other hand, whenever an employee has a low level of job and/or psychological maturity, then he needs a bit more supervision and attention.

According to Hersey and Blanchard's situational leadership theory leader behavior options. On the other hand, Fielder's contingency theory states exactly the opposite - leader effectiveness is determined not by the leader's ability to adapt to the situation, but by the ability to choose the right leader for the situation (the basic concept of Hersey and Blanchard's theory) (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1993). Based on this theory there is no way to determine who is going to take responsibility for the situation and the action that has to be taken. In fact, some leaders are simply better for a case specific situation than others. Here is the point where the theory comes to the decision between "the egg or the chicken". On one hand leaders have to be able to react on different occasions and have a curtain level of job knowledge and skills and a higher level of confidence, so they should be able to handle all kinds of specific situations. On the other hand, it is a fact that people reactions are different and individuals have a different understanding over situations. In some situations, there are leaders with higher level of confidence for example, who may react faster or slower to a specific situation.

In the late 1970s, leadership theory research moved beyond various types of situational supervision as a way to improve organizational performance. Here we are talking about transactional leadership – the one focused and based on performance (Behling & McFillen, 1996; Hunt, 1991). Research has shown that many leaders turned to a transactional leadership theory, the most prevalent method of leadership still observed in today's organizations (Avolio, Waldman, & Yanimarina, 1991; Seltzer & Bass, 1990). The underlying theory of this leadership method was that leaders exchange rewards for employees' compliance, a concept based on bureaucratic authority and a leader's legitimacy within an organization (Tracey & Hinkin, 1994; Yukl, 1998). For example, this reward exchange included the leader's ability to fulfill promises of recognition, pay increases and incentives, and advancements for employees who perform well. Transactional leadership focuses on control, not adaptation. Avolio, Waldman and Yammarino suggest that the leaders focus should be put on the day – to – day operations of the business that influence directly the employees, instead of trying to create a similar goal between the working force and the organizational end goal. This would be an easier way to motivate instantly and get commitment from the employees on a daily basis. Not to mention the fact that if this reaction appears instantly, their productivity will increase instantly as well. A slight gap in this theory is the fact that it is very shortsighted and it is not looking in the entire situation, or future of the organization, in the moment when it is offering some kind of rewards.

In general, transactional leadership theory focuses on the specific interactions between leaders and followers and is based on reciprocity - transactions by which an individual gains influence over others and tries to sustain it over time. So respectfully leaders do not

only influence followers but are also influenced by the same. In this case and theory, the leaders are not given or do not take influence, but actually earn it by adjusting to their expectations. Leaders who follow this theory approach follower with a goal to exchange instead with presenting a common organizational goal and trying to influence or convince the surrounding to have the same or similar goal. Slightly the focus of effective leadership began to change and leaders no longer had to measure work and ensure that the most effective person did the job in the most efficient manner. Leaders now needed active involvement from the followers to achieve the organization's goals without mentioning the goals themselves. Douglas McGregor, who is closely linked to the work of the behavioral theorists, provided a basis for a new emerging theory of leadership–transformational leadership. This is one more example of how the time requirements change the way that researchers like McGregor can change their understanding and approach towards the theory for leadership and management. Transformational in difference with the transactional leaders focus on the Organization. At this point there is an actual correlation created between the two different terms of management and leadership, because literature reviews suggest that traditional power, derived from a leading (leader's) position in a bureaucratic, hierarchical structure, is becoming obsolete and that effective leaders work from the "inside out" to transform their organization and workers. The main job of the transformational leader is not to make every decision within the organization, but to ensure that there is collaboration and the decision – making is not coming from only one side, no matter which side this is. This type of leadership motivates individuals to work together and creates the urgency to work in a ream in order to create sustainable productivity. Transformational leadership is more like an expansion of transactional leadership and it has been the theory of choice in the past several decades. As started by Burns, the transformational leader asks followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the group, organization, or society and to consolidate their immediate needs – to look a bit more long-term. That way the goal is for the focus to move to the more important outcome, that can bring in general, more and bigger benefits to bought sides – organization and employees. Bass and Avolio conclude that transformational leadership contains the factor of followers needing to look up to somebody that can describe and fit their own ideals, so they can most likely follow his vision, simply because it is similar to what they want to achieve. This role model is most likely to bring them to their personal goals, which respectfully means that employees are more motivated and productive in general in their working environment. Burns touts Mahatma Gandhi as the best modern-day example of a transformational leader because he aroused and elevated the hope and demands of millions of his countrymen whose lives were transformed in the process. Also transformational leadership focuses on a leader's understanding of their affect and respectfully effect on how followers feel trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect toward the leader and how followers are motivated to do more than expected. This is a clear modeling of the followers' behavior and directing them to look beyond their immediate needs, in and involving them in a larger, long-term plan that includes the needs of others, before their own needs. The very definition of transformational leadership states the building of commitment to the organizational, groups objectives. The primary focus is on the organization and secondary focus comes on personal development. The result in general is an enhanced performance. Transformational

leaders, transform the personal values of followers to support the vision and goals of the organization by and from here on, Avolio, Waldman, and Yammarino, have established four primary behaviors that constitute transformational leadership as a term: 1. charismatic influence, 2. inspirational motivation, 3. intellectual stimulation, and 4. individualized consideration. Ultimately, transformational leaders can develop a very powerful influence over followers. Those kind of qualities assure respect and trust from the followers in the transformational leaders, so they conform their values to those of the leaders and yield power to them. For this reason, it is crucial that transformational leaders understand how their values affect the organization. For example, Likewise, Barnard, also understood this concept when he wrote, "the endurance of an organization depends upon the quality of leadership; and that quality derives from the breadth of the morality upon which it rests".

The new type of leaders in our world - Social change leadership is driven by images of both the present and the future. Individuals identify a current, pressing systemic inequity and name that inequity as a problem. They also envision a world without that inequity; they create a picture of a just and fair future state where there is a clear idea of what should be the understanding of leadership. The point of the view in the future in comparison to what has been needed and what is needed now is to make a prediction about the upcoming changes in the understanding, so the implementing of new aspects can start from earlier. Today people are aiming to be proactive in order to achieve organizational and personal success faster and if possible immediate. These depictions of both the current state and the future motivate action.

Social change leadership is to be attuned to the interaction of values, beliefs, actions and practices and how they mutually influence each other and the achieving of the end organizational goal and productivity in general of the working process.

The current worldview of "social change organizations" SCOs comes not from the visible leader, who is or is put on that position, but from the collectivity, expressed in the organizational culture, via stories, language, attitudes, mentality, ethics, missions and beliefs. The worldview is not something imposed by a person in a position of authority, but a negotiated reality that emerges for members of the group as they engage in their work. This departs from most work on leadership, which continues to elevate the importance of having and putting a visible leader that the community can look up to. There is more and more importance given from organizations to creating new leaders that stay "hidden" I nthe organization itself which is opposing the current theories. More organizations are focused on embracing internal leaders in every department of their structure, no matter if he is put on a authority position, with the idea that if he is able to influence without authority, most likely he will be followed, no matter the current position. In this case he has to be motivated from the organization to have a common goal and to learn how to understand his influence over the followers. To not act only according to a position or a task, but to act on spot and take responsibility for actions that he takes. Yet social change organizations provide a concrete example of embodied collective leadership. Social change organizations, grounded in values of inclusion, equity and democracy, generally reject the notion of leadership as limited to the few. They believe that everyone has the potential for leadership and they invest in leadership development as core to their work, but in fact individuals may be leaders in one sphere and followers in another. There are a lot of tools and instruments

that can be thought and provided, but there are human qualities that if don't already exist in an individual, can't be developed any further. They may be in a leadership position for some period of time and then step back, only to step forward again at another time or in another situation. We also argue that applying this conceptualization of leadership to other organizations may allow us to see collective leadership in different guises and contexts. While other organizations may have more rigid hierarchies, there may be informal ways in which members slip in and out of roles as leaders and followers. A lot of things actually depend on the organizational structure and if some actions which are initiated individually are embraced and taken in to consideration from the higher levels of the organizational structure. "If we focus only on visible individuals, rather than on how groups come together to set direction and spur commitment, then we won't see this fluidity or shared responsibility for the work". *(Ospina, Sonia and Foldy, Erica Gabrielle, Toward a Framework of Social Change Leadership (September 2005). Page 42. NYU Wagner Research Paper No. 2010-05.)*

References
1. Avolio, B. J., Walderman, D. A., & Einsten, W. A. (1988). Transformational leadership in a management game situation. Group and Organizational Studies, 13, 59-80.
2. Avolio, B. J., Walderman, D. A., & Yanimarina, F. J. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: The four Is of transformational leadership. Journal of European Industrial Training, 15, 9-16.
3. Barnard, C. I. (1968). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
4. Bass, B. M. (1990). Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, & managerial applications. New York: The Free Press.
5. Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Goodheim, L. (1987). Biography and the assessment of leadership at the worldclass level. Journal of Management, 13, 7-9.
6. Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., Avolio, B. J., & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. Group and Organizational Studies, 12, 73-87.
7. Behling, O., & McFillen, J. M. (1996). A syncretical model of charismatic/transformational leadership. Group & Organizational Management, 2, 163-191.
8. Clawson, J. G. (1999). Level three leadership: Getting below the surface. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
9. Gerstein, Miriam and Friedman, Hershey H., A New Corporate Ethics and Leadership Paradigm for the Age of Creativity (June 14, 2017). Journal of Accounting, Ethics and Public Policy, Vol. 18, No. 2, 2017. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2986603
10. Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (1996). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
11. Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. New York: World Publishing Co.
12. Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (1993). Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc
13. Maslow, A. H. (1959). New knowledge in human values. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.
14. McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.
15. Morgan, G. (1997). Images of organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
16. Ospina, Sonia and Foldy, Erica Gabrielle, Toward a Framework of Social Change Leadership (September 2005). Page 42. NYU Wagner Research Paper No. 2010-05.

17. Stone, A. Gregory, Patterson, Kathleen, The History of Leadership Focus, Servant Leadership Research Roundtable (August 2005), REGENT UNIVERSITY.

18. Tracey, J. B., & Hinkin, T. R. (1994). Transformational leaders in the hospitality industry. Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 35(2), 18-24.

19. Yukl, G. (2002). Leadership in organizations. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. Morgan, G. (1997). Images of organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Nair, K. (1994). A higher standard of leadership: Lessons from the life of Gandhi. San Francisco, CA: BerrettKoehler Publishers.