Leadership and Its Place in Organisations: A Theoretical Synthetic Analysis (Note 1)

Sunday Tunde Akindele[1] & Yakibi Ayodele Afolabi[2]

[1] Department of Political Science, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria

[2] Department of Business Administration and Management, Osun State Polytechnic, Iree, Nigeria

Correspondence: Sunday Tunde Akindele, Department of Political Science, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. Tel: 234-803-711-6276. E-mail: sxakindel@yahoo.com

Abstract

The issue of leadership in the context of its place in our organisation and, in various human terrains has elicited series of scholarly attentions over the years. Leadership has become a key concern in organisations within both the private and public sectors of polities and corporate settings in today's world where everything begins and ends with the issue of leadership and its types. In fact, leadership determines the successes or failures of any human endeavour.

Against this premise, this paper deals with the issue of leadership using a synthetic analytical approach. It seeks a further retooling of the hitherto mutually inclusive components of leadership and its various types. In the process, while examining the linkage between the concepts of leadership and power and, the latter's transformation into legitimate authority; the concept of change leadership and its currency within the matrix of organisational and management studies was examined.

The paper concludes with the emphasis that the evocation of the concept of leadership, its types and/or styles, to alter the behaviours of others in groups and organisations will infinitely continue in our world, particularly at this period of the planetary phenomenon of globalization.

Keywords: leadership, organization, power, legitimacy, authority, change leadership, management, synthetic approach, interpersonal influence, theory y, theory x, servant leadership, followership, wake-up call, change process

1. Introduction

An organization is a continuing system of differentiated and coordinated human activities utilizing, transforming and welding together a specific set of human, material, capital, ideational and natural resources into a unique, problem-solving whole whose function is to satisfy particular human needs in interaction with other systems of human activities and resources in its particular environment (Bakke, 1959; Akindele, 2010).

An organization is a system which, as the attainment of its goal, "produces" an identifiable something, which can be utilized in some way by another system; that is, the output of the organization is for some other system, an input. In the case of an organization with economic primacy, this output may be a class of goods or services which are either consumable or serve as instruments for a further phase of the production process by other organizations. In the case of a government agency the out put may be a class of regulatory decisions; in that of an educational organization it may be certain type of "trained capacity" on the part of the students who have been subjected to its influence. In any of these cases there must be a set of consequences of the processes which go on within the organizations, which make a difference to the functioning of some other sub-system of the society; that is, without the production of certain goods the consuming unit must behave differently i.e., *suffer* a *"deprivation"* (Parson, 1956; Akindele, 2010).

An organization is a system of structured interpersonal relations (within which) individuals are differentiated in terms of authority, status and role with the result that personal interaction is prescribed or structured (through which) anticipated reactions tend to occur, while ambiguity and spontaneity are decreased (Presthus, 1958, 1978; Akindele, 2010).

The centrality and relevance of leadership to organizations is clearly decipherable from its foregoing conceptualizations. These theoretical conceptualizations remain valid today despite the currency of ICT-driven organizational structures and the tendency to think that the assumed "classicalism" of such theoretical postulates which globalised leadership as a vehicle for the attainment of any organisation's goals renders them illogical to the climate and landscape of modern organizations. Thus, the climes of today's organizations cannot ignore the indispensability of leadership to their visions and missions without severe consequences in view of its dominance as a feature of all organisations' systemic existence.

Given this premise, the main objective of this paper is to examine the place of leadership in our organizations using a theoretical synthetic analytical approach. This objective per se, is predicated on the critical assumption that any organization without a dedicated, committed purposeful and goal-oriented leadership cannot sustain its existence for the betterment of humanity and our society given the complexities involved which need coordination through mutually beneficial decisional assertiveness of leaders. Thus, the major thrust of our analysis in this paper is that leadership and its hitherto mutually inclusive components need further retooling through a critical synthesis of various styles both old and new in a manner which is attuned to today's organisational operations.

2. The Concept of Leadership and Its Eclecticism

The concept of leadership has attracted a lot of scholastic and intellectual attentions particularly in the quest to define its subject-matter. Its definition has not been an exception to the usual volatility and eclecticism of the disciplines within the social sciences in which management science is dominant. Even though, *"leadership remains one of the most relevant aspects of the organizational context"*, its definition *"has been challenging"*. Such definitions have *"varied depending on the situation"* (Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia).

Leadership is "*the ability to get men do what they don't want to do and like it*" (Cohen et al, 1984). It is "*the process of social influence in which one person can enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task. It is ultimately about creating a way for people to contribute to making something extraordinary happen*" (Ibid.). It is "*the process of using power to obtain interpersonal influence*" (Schermerhon Jr., Hunt and Osborn, 1985). In other words, leadership involves influence and its evocation to alter the behaviours of others in groups and organisational settings to attain desired goals based on proper agenda setting. Thus, in today's organizations, the understanding of the concept of leadership and its effectiveness is critical to the attainment of organizational goals in that:

> *Leaders today work in socially intricate organizations where they need the assistance not only of subordinates but also of peers, superiors, and external parties to accomplish their goals. Accomplishing goals that positively impact the organization requires effective leadership linked to strong power bases and workable influence strategies. Building a strong power base and developing effective influence strategies to produce power dynamic is an important leadership challenge. (Michelson, nd).*

The need for effective leadership is compelled by the fact that *"everything rises and falls on leadership"* and, the *"success or failure of every human endeavour depends solely on the kind of leadership available for such endeavours"* (YHDC, Leadership training, 2009). Thus, as Denga (1986) and, Esere (The Nigerian Journal, Unilorin) once articulated "a leader in an organization is an embodiment of a force that directs the entire organization towards the realization of the organizational goals". Thus, leadership connotes *"ability to inspire, direct, motivate and encourage others positively to targeted end. It is the ability to lead others"* (Olusoji, 2002). It *"represents authority and the pinnacle of the organization. It is the form that authority assumes when it enters into process"* (Mooney & Rieley, 1931 & 1947).

The eclecticism associated with the definition of the concept of leadership aside, the concept per se as a result of its centrality to organizational life and reality has attracted various ideological, scholastic and intellectual attentions and rhetorics. In the process, the eclecticism of the discourses on its subject matter notwithstanding, it has been articulated that *"there is no single best style of leadership"* and that:

> *effective leadership is task–relevant and that the most successful leaders are those that adapt their leadership style to maturity – (the capacity to set high but attainable goals, willingness and ability to take responsibility for the task, and relevant education and/or experience of an individual or group for the task) – of the individual or group they are attempting to lead/influence. Effective leadership varies not only with person or group that is being influenced, but it*

will also depend on the task, job or function that needs to be accomplished (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977).

In short, **"***leadership styles are as varied as the definition of the concept of leadership itself. Each style is usually depended on the person involved, places, times and circumstances in question and sometimes even moods"* (YHDC, Leadership training, 2009) hence; leadership has emotional dimensions to it and, its conceptualization as it can be clearly perceived. In other words as George (2000) clearly articulated, "leadership can be perceived as a particularly emotion-laden process with emotions entwined with the social influence process. And, according to Sy; Cote and saavedra (2005), *"leader's mood in an organization has some effects on his/her group".*

Leadership style has been theoretically elucidated as a predicate of leadership types. This is exemplified by the various theoretical construct on its subject matter. As a matter of fact, Mooney and Rieley (1931 & 1947) identified three types of leaders and their styles. These include "leaders who find it easy to delegate their own authority", "leaders who find it easy to delegate authority but not their own authority and responsibility" and "leaders who would not delegate authority".

Against this analytical premise, it has been articulated that "the nature of work in today's complex organisations requires deep knowledge on the issues of leadership, power, influence" and, followership (Michelson, op cit). Thus, the ability of any leader to manage, lead and sustain his followership confidence in our organizations and human settings is contingent on his understanding of the operational ecology of such organizations and settings.

2.1 Leader's Sustainability of Followership Confidence

The ability of a leader to sustain the confidence of his followers is two-pronged. In the first place, it depends on the leader and his style of leadership and, in the second place; it depends on the nature of the followers and the values of followership imbibed by them. This is particularly so in that, followership can either be voluntary (i.e., intrinsically generated/grown) or compelled/imposed (i.e., extrinsically generated/grown through compulsion).

The types of followership in place are contingent/predicated/determined by the types of leadership. However, the lifespan of both followerships is usually determined by the nature or the resilience of the followers. Voluntary followership grows with the permissiveness of the voluntary leadership and its humanistic nature. In short, voluntary followership is more attuned to servant leadership philosophy and characteristics while compelled followership is characteristically progenized by dictatorial leadership hence; the lifespan of compelled followership under such a leadership style is characteristically determined by the follower's level of tolerance or toleration of indecent treatment from the leader prior to a bubble burst or the explosion of the "gunned sack". However, in most cases, the cessation of compelled/coerced/extrinsic followership automatically leads to the extinction of the coercive and dictatorial leadership and the eventual ecological change or a total rebirth of the organizational system for a better leadership style (e.g., purposeful and humanistic leadership). Hence, the type of followers a leader gets is determined by the leader himself (Latour, 2004).

A leader that wants to sustain the confidence of his followers in his quest for organizational effectiveness and, successful attainment of corporate goals must endeavour to *"acknowledge that their perspective influences their subordinates"* (Ibid.). Such a leader must strive to develop and train his immediate subordinates vis-à-vis his *"level of expectation or level of competence for which they (i.e., the subordinates/followers) could strive" (Ibid.)*. This *"public mentoring technique" (Ibid.)* which Schein (1992) called *"deliberate role-modeling, teaching and coaching"* is the key to developing effective and dynamic followership. Thus; the development and sustenance of followership confidence by a leader is a sine-qua-non to any organization's success and goal attainment.

Through the leader's development of dynamic followers, effective followers will emerge. And, effective followers according to Latour (Ibid.) *"tend to be highly participative and critical thinkers"* and, they tend to be courageously determined in the performance of their duties. Effective followers *"courageously dissent when necessary, share credit, admit mistakes and, habitually exercise superior judgement".*

When fully developed, effective-follower *"will act like a partner in the leader-follower relationship"* in that *"they share the responsibility for the quality of the relationship they have with their leaders"; "they know they cannot be fully effective unless they work in partnerships that require both a commitment to high performance and a commitment to develop effective relationships with partners (including their boss) whose collaboration is essential to success in their own work"* (Potter et al (nd), cited in Latour, 2004), In other words, as a result of the leader's development of dynamic followership, the followers become extremely confident and committed to the performance initiative of such leaders. Once this happens, such followers become committed to the utilization of

the highest level of their efforts towards the attainment of the organizational vision, priorities, goals and mission statement.

The extent to which this confidence can be sustained constitutes the measuring rod of the leader's success or failure. This is more so in that effective followers according to Latour (Ibid.), are *"individuals with high organizational commitment who are able to function well in a change-oriented team environment. Additionally, they are independent, critical thinkers with highly developed integrity and competency. Thus, effective followers exhibit loyalty to the boss by endorsing organizational vision and priorities"*. As a matter of fact, hardly can any leader who is deprived of this type of followership succeed in any organizational setting regardless of its geo-political location within today's corporate world.

3. Insights on Leadership

The focus of this section is on leadership in terms of its undercurrents of styles, service and stewardship spirit. The essence of these insights is to examine whether a given leader is actually a leader fulfilling only the hitherto acclaimed view of leadership as a "top-down" phenomenon or, a leader that equally acts as a follower or servant to the led in the course of service to humanity.

In examining these insights, our focus is principally on servant leadership because the latter is the vehicle for service and spirited stewardship. In other words, service and stewardship spirit are enhanced and put in place by the philosophy of servant leadership devoid of arrogance of power that usually characterize the existential and/or systemic syndromes and values of bossy leaders or leadership.

3.1 Servant-leadership

The concept of servant leadership is not all that new in our organizational world or to the lexicon of organizational discourses. As a matter of fact, its pedigree can be traced back to about four decades. Specifically, the concept was developed in 1970 by Robert K. Greenleaf (www.greenleaf.org; www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership).

Servant leaders provide services – through committed stewardship spirit – to the people. They serve the people they lead. To a servant leader, employees/subordinates are an *"end in themselves rather than a means to an organizational purpose"* (Ibid.). Specifically, servant leaders have been taken to mean people or leaders who:

> *devote themselves to serving the needs of organization members, focus on meeting the needs those they lead, develop employees to bring out the best in them, coach others and encourage their self expression, facilitate personal growth in all who work with them, listen and build a sense of community (www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership).*

According to Greenleaf (1970, www.greenleaf.org):

> *The servant-leader is* servant *first... It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. The conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is* leader *first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions... The leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types. Between them there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature.*

Without doubt, looking at the thesis of servant-leadership, it can be articulated to some extent that its undercurrent philosophy is critically relevant to the attainment of organizational goal and; as a matter of fact, the concept of servant-leadership has enhanced the ability of organizations to reach their full potential. Through it "servant leaders" are felt to be effective because the needs of followers are so looked after that they (often) reach their full potential". Even though, the concept of servant leadership has been criticized through the assertion that *"serving people's needs creates the image of being slavish or subservient"* and/or *"that it is not a very positive image"*, the principles of servant leadership has been characterized as admirable (www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership) as a leadership style through which a leader *"views others (subordinates) as friends not as servants and, interact with them in a spirit of openness, humility and vulnerability"* (YHDC, 2009).

The creed of servant leadership is that the size of true leadership is determined by how many persons he has served and will be served *contrary* to the philosophy of other leadership styles whose measuring-rod of size and values of leadership is determined by the number of people serving the leader (Ibid.). The success or

attractiveness of servant leadership is further put into a clearer perspective by its "credo" which Greenleaf (1970, www.greenleaf.org, www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership), articulated thus:

> *This is my thesis: caring for persons, the more able and the less able serving each other, is the rock upon which a good society is built. Whereas, until recently, caring was largely person to person, now most of it is mediated through institutions – often large, complex, powerful, impersonal; not always competent; sometimes corrupt. If a better society is to be built, one that is more just and more loving, one that provides greater creative opportunity for its people, then the most often course is to raise both the capacity to serve and the very performance as servant of existing major institutions by new regenerative forces operating within them.*

It is clear from this "credo" that *"the servant leader serves others, rather than others serving them"* and that *"serving others comes by helping them to achieve and improve their conditions"* (Ibid.). Thus; the basic assumptions of servant leadership are that: *"the leader has responsibility for the followers; leaders have responsibility towards society and those who are disadvantaged and; people who want to help others best, fulfill these responsibilities by leading them* (http://changingminds.org/disciplines/leadership/style/servant_leadership.htm).

3.2 Linking Servant-leadership with McGregor's Classical Contributions to the Concept of Organizational Leadership

The Concept of servant-leadership, due to its emphasis on spirited stewardship and service, is a major reformative effort as far as organizational life is concerned. It can be regarded as a euphemistic reformation of McGregor's (1960) theory Y which has been widely regarded as a theoretical explication of a people's leader and/or, democratic leader in an organizational setting who, while acting as friendly leader enhances the happiness, improved morale and, the consequent increased productivity of the people (subordinates) within the organization, clearly calls to question the annihilating and repressive values of the organizational leaders depicted by his theory X.

If not exactly or totally, theory Y leaders in human groups or organizational settings, subscribe to certain values of servant-leadership in that, if such theory Y leaders are not really functioning and/or cannot exactly function as servant-leaders, they, according to the theoretical underpinnings of theory Y, share some of the value orientations of the servant-leaders vis-à-vis the perception of subordinates within organizations in the course of the pursuit of the attainment of organizational goals. As a matter of fact, the near affinity of the value strands or orientational philosophy of servant-leadership with those of McGregor's theory Y leaders can actually be appreciated and further understood against a synoptic consideration of the classical contributions of McGregor to the nature and characteristics of leadership in organizations through his theory Y and theory X scholastic efforts.

It should be stated however; that the analytical effort here is far from completely assuming that servant-leadership is exactly the same thing with the concept of democratic leadership that form the major thrust of McGregor's classical work. But, it as attempt to provoke further discourses on the knotty issue of leadership in organizations which has deep-seated historical roots traceable to the classical works of Adam Smith, the "wealth of nations"; Frederick Winslow Taylor, "scientific management", Max Weber, "bureaucracy", Mary Parker Follet, "the giving of orders" Herbert Simon, "proverbs of administration" and; other classical thinkers and theorists.

While not directly related, certain aspects of servant leadership can be located within the matrix and/or parameters of Douglas McGregor's (1960) theory Y and theory X of leadership in terms of leaders concerns for their subordinates within the organizational world. In other words, the issue of leadership in organizations or human settings or groups has long attracted the attentions of management scholars, thinkers and theorists. This has been so because the type of leadership that exists in any given human setting/organization has a lot to do with the success or otherwise of such an organization or setting in terms of service, stewardship and servant leadership and; the attainment of the organizational goals for both the organizations and, their clients.

The dichotomous explication by Douglas McGregor (1960), of the concept of leadership in organization which even though, has long remained a dominant feature of all organizations, has clearly put into a clearer perspective the consequences of the evolution of organization theory over the years for our organizations and requisite workers' morale and productivity. This work has actually shown the effects of the paradigm shifts associated with the theoretical movement on the concept of leadership and its place in our organizations vis-à-vis the place of the individuals within them (Akindele, 2010).

In his classical work "the human side of the enterprise", Douglas McGregor, examines the concept of the leadership using theories X and Y which over the years "have become such memorable theoretical constructs because they appear to be such polar opposites" (Shafritz et. al; 1981). The concept of Theory X (Dictatorial/regimental leadership or view of man) and Theory Y (Democratic or Liberalized view of man/employees in organization) form the core of Douglas McGregor's work-"The Human side of Enterprise" (1960). Without doubt, this work at its inception represented one of the products of the then contemporary research in Personnel Management and organization theory. It emphasizes the humanistic side of organization's environment.

McGregor criticized the dictatorial core of traditional theory of personnel management in relations to man's existence within the organizational environment. He called the traditional theory of personnel management THEORY X which saw only THE MANAGER as an "active agent for motivating people, controlling their actions, modifying their behaviour to fit the needs of the organization (McGregor, 1960). From the perspective of McGregor, THEORY X has a pessimistic view of human nature. It views man as indolent, self-centered and, resistant to change and thus, must be repressed or forced to accept responsibility. This theory emphasizes nothing than "Management by direction and control". In criticizing or condemning the THEORY X view of man (within the organizational environment) as archaic in terms of contemporary developments within organizational environment, McGregor utilized Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs as the base.

From the perspective of McGregor, the philosophy of management by direction and control which forms the core of Theory X regardless of whatever form it takes, is inadequate not only because of its regimental nature but also due to the fact that the human needs on which it relies are today unimportant motivators of behavior (Ibid.). As a matter of fact, according to McGregor, "direction and control are essentially useless in motivating people whose important needs are social and egotistic". Thus, he went further to emphasize the need for managers to shift from THEORY X (regimental/dictatorial and management by direction and control) to THEORY Y (democratic/liberal view of man). This line of thought or view expressed by McGregor finds solace in the fact that THEORY Y is the "process primarily of creating opportunities, releasing potential, removing obstacles, encouraging growth, providing guidance" (McGregor, 1960). Thus, the goal of THEORY Y from his perspective is to create a humanistic environment where people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts towards organizational objectives.

The core of THEORY Y, according to this scholar, could be practically implemented in organization through "job enlargement, delegation of authority, decentralized responsibilities and participatory management etc". Generally, within the context of his work McGregor strived to create "a healthy organization by allowing for maximum growth of human potential through a realistic understanding of human motivation and a fostering of a democratic organizational environment conducive to the development of individual capabilities".

Put together, McGregor's work is nothing but an intellectual explication of the archaism of traditional theory (i.e. theory X) of personnel management due to its dictatorial/regimental nature and exploitative or manipulative view of man within organization and, the necessity to adopt a more dynamic and liberal view (Theory Y) of man within the organizational set up. A synoptic though concrete comparative perusal of both Theories (X and Y) would reveal the polarity between the two in terms of relevance or otherwise to contemporary position of man within the organizational set up.

3.2.1 Theory X

Theory x view or conception of management's task in harnessing or tapping human energy to organizational requirements can be propositionally trichotomized thus:

(1)   Management is responsible for organizing the elements of productive enterprise – e.g. money, materials, equipment and, people – in the interest of economic ends.

(2)   With respect to PEOPLE, this (i.e. organizing the elements of productive enterprise) is a process of DIRECTING their efforts, motivating them, controlling their actions, modifying their behaviour to fit the needs of the organization.

(3)   Without this active intervention by management, people would be passive – even resistant – to organizational needs. They must therefore be persuaded, rewarded, punished, (and) controlled. Their activities must be directed (McGregor, 1960)

In addition to the foregoing, other widespread beliefs and views which form the core of this conventional theory of personnel management and its variables of structures, managerial policies, and practices include:

•   The average man is by nature indolent – he works as little as possible.

- He (i.e. the average man) lacks ambition, dislikes responsibility and prefers to be led.
- He is inherently self-centered, indifferent to organizational needs.
- He is by nature resistant to change.
- He is gullible, not very bright, the ready dupe of the charlatan (i.e. a fake) and the demagogue

In highlighting how these beliefs have affected conventional organizational structures and policy orientations with respect to their (organizations) view of man, McGregor explained that management – (using these assumptions as guides,) – conceived of a range of possibilities between two extreme approaches (hard and/or soft approaches). According to this theorist, within the confines of the hard approach, "methods of directing behavior involving coercion and threat (usually disguised), close supervision, tight controls over behaviors" largely exist. But then, this approach which is difficult and usually ineffective in times of full employment is not without costs because, force which underlies it cannot but breed counter-forces, restriction of output, antagonism, militant unionism, subtle but effective sabotage of management objective. On the other extreme is the soft approach. Its methods – (direction) –involve management permissiveness, satisfying people's demands, and achieving harmony in an attempt to make the employees tractable and accept direction. But then, its shortcomings range the breeding of abdication of management to harmony, indifferent performance to expectation of more benefits by employees in return for less contribution.

3.2.2 Theory Y

This theory is almost a direct opposite of Theory X going by its more optimistic and liberal view about man and human nature. Its core includes the following:

- Management is responsible for organizing the elements of productive enterprise – (e.g. money, materials, equipment, people etc.) – in the interest of economic ends.

- People are not by nature passive or resistant to organizational needs. They have become so as a result of experience in organizations.

- The motivation, the potential for development, the capacity for assuming responsibility, the readiness to direct behavior toward organizational goals are present in people. Management does not put them there. It is a responsibility of management to make it possible for people to recognize and develop these human characteristics for themselves.

- The essential task of management is to arrange organizational conditions and methods of operation so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts toward organizational objectives".

Theory (Y) is symmetrical to what Peter Drucker called "Management by Objectives (MBO) because it brings about a process primarily concerned with creating opportunities, releasing potentials, removing obstacles, encouraging growth and providing guidance for employees or people in the organizations. And, it does not involve the abdication of management, the absence of leadership, the lowering of standards, or the other characteristics usually associated with the "hard approach" under Theory X.

A cursory look at the synoptic perusal of theories x and y above tends to depict theory y as more consistent with the good and repression-free society. Hence, "few public administrators would deny the importance or worth of McGregor's idealistic "new consensus" as expressed in THEORY Y to the landscape of organizations today which, in itself has been dictated and would continue to be dictated by the evolution of its theory and its attendant paradigm changes.

It should be stressed however, that theory Y in spite of its positive attributes is not a technique or style of management without its cost and consequences for managers and leaders applying it in their organizations. In other words, the adoption of Theory Y as a technique or style of management in organizations involves opportunity cost in terms of the reactions of the organizational environment and people within such organizations.

The likely cost and consequences faced by managers and leaders in organizations and political settings seeking to evoke the principles of Theory Y have been clearly articulated by Crockett (1970) in the conclusion of his work on team building thus:

> *the so-called Theory Y style of management – management by participation – is neither soft headed nor "easy". It is much easier to avoid confrontation by issuing orders. It is easier to avoid personal involvement and conflict by smoothing over surface. Theory Y management is not for the executive who likes surface serenity and obsequiousness. Theory Y management is for those managers who are willing to take the gut punishment*

of a truly tough-minded approach to management. It is for those who believe that conflict can be handled best by confronting it openly and for those who understand that real commitment of their people can be secured only by their continuing participation in making plans and setting objectives.

It is arguable to some extent that the opportunity cost and consequences which may be likely involved in the full or wholesale adoption of either Theory X or Theory Y as a technique or style of management may have clearly influenced the thinking of some scholars that both theories may be mixed for a better organizational performance and systemic existence (Akindele, 2010). Thus, it has been clearly stated that "it is a poor manager that would adopt in toto either Theory X or Theory Y (Shafritz, Hyde and, Rosenbloom 1981). Most work situations require a mix rather than simplistic acceptance of one construct or another". Thus, a synoptic comparison of McGregor's theory X and theory Y has been provided by Hersey (1985) in his analysis of the situational leader. He categorically asserted that "the leader's high, realistic expectation causes high performance of followers; the leader's low expectation lead to low performance of followers. In order to make an effective cycle, a leader needs to motivate followers properly". As a matter of fact, the new thinking within the organizational world today is that such motivation can be enhanced or promoted by no other person than a change leader. This leads us to the discussion of the concept of change leader in the next section below.

4. Change Leadership and the Change Leader

The concept of change leadership is a key to large-scale, sustainable reform. It is a leadership style or process through which a leader that is committed to sustained and sustainable innovation in the quest for organizational effectiveness emerges. Thus, a change leader is a focused leader who is committed to the development of knowledge and skill within his organization particularly in terms of programme coherence and technical resources (Newmann; King and, Younge 2000). Change leaders are critically concerned with and, committed to the achievement of large-scale organizational turnaround in the course of their leadership role and management of human and natural resources within a given political economy and its accompanying multiple variables and/or other societal landscapes and their terrains.

A change leader is one who seeks deep and lasting reforms through the establishment of conditions aimed at the attainment of *"enduring greatness"*. In other words, a change leader is a leader who *"catalyzes commitment to a compelling vision and higher performance"* by going beyond *"performance standard"* and building *"enduring greatness"* (Collins, 2001). Generally, a change leader is one whose goal is *"sustainable change in society"* (Fullan 2002). He is a leader of the future who is *"attuned to the big picture"* of his environment and, he is regarded as *"a sophisticated conceptual thinker who transforms the organization through people and teams"* demonstrating *"palpable energy, enthusiasm and hope"* using his acclaimed characteristics of moral purpose; an understanding of the change process; the ability to improve relationships; knowledge creation and sharing; coherence making" and; ability to hear wake-up call (Fullan, 2002; Anderson and Anderson, nd).

4.1 Moral Purpose

This is a social responsibility to others and the environment most especially if, for an example, the goal (in focus) by the change leader is systemic improvement that is, improving all the organizations in the area of his existence (organization). A change leader who is committed to systemic improvement must also be nearly as concerned about the success of other organizations in his area of operation as his own.

4.1.1 Understanding the Change Process

For any leader to be regarded as a change leader he has to clearly understand the processes that are involved in the change process. This is particularly so, as Fullan (2002), once clearly articulated that *"having innovative ideas and understanding of the change process are not the same thing"*. As a matter of fact, *"those firmly committed to their own ideas are not necessarily good change agents (or leaders) because being a change agent (leader) involves getting commitment from others who might not line one's ideas"*. Specifically, understanding the change process by a change leader involves the following guidelines:

- The goal is not to innovate the most. Innovating selectively with coherence is better.
- Having the best ideas is not enough. Leaders help others assess and find collective meaning and commitment to new ways.
- Appreciate the implementation dip. Leaders can't avoid the inevitable early difficulties of trying something new. They should know, for example, that no matter how much they plan for change, the first six months or so of implementation will be bumpy.

- Redefine resistance. Successful leaders don't mind when naysayers rock the boat. In fact, doubters sometimes have important points. Leaders look for ways to address those concerns.

- Reculturing is the name of the game. Much change is structural and superficial. Transforming culture - *changing what people in the organization value and now they work together to accomplish it* – leads to deep lasting change.

- Never a checklist, always complexity. There is no step-by-step shortcut to transformation; it involves the hard, day-to-day work of reculturing (Ibid.)

A change leader must know the difference between his own expertise in any given context and the expertise required in managing the process of change. Thus; as Anderson and Anderson (nd) once articulated *"most often when leaders decide to mobilize a change effort, events are already underway and, information has already been surfaced that affect what the leaders must do. Consequently, they need to figure out what has been happening, what is known, and who is doing what"*. A change leader *"does not make the mistake of assuming that the best idea will carry the day"* (Fullan, 2002). Instead, he *"provides opportunities for people to visit sites that are using new ideas, invites questions and even dissent and, expects the change process to proceed in fits and starts during the first few months of implementation"*.

4.1.2 Improving Relations

A successful change in organization is clearly predicated on improved relationships. As a matter of fact, improved relationships are predictors of better organizational climate and sustainable development. Organizational ground is lost in a situation of stagnant or decreased relationships. Hence, change leaders *"build relationships with diverse people and groups – especially with people who think differently"* (Fullan, 2002). This is particularly so because people who think differently within organization no doubt add to the increased complexities of such organizations.

Giving prominence to these complexities and, the need to build relationships in complex times, Goleman, Boyatzis and, Mckee (2002), clearly asserted that *"in complex times, emotional intelligence is a must. Emotionally intelligent leaders are able to build relationships because they are aware of their own emotional make-up and are sensitive and inspiring to others"*. Thus, the change leader knows and, should continue to know that *"building relationships and teams (in organizations) is the most difficult skill (for both the organization and the leader)"* (Hay Management Consultant, 2000). To successfully build relationships in organizations, change leaders must work *"hard to develop the full range of emotional intelligence domains, especially self-management of emotions and empathy toward others"* (Goleman, Boyatzis and, Mckee, 2002). This is particularly so in that *"focusing on relationships isn't just a matter of boosting"* organizational achievement/productivity (depending on the socio-political and economic settings) for the year *"but rather a means of laying the foundation for" subsequent years"* (Fullan, 2002). According to this scholar the change leader's *"efforts to motivate and energize"* the organization's members of staff and *"forge relationships among otherwise disconnected"* staffers *"can have effect on the overall climate of the organization.*

4.1.3 Knowledge Creation and Sharing

Effective change leadership is predicated on creating and sharing knowledge within organizations. Knowledge is clearly attained in organizations through the social process of information transformation and sharing. Thus, *"organization must foster knowledge giving as well as knowledge seeking" through information"*. Through the creation and sharing of knowledge, continuous learning and development take place hence, a change leader encourages individuals within the organization to add to their knowledge through sharing without been unmindful of the fact that *"there will be little to add if people are not sharing"*. It is clearly the belief of the change leader that the critical *"norm of sharing one's knowledge with others is the key to continual growth for all"* within any given organization or social setting (Fullan, 2002). Thus, *"knowledge creation and sharing fuels moral purpose"* in organizations and/or social settings led by a change leader.

4.1.4 Coherence Making

This is a critical variable in any organization or social setting that comprises of people with different values and asymmetrical needs, aspirations and goals all of which add to the complexities of such organizations. These complexities in themselves *"inherently generate overload and fragmentation"* (Ibid.) hence, a change leader to be effective *"must be coherence-makers"* (Fullan, 1999 and 2001). As a matter of fact, coherence making by a change leader is enhanced by *"the other characteristics of the change leader* – moral purpose; an understanding of the change process; the ability to build relationships, and creation and sharing of knowledge – *through checks and balances embedded in their interaction"* (Fullan, 2002). Analyzing his position on coherence-making

further, this scholar articulated the fact that *"leaders with deep moral purpose provide guidance; but they can also have blinders if their ideas are not challenged through the dynamics of change, the give and take of relationship, and the ideas generated by new knowledge"*. He went further to contend that *"coherence is an essential component of complexity and yet can never be completely achieved"*.

4.1.5 Ability to Hear Wake-Up Call

A change leader must have the ability to hear wake-up call. This ability is critical and central to the actual process of change and his expected success on same most especially considering the fact that the process of change forms one of cardinal characteristics of his existence as a change leader. Thus, according to Anderson and Anderson (nd):

> *The actual process of change begins the moment a person or a group hears the wake-up call and recognizes that there is a reason to change-*an opportunity to be pursued or a threat to be removed. *The wake-up call can be heard anywhere in the organization, at any level. At times, there is grass-roots awareness of the need long before the executives take notice. However, for an organization-wide transformation to mobilize, the leaders of the organization affected must ultimately hear the signal clearly enough to warrant attention and discussion, if not action. In change-resistant organizations, executives typically do not get or heed wake-up calls until the signals become so painful and dangerous that they threaten the organization's very survival. The wake-up call may come in the form of a dramatic event, such as the competition beating you to market with similar or better product than you have under-development; or it may be accumulation of many indicators that finally culminate in a loud and meaningful message. Examples of the latter include loss of market share, new technological advancements in your industry, mergers of your key competitors, the required closure of a once valuable factory, the initiation of a hostile unionization effort, or an increase in turnover of critical employees. At this very early in the transformation, it is important to identify and understand what wake-up calls exist, what they mean, and what is being done with them by those in position to initiate a change effort. The mindset of the leaders has a major impact on the meaning made of the information in the wake-up call. If the leaders are conscious and open to learning and changing, they will deal with the wake-up call differently than if they are not. However, let's assume that, at some point, the signal is receive, the insight about the need for change is registered, and the change process is set in motion.*

A change leader to fully utilize the wake-up call ability must recognize the fact that *"a change is needed; the change is transformational; transformation demands new approaches, strategies, mindsets, and behavior; and transformation requires the leaders to personally change their mindsets, behavior and style"*. Contrary to leaders who do not subscribe to change because of their indifference and/or immunity to change which makes *"the mistake of seeking external innovations"* and blind focus on *"too many projects"* their operational hallmarks, change leaders do concentrate on the internal goals and mission of their organizations *"as the central focus of their organizational "reform agents"* and, they *"usually keep an eye out for external ideas that further the thinking and vision of their organization"* (Fullan, 2002). Thus, Change leaders *"value the tensions inherent in addressing hard to solve problems because that is where the greatest* (organizational/systemic) *accomplishments lie"*. It should be stressed however, that the role of the change leader in the change process is largely dictated by the structure of power and/or power configuration within the organizational landscape.

5. Concept of Power

The concept of power is very central and critical to the systemic existence of all humans within all groups or organizational settings. It is *"a measure of an entity's ability to control the environment around itself including the behaviours of others"* (Wikipedia) hence, according to Michelson (nd); it is *"a pervasive reality in the life process of all modern-day organizations"*. The centrality of power to human existence explains why *"leaders regularly acquire and use power to accomplish specific work goals and to strengthen their own positions vis-à-vis the reading of general or organizational goal"*. The dark side of power which hitherto, has earned it the derisive labels like *"power is evil"*, *"corrupt"*, *"self-serving"*, *"manipulative"* and, *"hurtful"* (Kanter, 1979), notwithstanding, *"there is however, a positive face to the issue/concept of power, its acquisition and use within organizational and human settings to achieve organizational, group and individual goals* (Michelson, op. cit, nd). Thus, *"power acquisition and power use can have impact on career progress, on job performance, on*

organizational effectiveness, and on the lives of numerous people" (Kotter, 1979). This explains why *"every interaction and every social relationship in an organization"* involves *"an exercise of power"* (Gibson, Ivancevich and, Donnelly, 1985).

From the foregoing it is clear that power is a very important concept in our lives. It is the *"ability to command others to obedience without resistance; it involves the use of compulsion and coercion"* (Crick, 1964). It is *"the capacity to affect another's behaviour by threat of some form of sanction"* (Ball, 1983). The sanctions may be negative (in which case it involves the threat of denial of rewards or imposition of other penalties) or positive (which involves promises of wealth, honour or other forms of rewards) (Ball, 1983; Akindele, Obiyan and, Owoeye, 2000). For the exercise of power to be really acceptable it has to be authorized or legitimized hence; the concepts of power means nothing without its transposition to authority through legitimacy.

Authority is the right to direct and command others to obedience without dissent, and it is associated with respect and influence as well as ability to secure voluntary compliance. It also the recognition of the right to rule irrespective of the sanctions the ruler may possess (Leeds, 1981; Ball; 1983; Akindele, Obiyan and, Owoeye, 2000). Authority can be derived from three sources which according to Max Weber (1947) are Traditional Authority; Charismatic Authority and; Legal-Rational Authority. Traditional Authority is the acceptance of the right to rule of someone resulting from the continuous exercise of political power. It is based on hereditary attributes. Charismatic Authority is the acceptance or recognition of a person's right to rule due to exceptionally strong, dynamic, likeable personality and character. The word charisma means the gift of grace. It relates to the personal qualities and abilities of a particular leader to shape the nature of his environment through charismatic mobilization of the people. Legal-Rational Authority is based on the ascension of a person to a particular post through some established rule or procedures for an example, Political Office holders through elections. It connotes the exercise of rules in an effective, impartial manner. It applies to the modern states whereby the exercise of power takes the course of law. This type of authority is possessed or acquired by holding political and administrative offices (Akindele, Obiyan and, Owoeye, 2000).

6. Conclusion

The concept of leadership and its place in today's organizations have been synthetically analysed in this paper. In the process, its various components of power; legitimacy; authority; influence and; followership were examined. Using these as critical templates the concepts of servant-leadership and change leadership and, their techniques; values and, inclinations as recoiled or retooled components of classical leadership were analyzed in the context of the feelings, emotions, goals and aspirations of people embedded within various human organizations today.

References

Akindele, S. T. (2010). *THE NERVES OF ORGANIZATION: A Genealogical Discourse of Organizational Theory and its Threads.* Saarbrucken, Germany: LAP LaMBERT Academic Publishing AG & Co. KG.

Akindele, S. T., Obiyan, A. Sat., & Owoeye, J. (2000). *The subject matter of Political Science* (2nd ed.). Ibadan: College Press and Publishers Ltd.

Anderson, L. S. A., & Anderson, D. (n. d.). *The change Leader's Road Map: How to Navigate your Organization's Transformation* (Chapter One).

Bakke, E. W. (1959). Concept of the Social Organization. In M. Haire (Ed.), *Modern Organization Theory*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Ball, A. (1983). *Modern Politics and Government* (3rd ed.). London: McMillan.

Bono, J. E., & Illies, R. (2006). Charisma, Positive emotions and mood contagion. *The leadership Quarterly, 17*(4), 317-334. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.04.008

Cohen, A. R., et. al. (1984). *Effective Behaviour in Organizations*. Homewood, Illinois: IRWIN.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap...and other don't.* New York: Harper-Collins.

Crick, B. (1964). *In Defence of Politics.* London: McMillan.

Crockett, W. J. (1970). Team-Building-One Approach to Organizational Development. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 6*(3), 291-306. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002188637000600303

Denga, D. I. (1986). An Introduction to Foundation of Education. Calabar: Advanced Publishers & Printing.

Esere, M. O. (n. d.). Leadership Styles of Husbands in Homes: Implications for Family Stability. *The Nigerian Journal.*

Follett, M. P. (1926). The Giving of Orders. In H. C. Metcalf (Ed.), *Scientific Foundations of Business Administration*. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins Co.

Follett, M. P. (1940). In H. C. Metcalf, & L. Urwick (Eds.), *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Fullan, M. (1999). *Change Forces: The sequel.* London: Taylor & Francis/Falmer.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a Culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Fullan, M. (2002). *The Change Leader*. Metairie, LA: Center for Development and Learning.

George, J. M. (2009). Emotions and Leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations, 53*, 1027-1055. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726700538001

Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., & Donnelly, J. H. Jr. (1985). *Organizations: Behaviour, Structure, Process.* Plano, Texas: Business Publications, Inc.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & Mckee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Hay Management Consultants. (2000). *The lessons of leadership.* London: Author.

Hersey, P. (1985). *The Situational Leader.* New York: Warner Books.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). Management of Organizational Behaviour (3rd ed. – Utilizing Human Resources). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Kanter, R. M. (1979). Power Failure in Management Circuits. *Harvard Business Review, 65*.

Kotter, J. P. (1979). *Power in Management*. New York: AMACOM.

Latour, S. M. (2004). Dynamic Followership: The Prerequisites for Effective Leadership. *Air and Space Power Journal*, (Winter), Parts 1 & 2.

Leadership. In *Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia*.

Leeds, C. A. (1981). *Political Studies* (3rd ed.). Estover: Macdonald & Evans Ltd.

Maslow, A. H. (1962). *Toward a Psychology of Being.* Princeton: Van Nostrand. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10793-000

McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Michelson, B. J. *Leadership and power base development: Using Power Effectiveness to manage Diversity and Job-related Interdependence in Complex Organizations.* An Article specially prepared for AU-24, Concepts for Air Force Leadership.

Mooney, J. D., & Rieley, A. C. (1931). *Onward Industry*. New York: Harper and Brothers. Later published in 1939 and, 1947 by James D. Mooney with a new title of "Principles of Organization".

Mooney, J. D., & Rieley, A. C. (1947). *The Principles of Organization.* New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Mooney, J. D. (1947). The Scalar Principles. In J. D. Mooney, & Rieley, A. C. (Eds), *The Principles of Organization*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Newmann, F., King, B., & Younge, P. (2000). *Professional development that addresses school capacity*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.

Olusoji, A. (2002). *The Making of a Leader: Exploring the Skills of Leadership.* Lagos: Leadership Publishing House.

Parsons, T. (1956). Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 1*(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2390840

Potter, E. H., Rosenbach, W. E., & Pittman, T. S. (n. d.). Leading the New Professional. In Taylor & Rosenbach (Eds), *Military Leadership.*

Presthus, R. (1958). Toward a theory of Organizational Behaviour. *Administrative Quarterly*, (June), 46-72.

Presthus, R. (1978). *The Organizational Society*. New York: St. Martin's Press Inc.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schermerhorn, J. R. Jr., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (1985). *Managing Organizational Behaviour*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Shafritz, J. M., & Whitbeck, P. H. (Eds.). (1981). *Classics of Organization Theory.* Oak Park, Illinois: Moore Publishing Company, Inc.

Shafritz, J. M., Hyde, A. C., & Rosenbloom, D. H. (1981). *Personnel Management in Government: Politics and Process.* New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.

Simon, H. A. (1946). The Proverbs of Administration. *Public Administration Review, 6*(Winter), 53-67. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/973030

Simon, H. A. (1957). *Administrative Behaviour – A Study of Decision-making in Administrative Organizations.* New York: Free Press.

Smith, A. (1776). *An Inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of Nations*.

Sy, T., Cote, S., & Saavedra, R. (2005). The contagious Leader: Impact of the leader's mood on the mood of group members, group affective tone, and group processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(2), 295-305. Retrieved from http://www.rotman.utoronto.ca/~scote/syetalJap.pdf. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.295

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Shop Management.* New York and London: Harper and Brothers.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The Principles of Scientific Management.* Later published in 1916 in the Bulletin of the Taylor Society (December).

Weber, M. (1922). Bureaucracy. In H. Gerth, & C. W. Mills, (1946) (Eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press Inc.

Weber, M. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations.* Translated by A. M. Henderson, & T. Parsons. Glencoe, Illinois.

What is Servant Leadership? Retrieved from www.leadersdirect.com/servant-leader; www.greenleaf.org/whatissl

Youth Heritage Development Centre (YHDC). (2009). Styles of Leadership. *Leadership Training*, Part I.

Note