





Figure 1: The Michigan Model of Leadership

## Leadership Traits

### *The Problem with Leadership Studies*

Three problems that leadership scholars and practitioners faced were identified in the 1990s. Solving these problems is important to the leadership practice in the twenty-first century.

1. The importance of periphery and content in leadership studies aimed at understanding the essential nature of what leadership is the process whereby leaders and followers relate to one another to achieve a purpose. People know too much about their leaders and very little about what leadership really is.
2. Neither the scholars nor the practitioners have been able to reach consensus on leadership definition with clear, precise, accurate, researchable, practical, concise, and persuasive for people to label it correctly when they see it happening or engaging in it.
3. The concept of leadership does not add up in the 1990s because leadership practitioners and scholars have no definition of leadership to hold on to. Finally, no one has presented an articulated school of leadership that integrates understanding of leadership into a holistic framework.

### *An Overview of Leadership Studies*

- Of all the hazy and confounding areas in social psychology, leadership theory undoubtedly contends for top nomination.
- Ironically, probably more has been written and less is known about leadership than about any other topic in the behavioral sciences.
- It is permissible for leadership scholars not to know what leadership is.
- Behaviors were not the only variables that produced effective leadership.
- The idea that many people are born to be leaders remains inaccurate, other inaccurate theories are distinct theories of leadership, separate time frames for the leadership theories, alternate leadership theories, and theoretical quiescence

### *Definitions of Leadership: 1900-1979*

- Leadership in the **1990s** described only the role of leaders as one who leads, guides, conducts, directs, or control; a director or conductor, a chief or commander, position of a leader, ability to lead and not defining leadership.
- From **1900-1929** Leadership was defined as management of men by persuasion and inspiration. In the **1930s** leadership was defined as personality in action under group conditions. Leadership in the **1940s** was defined as the result of an ability to persuade or direct men or dynamic relationship. In the **1950s**, leadership was group dynamics, behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group. Leadership was referred to in the **1960s** as acts by person which influence others. Finally, in **1979**, leadership defined as emotional relationship which is an integral part of group dynamics and relation-



*“Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes”*

## Leadership Definitions: The 1980s

Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes. Leadership is the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers. Hence, leadership conceived of as ability is a slippery concept, since it depends too much on properties of the situation and of the people to be "led. From this definition, there are four essential elements that must be present if leadership exists or occurring:

- The relations is based on influence
- Leaders and followers are the people in this relationship
- Leaders and followers intend real changes
- Leaders and followers develop mutual purposes.

*"The ultimate test of practical leadership is the realization of intended, real change that meets people's enduring needs"*



**Leadership**

## The Nature of Leadership

Rosts' book draws a line between leadership and management, a distinction that most of his predecessors fail to make. Leadership, he notes, is an *influence relationship*, while management is an *authority relationship*. Leadership requires followers; management requires subordinates.

Leaders and followers are the people in the influence relationship called leadership. Leadership is the reciprocal process of mobilizing, by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict to realize goals independently or mutually.

The ultimate test of practical leadership is the realization of intended, real change that meets people's enduring needs". Leaders and followers are not up to that job unless leadership scholars and practitioners begin to move toward model of leadership more tuned to the postindustrial era.

*"A job is only about a person's net worth, not self-worth"*

## Leadership and Management

The characteristics that distinguish leadership from management are given as follows:

### Leadership:

- Influence relationship
- Leaders and followers
- Intend real changes
- Intended changes
- Reflect mutual purposes

### Management

- Authority relationship
- Managers and subordinates
- Produce/sell goods/services
- Goods/services result and Coordinated activities



### *Leadership and Ethics in the 1990s*

If leadership is an influence relationship, then the process whereby leaders and followers interact becomes crucial to the ethics of leadership. Leaders and followers must be attentive to the influence process that forges relationships. They must guard their relationship from attempts by both leaders and followers to use coercive and authoritarian methods to control the relationship, to promote their own purposes, to win approval of their specific proposals. Leaders and followers need to develop a new language of civic virtue to discuss and make moral evaluations of the changes they intend for organizations and societies. This new language of ethics must center on an integrated concepts of the common good, of our social ecology as a community.

### *Leadership in the Future*

Looking at leadership through the lens of a single discipline has not worked well in the past and it will not work any better in the future. When leadership is anything anyone wants to say it is, the concept of leadership is meaningless, hence nonsense. The understanding is referred to as industrial paradigm with the following characteristics: structural factionist view of organizations, view of management as preeminent profession, personalistic focus on the leader, dominant objective of goal achievement, self-interested and individualistic outlook, a male model of life, a utilitarian and materialistic ethical perspective and a rational technocratic linear and scientific language and methodology.

Leadership studies would be significantly improved if practitioners, translations specialists, and academic scholars would collaborate in research project on postindustrial leadership to developing grounded conceptual frameworks that make sense, transform and inform the practice of leadership in the future.

The 1990s are upon us , and it is time to forsake the old paradigm and begin a new life for leadership study and practice by consciously thinking and acting in ways that are consistent with post-industrial framework.

## *Analysis and Conclusion*

When did the last societal paradigm shift? The industrial revolutions of real leadership definitions happened over two centuries ago. The people in this generation may be the first in history who can reflect upon a societal paradigm shift, who can watch themselves go through the transition from an industrial era to a postindustrial era. All kinds of potential futures are possible for future leader when the meaning of leadership is known and understood.

- *Being the boss does not*

*equate with being a leader. "Boss" is about authority, title, or position, but "leader" is about behavior.*

- *True leaders use soft power, not hard power. Hard power is what comes via authority and includes power in the form of rewards (such as compensation and bonus) and penalties. Soft power is where a leader is followed because a person wants to follow. Soft power is far more effective.*

- *Leaders must build relationships that entail strong mutual confidence. When supervisors delineate "expectations," they are telling people what they want them to do. More effective is when a leader is able to forge a relationship with mutual confidence; the leader is confident in the follower and the follower is confident in the leader. Such confidence-based relationships are far more successful.*



*"Turning around struggling organizations requires creating a sense of collective pride"*