CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter review what has been discussed on the concept of leadership. The chapter traces what has been viewed as the characteristic of effective or ineffective leadership. In the context of this chapter, characteristics are the personal qualities that contribute to a person's leadership practices. Perspective on leadership is the central focus in this chapter and it is discussed in various themes. The chapter begins with a brief review of some theories on leadership, followed by key leadership concepts where the questions such as 'what is leadership' and 'what is being a leader' will be answered. Historical overview on leadership, styles and types of leadership are worthy to be noted. Characteristics of leadership qualities are crucial in this discussion. Schyns & Meindl (2005: ix) regards implicit leadership as an appropriate ways to respond to leaders so that potential social or organisational 'bumps' can be avoided.

2.2. Perspectives on leadership

2.2.1. Leadership theories

Theories involving features of leadership such as traits, situational interaction, function, behaviour, power, vision, values, charisma, and intelligence have been produced (Richards & Engle 1986:206; Locke et. al. 1991). Some of these theories have received attention, and they are: early history theory; alternative theories; re-emergence of trait theory an attribute pattern approach theory, functional theory, behavioural and style theories, transactional and transformational theories as well as neo-emergent theory.

2.2.1.1. Early history theory

The concept of leadership has been in the public domain since early history. It has been observed that the search for the characteristics or traits of leaders has been ongoing for

centuries. Plato and Plutarch are considered to be the greatest philosophers in history. The former is known for his *Republic*[21] and the latter for his outstanding writings *Lives*. The two philosophers have explored the question: "what qualities distinguish an individual as a leader?" (Blackburn & Simon 2007:1ff). The importance of leadership has been considered since early history. Leadership has been perceived as rooted in the characteristics that certain individuals possess (Schofield 2005:293-302). The idea suggesting that leadership is based on individual attributes is known as the 'trait theory of leadership'. The view of leadership and the trait theory was explored in greater detail in the previous century.

Among others Thomas Carlyle and Francis Galton's writings serve as perfect example research of early history. The talent, skills and physical characteristics of men, who rose to power have been identified by Carlyle (1869) in his *Heroes and Hero Worship* (1841). On the other side in Galton's (1869) *Hereditary Geniu* Galton concluded that leadership was inherited. Galton examined leadership qualities in the families of influential men. The notion that leadership is rooted in characteristics of a leader is highly supported. In most cases, larders are evaluated on how they behave in public and in their private lives. The behaviour of a leader has a significant role in leadership (Kickul & Neuman 2000:27-51). According to Zaccaro (2007:62, 6-16) the trait-based perspective dominated empirical and theoretical work in leadership. For decades, this trait-based perspective dominated empirical and theoretical work in leadership (Zaccaro 2007:62, 6-16). Early research techniques have assisted researchers in conducting over a hundred studies that propose a number of characteristics that distinguished leaders from non-leaders: intelligence, dominance, adaptability, persistence, integrity, socioeconomic status, and self-confidence just to name a few. By exploring early historians and philosophers, such as Plato, Plutarch, Carlyle and Galton on the concept of leadership, the behaviour of the leader is to be account for. Equally important, leadership qualities are to be considered.

---

[21] The Republic is a Socratic dialogue written by Plato around 380 BC concerning the definition of justice and the order and character of the just city state and the just man (Brickhouse, Thomas and Smith, Nicholas D. Plato (c. 427-347),The Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, University. of Tennessee, cf. *Dating Plato's Dialogues.*

2.2.1.2. Alternative theory

A series of qualitative reviews of early history studies prompted researchers towards a different view behind leadership in the late 1940's and early 1950's (Bird 1940; Stogdill 1948: 35-71; Mann 1959:241-270). Stogdill and Mann are of the opinion that although certain traits were common in various studies, general findings proposed that individuals holding leadership positions in a specific situation(s) does not imply that he or she may become a leader in other situations. As a result leadership was no longer characterised as an enduring individual trait, as situational approaches posited that individuals can be effective in certain situations, but not in others (Foti & Hauenstein 2007:347-355). This approach dominated much of the leadership theory and research for the next few decades. Although Stogdill and Mann alluded that if a person is a leader in one situation it may not necessarily mean that he or she may maintain the same position, the experience of that individual qualifies him/er to be a leader. Through the nature of the individual's behaviour and expertise, the person who holds a leadership position may alternate to another situation.

2.2.1.3. Re-emergence of trait theory

New methods and measurements were developed after influential reviews that re-establish the trait theory as a viable approach to the study of leadership (Leadership 1991). Improvements in researchers' use of the 'round robin research design methodology' allowed researchers to see and who emerged as leaders across a variety of situations and tasks (Kenny &Zaccaro1983:678-685). During the 1980s statistical advances allowed researchers to conduct meta-analyse.

Using quantitative methodology researchers analysed and summarised the findings from a wide array of studies. The re-emergence allowed trait theorists to create a comprehensive and parsimonious picture of previous leadership research (Lord *et al* 1986:402ff). Reliance on the qualitative reviews of the past was avoided. The new method made it possible for researchers to reveal the following: every individual can and do emerge as leaders across a variety of situations and tasks (Kenny & Zaccaro 1983:678-685).The existing relationship between

leadership and individual traits are important. Among others, the following traits are identified: intelligence, adjustment, extraversion (Lord *et al*1983:402-410), conscientiousness (Arvey *et al*. 2006:1-20; Judge *et al.*2000:765-780; Tagger *et al.* 1999:899-926), openness to experience (Judge *et al*. 2002:767ff), general self-efficacy (Smith & Foti 1998: 147-160, Foti & Hauenstein 2007:347-355).

Although the trait theory of leadership regained popularity, its re-emergence has not been accompanied by increasing sophisticated conceptual framework. Four trait theorists are noted (Zaccaro 2007:7ff). Firstly, focuses on a small set of individual attributes such as the neglect of cognitive abilities, motives, values, social skills, expertise, and problem-solving skills. Secondly, the failure to consider patterns or the integration of multiple attributes. Thirdly, distinction between those leader attributes that are malleable over time and those that are shaped by and bound to, situational influences should be avoided. Lastly, considering stable leader attribute accounts for the behaviour diversity should not be considered.

2.2.1.4. Attribute pattern approach

Considering the criticisms of the trait theory outlined above, several researchers adopted different perspectives of leader individual differences, known as *the leader attribute pattern approach* (Foti & Hauenstein 2007:347-355; Zaccaro; Gulick & Khare 2008:13-29; Gershenoff & Foti 2003: 170-196; Mumford, Harding, Jacobs & Fleishman 2000:11-35). In contrast to the traditional approach, the leader attribute pattern approach is based on theorists' arguments. Theorists' argue that the influence of individual characteristics on outcomes is understood by considering the person as an integrated totality rather than a summation of individual variables (Gershenoff & Foti2003: 170-196; Smith & Foti 1998: 147-160). In other words, the leader attribute pattern approach argues that integrated constellations or combinations of individual differences may explain substantial variance in both leader emergence and leader effectiveness beyond that explained by single attributes, or by additive combinations of multiple attributes. Classical management theory and scientific management are another extreme of leadership. Classical theories focused on the design of the total organisation while scientific managers focused on the systematic management of individual

61

job. Furthermore, classical theorist devoted their energies to identify methods through which this kind of organisational structure could be achieved (Bass 1990).

2.2.1.5. Behavioural and style theories

In response to the early criticisms of the trait approach, theorists began to research leadership as a set of behaviours (cf. Lewin, Lippitt & White 1939:271-301). It entails evaluating the behaviour of 'successful' leaders, determining behaviour taxonomy and identifying broad leadership styles (Magnusson 1995: 219-247). Leadership takes a strong personality with a well-developed positive ego (Arvey et al 2006:1-20, Zaccaro et al 2008:13-29). Not so much as a pattern of motives, but a set of traits is crucial. To lead; self-confidence and a high self-esteem is useful, perhaps even essential (Frey & Curlette 2009:212-240). Positive reinforcement occurs when a positive stimulus is presented in response to behaviour, increasing the likelihood of that behaviour in the future (Miner 2005:39-40). Positive reinforcement can be used in a business setting. Assume praise is a positive reinforce for a particular employee. If the manager praise and appreciate the work done by the an employee, he/she develop positive attitude (Hackman 2005:269-287; Zaccrob & Kilimoski 2001:3-41).The use of positive reinforcement is a successful and growing technique used by leaders to motivate and attain desired behaviours from subordinates (Blake et al. 1964). Empirical research covering the last 20 years suggests that reinforcement theory has a 17 percent increase in performance (Lussier & Acus 2010). Additionally, many reinforcement techniques such as the use of praise are inexpensive, providing higher performance for lower costs.

2.2.1.6. Situational and contingency theories

Situational theory appeared as a reaction to the trait theory of leadership. Social scientists argued that history was more than the result of intervention of great men. Time produces the person and not the other way around Miltenberger (2004).This theory assumes that different situations call for different characteristics (Blake1982:207-210). According to this group of theories, no single optimal psychographic profile of a leader exists. What an individual actually does when acting as a leader is in large part dependent upon characteristics of the

situation in which he functions (Lussier & Achua 2010). If a leader does not 'take charge' he can be perceived as a failure in protracted or thorny organisational problems (Heifitz 1994: 16). Thus, theorists defined the style of leadership as contingent to the situation, classified as contingency theory. Four contingency leadership theories appear more prominently in recent years: Fiedler contingency model, Vroom-Yetton decision model, the path-goal theory, and the Hersey-Blanchard situational theory.

The Fiedler contingency model bases the leader's effectiveness on what Fred Fiedler called *situational contingency*. This results from the interaction of leadership style and situational favourableness (later called 'situational control'). This theory defined two types of leader: those who tend to accomplish the task by developing good-relationships with the group (*relationship-oriented*), and those who have as their prime concern carrying out the task itself (*task-oriented*) (Hemhill 1949). According to Fiedler, there is no ideal leader. Both task-oriented and relationship-oriented leaders can be effective if their leadership orientation fits the situation. When there is a good leader-member relation, a highly structured task, and high leader position power, the situation is considered a "favourable situation". Fiedler found that task-oriented leaders are more effective in extremely favourable or unfavourable situations, whereas relationship-oriented leaders perform best in situations with intermediate favourability.

Victor Vroom, in collaboration with Phillip Yet to developed taxonomy for describing leadership situations (Wormer *et. al* 2007: 198). Taxonomy was used in a normative decision model where leadership styles were connected to situational variables. This approach was novel because it supported the idea that the same manager could rely on different group decision making approaches depending on the attributes of each situation. This model was later referred as situational contingency theory (Vroom et. al 1988).

The theory identifies four leader behaviours, *achievement-oriented*, *directive*, *participative* and *supportive*; those are contingent to the environment factors and follower characteristics. In contrast to the Fiedler contingency model, the path-goal model states that the four leadership behaviours are fluid, and that leaders can adopt any of the four depending on what the

situation demands. The path-goal model can be classified both as a contingency theory, as it depends on the circumstances, but also as a transactional leadership theory, as the theory emphasises the reciprocity behaviour between the leader and the followers.

2.2.1.7. Functional theory

Functional leadership theory is useful for addressing specific leader behaviours expected to contribute to organisational or unit effectiveness (Hackman & Walton 1986; McGrath 1962). This theory argues that the leader's main job is to see that whatever is necessary for group needs is taken care of; thus, a leader can be said to have done their job well when they have contributed to group effectiveness and cohesion (Fleishman *et al.,* 1991; Hackman & Wageman 2005; Hackman & Walton 1986). While functional leadership theory has most often been applied to team leadership (Zaccaro; Rittman & Marks2001), it has also been effectively applied to broader organisational leadership as well (Zaccaro, 2001). In summarising literature on functional leadership (cf. Kozlowski *et al*. 1996; Zaccaro et al. 2001, Hackman and Walton 1986, Hackman & Wageman 2005; Morgeson 2005; Klein, Zeigert, Knight, and Xiao 2006) observed five broad functions a leader performs when promoting organisation's effectiveness. These functions include: first, environmental monitoring; second, organising subordinate activities; third, teaching and coaching subordinates, fourth, motivating others, and fifth, intervening actively in the group's work.

A variety of leadership behaviour is expected to facilitate these functions. In initial work identifying leader behaviour, Fleishman (1953) observed that subordinates perceived their supervisors' behaviour in terms of two broad categories referred to as consideration and initiating structure. Consideration includes behaviour involved in fostering effective relationships (Fleishman 1991:245-287). Examples of such behaviour would include showing concern for a subordinate or acting in a supportive manner towards others. Initiating structure involves the actions of the leader focused specifically on task accomplishment. This could include role clarification, setting performance standards, and holding subordinates accountable to those standards. Individual skills such as good communication are of outmost importance (Hoyle 1995: ix, 56-59).

2.2.1.8. Transactional and transformational theories

Two theories of leadership are identified, namely, transactional and transformational theories. *The transactional leader* is given power to perform certain tasks and reward or punishment for the team's performance (Hersey *et al*. 2008; cf. Burns 1978). It gives the opportunity to the manager to lead the group and the group agrees to follow his lead to accomplish a predetermined goal in exchange for something else (Bass 1990:19-31). Power is given to the leader to evaluate, correct and train subordinates when productivity is not up to the desired level and reward effectiveness when expected outcome is reached. *The transformational leader* motivates its team to be effective and efficient (Hersey *et al*. 2008; cf. Burns 1978; Avolio *et al*. 1991:9-16). Communication is the base for goal achievement focusing the group on the final desired outcome or goal attainment. This leader is highly visible and uses chain of command to get the job done. Transformational leaders focus on the big picture, needing to be surrounded by people who take care of the details (Bass 1990:21ff). Transformational leader seeks ideas that move the organisation to reach the company's vision.

2.2.1.9. Neo-emergent theory

The Neo-emergent leadership theory (from the Oxford school of leadership) espouses that leadership is created through the emergence of information. In other words, the reproduction of information or stories forms the basis of the perception of leadership by the majority. In modern society, the press and other sources report their own views of a leader. These views may be based on reality, and a political command or an inherent interest of the author, media or leader. Therefore, it can be contended that the perception of all leaders is created and does not reflect their true leadership qualities at all.

2.2.1.10. Synthesis

The subject of leadership is wide and complex in such a way that dealing with a topic warrants deeper understanding about it. As a result, a journey through leadership has been explored with an intention to explore some theories thereof various themes such as leadership theory.

2.3. Concepts of leadership

2.3.1. Introduction

Leadership is a concept that originally developed in folk psychology to explain social influence in groups (Andrews & Field 1998:128; Calder 1977). Stogdill (1974) pointed out that, while the term "leaders" was noted as early as the 1300's and conceptualised even before biblical times, the term leadership has been in existence only since the late 1700's. Basson (1990) understands that scientific research on the topic did not begin until the 20th century. Beck and Yeage (2001: xvii) attested that the leader's dilemma of defining leadership remains a concern for anyone faced with managerial responsibilities in the twenty-first century. There has been intensive research on the subject of leadership based a variety of perspectives (Lourens 2001:5; Andrews & Field 1998:128). Most people have lost touch with the meaningful concept in everyday organisational life (Andrews & Fields 1998: 160; Meindl 1995:159ff; Bennis 1959:259).

The recent growth in interest in the cognitive aspects of leadership suggests that the way in which leadership is understood by those within an organisation is critical to research (Wofford and Goodwin 1994: 167; Lord 1985:107; Lord *et al*. 1984: 347ff). Traditionally, the study of leadership has been closely tied to the study of a leader and his or her relationship with followers. There has been growing evidence that 'follower' perceptions played an important role in the determining the outcome of leadership (Chen and Meindl 1991: 521ff; Lord *et al.,* 1984: 355; Shamir *et al.* 1994: 29). The results have led to a changing definition of the locus of leadership (1990:19). Andrews and Field (1998:128) are of the opinion that leadership is characterised by three things, *leaders, followers* and their *interactions* (cf. Dansereau *et al.* 1995: 99ff). Further, there is an academic interest in the perpetual process of the actors involved. The interest has been manifested in charismatic leadership literature (Conger and Kanungo 1987:638ff; Ellis *et al.*1996: 515), the "romance of leadership" attribution theories (Meindl 1990:335) and information processing approaches (Lord 1985: 117ff). Perceptions on leadership are critical because only those perceived as leaders allowed the discretion and influence to

lead effectively (Lord and Maher 1993:345; Andrews and Fields 1998:129). Leaders are effective when followers are willing to be led. The assumption implies that followers had an important role to play towards a leader. Stogdill (1974:5ff) noted that there are many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept. At the risk of being criticised for merely adding to` this list, the following definition is offered in the hope of incorporating important aspects of several of its predecessors: leadership is both a *process* and a *property.* The *process* of leadership is the use of no coercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities of the members of an organised group towards the accomplishment of group objectives. As a *property* leadership is the set of qualities or characteristics attributed to those who are perceived to successfully employ such influence. It is important to recognise what this definition includes and what it excludes. Therefore leadership can be described as an act and as well as person.

2.3.2. What is leadership?

Leadership involves leaders and followers who intend real change (reflecting) their mutual power (Rost 1991:102). True leadership includes a spiritual dimension (Bolman & Deal 1995:5). Leadership should be seen as a holistic phenomenon. People tend to concentrate on physical matters while forgetting spiritual matters. By so doing it neglects other features of mankind. 'Man' is more than a physical being. Leadership can also be defined as the will to control others. The definition of the verb '*to lead'* comes from the Latin *agree,* meaning 'to set into motion' (Whitney 2007:5ff; cf. Jennings 1960). As a noun leadership contains three different meaning: The position of a leader, capacity or ability to lead and last a group of leaders. Leadership has been a topic of interest for historians and philosophers since ancient times (Daft 1999). But it was only around the turn of the 20[th]century that scientific studies on the topic began. Modern's meaning of the word *leader,* has a sense of someone who sets ideas, people, organisations, and societies in motion; someone who takes the words of idea, people, organisations, and societies on a journey (McManus 2006:16; McFarland 1979:217). To lead such a journey requires a vision, courage, and influence.

Leadership involves creating a state of mind in others (Cantor and Beanery 1992:59). Leadership has been the subject of great deal of study and writing during the past 50 years (Lee 1989:12). MacGregor Burns (1972:2) says that leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomenons on earth. The researcher is tempted to agree with the above mentioned opinion. Leadership is often misunderstood because most people associate it with "power", "aggressive", "greed", "dominant' and so forth. Tannenbaum (1979:217) has used variables similar to McGregor's, connecting them by the idea of influence. He defines leadership as "interpersonal influence exercised in situations and directed through the communication process, toward attained goals. Leaders, therefore, are 'individuals who significantly *influence* the thoughts, behaviour and feelings of others (Gardner 1995:6)'. Leadership is interpersonal influence, exercised in a situation, a directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals (Tannenbaum, Weschler & Massarik 1961:24). Leadership is an influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of organisation (Katz & Kahn 1978: 528; Bothwell 1983: vii). Leadership should also be thought of as interaction (between the leader and followers), as an influential relationship to *control* events, the understanding to chart a course, and the power to get a job done, cooperatively using the skills and abilities of others (Krause1997:3). Leadership is more than having authority and power over subordinates (McManus 1996:996, Tony 1996). Most people have tried to lead-successfully knowing that *taking charge* is easier said than done (Bech and Yeager 2001: xviii).

Inspiration, good habits and right principles are absolutely essential but aren't always enough if there is no effective leader. A leader is anyone who has *followers.* Conversely one cannot be a leader without a follower (Lundy 1986:41). To Hemphill & Coons (1957:7) leadership is the behaviour of an individual when he is *directing* the activities of a group toward a shared goal. Stogdill (1974:411), however, regards leadership as the *initiation and maintenance* of structure in expectation and interaction. Laurens (2001:6) stresses that leadership is a word taken from the common vocabulary and incorporated into the technical vocabulary of a scientific discipline without being precisely redefined.

There is no agreed definition of leadership or what the concept should embrace (Avery 2004:4). Decades of academic analysis have given us more than 350 definitions of leadership (Bennis & Nanus (1985:4). Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth (Daft 1999:373).

After exploring the concept of leadership and its treats, the researcher argues that leadership is a holistic phenomenon. There is no universal definition of the term *leadership*. The following features are part of leadership: A leader, follower, influence, control, law and order. Leadership has been described as the process of social influence in which one person can enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task. Definitions inclusive of the nature of leadership have also emerged. Alan Keith of Genentech states that, "Leadership is ultimately about creating a way for people to contribute to making something extraordinary happen." Every organisation needs leaders at every level (Van Vugt, Hogan & Kaiser 2008:182-196). A leader is a person who influences a group of people towards a specific result. It is not dependent on title or formal authority.

Effective leadership is defined as an individual with the capacity to succeed in a given condition and be viewed as the expectations of an organisation or society (Ogbonnia 2007). Leaders are known by the following attributes: caring for others, effective communication, and a commitment to persist (Henry 1971: 884–89). Any person appointed to a leadership position has the mandate to exercise power and command as well as to enforce obedience by virtue of the authority of his position (Lewin Lippitt & White 1939: 271–301).

2.3.3. Synthesis

The concept of leadership is crucial for a better understanding on the subject. It has been noted that the recent growth in interest in the cognitive aspects of leadership suggest that the way in which leadership is understood by those within an organisation is critical to research. Moderns meaning of the word leader, has a sense of someone who sets ideas,

people, organisations, and societies on a journey. Therefore leadership can be described as an act as well as a person.

2.4. Historical views on leadership

Sanskrit literature identifies ten types of leaders. Defining characteristics of the ten types of leaders are explained with examples from history and mythology (Van Vugt & Ahuja, 2010). *Aristocratic thinkers* have postulated that leadership depends on one's blue blood or *genes*: *monarchy* takes an extreme view of the same idea, and may prop up its assertions against the claims of mere aristocrats by invoking divine sanction: see the divine right of kings. Contrariwise, more democratically-inclined theorists have pointed to examples of *meritocratic* leaders, such as the Napoleons marshals profiting from careers open to talent. In the autocratic /paternalistic strain of thought, traditionalists recall the role of leadership of the Roman *pater familias.* Feminist thinking, on the other hand, may object to such models as patriarchal and posit against them emotionally-attuned, responsive, and consensual empathetic guidance, which is sometimes associated with matriarchies. Comparable to the Roman tradition, the views of Confucianism on "right living" relate very much to the ideal of the (male) scholar-leader and his benevolent rule, buttressed by a tradition of filial piety.

Leadership is a matter of intelligence, trustworthiness, humaneness, courage, and discipline. Reliance on intelligence alone results in rebelliousness. Exercise of humaneness alone results in weakness.

Other historical views of leadership have addressed the seeming contrasts between secular and religious leadership. The doctrines of Caesaro-papism have recurred and had their detractors over several centuries. Christian thinking on leadership has often emphasised stewardship of divinely-provided resources - human and material - and their deployment in accordance with a Divine plan. Compare servant leadership. The authors distinguish the following types of organisational power:

Legitimate power: refers to the different types of professional positions within an organisations structure that inherits such power (e.g. Manager, Vice-President, Director, Supervisor, etc.). These levels of power correspond to the hierarchical executive levels within the organisation itself. The higher position such as President of the company has a higher power than the rest of the professional positions in the hierarchical executive levels. *Reward power*: is the power given to managers that attain administrative power over a range of rewards. Employees who work for managers desire the reward from the manager and will be influenced by receiving it as a result of work performance. The rewards may be a pay rise or promotion.

Coercive power: is the manager's ability to punish an employee. Punishment can be a mild punishment such as a suspension or a serious punishment such as termination. *Expert power*: is attained by the manager due to his or her own talents such as skills, knowledge, abilities, or previous experience. A manager which has this power within the organisation may be a very valuable and important manager in the company. *Charisma power*: A manager who has charisma will have a positive influence on workers, and create the opportunity for interpersonal influence. A person that has charisma will confer great power as a manager. *Referent power*: a power that is gained by association. A person who has power by association is often referred to assistant or deputy. *Information power*: a person who has possession of important information at an important time when such information is needed to organisational functioning. Someone who has this information knowledge has genuine power. For example, a manager's secretary would be in a powerful position if the secretary has information power (Chomsky 1999:53).

2.5. Types of leadership

2.5.1. Introduction

Social scientists refer to leadership as authority. Based on Marx Weber's terminology, Schaefer and Lamm (1995:426) discussed types of authority, namely charismatic,

traditional and legal. Dreyer (2002:625) further referred to these types of authority when discussing the development of leadership in the biblical world. The notion of authority has been a matter of concern ever since. Weber (1968a:15ff)'s contribution paved the way for many to explain and define authority or leadership as a basic point of departure. Three types of authority are discussed. To have an overview of what leadership is all about, charismatic, traditional and legal authority demands attention (Dreyer 2002:625 cf. Weber 1968a:15-16; Horrell 1999:313).

2.5.2. Charismatic authority (leadership)

The term 'charismatic authority' refers to power made legitimate by a leader's exceptional personal or emotional appeal to his or her followers. Charisma lets a person lead or inspire without relying on a set of rules or traditions (McFillen 1996:163-191). It does not depend on office, position or status, but individual qualities of an extraordinary person (Dreyer 2002:627). Charismatic authority is derived more from the beliefs of followers than from actual qualities of leaders (Avery 2004:93). As long as people perceive a leader as having qualities of leadership, he remains a leader (House, Spangler & Woycke 1991:364-396). Charismatic leadership focuses on the relationship between the followers. Direct and indirect effects of characteristics of leadership are highlighted (Kirkpatrick & Locke 1996:36-51). This is an intense personal and emotional relationship (Dreyer 2002:629; cf. Holmberg 1978:148). A leader is considered to be a source of goodness, truth and strength.

Since the 1980s, theories of transformational and charismatic leadership have been ascended in the leadership field (Yukl 1998:33). Emotion and values are necessary to understand how a leader can influence followers (Kirkpatrick & Locke 1996:36-51). Followers are also influenced to make self-sacrifices, commit to ideological objectives. Seemingly charismatic authority represented by the prophet is usually regarded as the 'purest' form of authority. It claims to break through all existing normative structures Spencer (1970:123-124). As such, charismatic authority precipitates charismatically-certified norms, e.g., sacred law as revealed by the prophets (Weber 1964:361). In the

stage of the 'routinisation' of charisma, charismatic authority becomes encrusted norms which govern its allocation, as in the procedures for resolving the pro in the problem of succession (Binney et. al 2005:17ff).

Charismatic authority is unbounded by norms (Spencer 1970:125). The prophet, as long as he retains his charisma can destroy old norms and create new ones. In time, the working of charismatic authority leaves a residue of sacred norms produced by the word or deed of the prophets (McManus 2006:126ff). These charismatic certified norms limit the authority of successors to the original leader. According to Binney *et al* (2005:18), charisma is a 'social process', as is leading. Binney's understanding of charisma as social process is somehow confusing as it is a character. Nevertheless, that is how he views the concept of 'charismatic'. It is surprising why people want to abandon responsibility and be led by a masterful, charismatic leader. The question raised is whether the charismatic person meets their own needs at the expense of those of others (Binney *et al*. 2005:18). A leader who has charisma will have a positive influence on workers and create the opportunity for interpersonal influence in an organisation (Yukl 2006). A person has charisma, and this will confer great power as a manager.

2.5.3. Traditional authority (leadership)

In a political system based on 'traditional authority', legitimate power is conferred by customs and accepted practice. Characteristically, leadership has been performed by men. The fact that leadership was exercised by men does not imply that women were incompetent to lead, but they were not given the opportunity. The system of the day was mail dominated.

The notion of leadership has been implicitly assumed by men. Hence, leadership may be assumed to imply maleness (Hearn & Parkin 1988:20). The orders of a leader are felt to be legitimate and are unchallenged. For example, a king or queen is accepted as ruler of a nation by virtue of inheriting the crown. The monarch may be loved or hated, competent or incompetent; in terms of legitimacy, that does not matter. For a traditional leader

authority rests in customs, not in personal characteristics, technical competence, or even written law. The relationship between norms and authority is reserved. In 'charismatic authority' the leader generates norms, in traditional authority; the norms generate the leader (Spencer 1970:126). The bearer of authority, the king/queen or the heredity chief depends on traditional norms for his/her authority. S/he claims a legitimate right to the throne by virtue of the traditions which defines succession. The legitimacy of traditional authority thus rests upon the legitimacy of traditional norms (Spencer 1970:127). The same traditional norms constrict the sphere of traditional authority. The traditional leader is limited by custom in the range of his/er edicts.

In traditional leadership; the ideology of authority centered on men. Women were seldom given the opportunity to be leaders. During this system, they were men whose leadership was guided by women. The fact that leadership was exercised by men does not imply that women were incompetent to lead, but they were not given the opportunity. The system of the day was male dominated.

2.5.4. Legal–Rational authority (leadership)

Power made legitimate by law is known as 'legal-rational authority. Legal rational – authority derives its power from written rules and regulations of political systems. Authority derives from legal norms (Spencer 1970:127).A bureaucrat derives his authority from the legal norms defining the sphere of jurisdiction of his authority is bounded by legal norms. Legal realists acknowledged that rights impose duties on others and that liberties impose vulnerabilities on those affected by exercising those liberties (Singer 2000:11).

2.5.5. Intellectual leadership

Capturing value from intellectual capital and knowledge-based assets becomes a new mantra (Andersen 2006:109). Some knowledge is held back and protected under trade-secret law, brand name identity is protected through trade mark law and a lot of written

information is protected by copy right (Drahos & Braithwaite 2002:6). Based on those aspects, some intellectual leadership goes unnoticed.

Many African intellectuals engaged or are still engaged in an intensive competition to 'achieve' the status of the 'greatest psychopath' (Mangu 2005). African social science should take the study of *sycophancy* more seriously (Ibrahim 1997:116). Life in Africa is still dominated by political and intellectual vagrancy for material interests. Lack of consistency, opportunism, and the politics of the belly practiced by those who choose to betray their people by joining authoritarian leaders and entrenched human rights violators (Mangu 2005). This is partly due to the weakness of the middle class (e.g. lawyers, universities professors, medical doctors, and educators) and its exploitation by the ruling group which constitutes another obstacle to constitutional democracy in Africa (Mangu 2005; Nzongol-Ntalaja 1997:21). While Mangu singled out the few intellectuals, it is of importance to know that intellectuals consist of religious, legal, business, natural and social scientists. Intellectual leadership must emancipate itself ideologically, economically and financially from political leadership. A strong and responsible intellectual leadership is needed to advance or consolidate constitutionalism and democracy in Africa (Mangu 2005).

2.5.6. Political leadership

The characteristics of individual leaders are extremely relevant in determining political outcomes (Wiseman 1990:186; Huntington (1991:316; Wiseman (1996: 165). The said view is highly perceived as the true in relation to democratisation as it does to any other political development. In modern times, many times, countries, organisations, companies are led politically. Political leadership can be viewed as either positive or negative. Change in leadership is expected. While some African political leaders have promoted change like Khama, Masire (Botswana); Rangoolam (Mauritius); De Klerk, Mandela, Mbeki (South Africa), some are still resistant to change. Mugabe (Zimbabwe), Musevini (Uganda), Eyadema (Togo), Bongo (Gabon), Ngouesso (Congo), Biya (Camerron), Gadaffi (Libya) Mbasogo (Equatorial Guinea), Ben Ali (Tunisia)] many others have been

or still remain the major obstacles to any real effort at political reform in their countries (Gordon 1997:153). Differences of input could soon become overwhelming differences of output (Gleick 1988). Chaos theorists refer this as the 'butterfly effect' (Mangu 2005 :). What happens to individual leaders may have a significant effect in his or her organisation or institution. Political leaders are subject to the misfortune of sickness, fatal disease and accidental death, as are the rest of people (Wiseman 1996:132,173). The ultimate death of a leader who was committed to democracy would easily have severely negative consequences for a fragile and new democracy (Wiseman 1996:132). On the one hand the death of some authoritarian leaders can constitute an unexpected opportunity to end authoritarianism and engage in a transition to civilian and democratic rule.

2.5.7. Transformational leadership

Transformational leadership occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of employees (Bass 1990b:21). Transformational leadership also takes place when leaders generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group (Barling, Weber & Kelloway 1996:827ff). When individual leader stirs his/her employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group, it is also known as transformational leadership. Bass (1990a:53) stipulates that this transcending beyond self-interests is for the "group, organisation, or society". Transformational leadership is a process of building commitment to organisational objectives and the empowering of followers to accomplish those objectives (Yukl 1998; Stone *et al.* 2003:350; Owen 1990:19).Leadership is viewed as a continuum with transformational leadership Transactional leadership occurs when leaders exchange promises of rewards and benefits to subordinates for the subordinates' fulfillment of agreements with the leader (Burns 1990a:53). Transactional leader recognises followers' needs and then defines the exchange process for meeting those needs (Stone *et al.* 2003:350). Both the leader and the follower benefit from the exchange transaction. It is a mutualism kind of leadership. Tracey and Hinkin (1998:220ff) hold the view that transactional leadership is based on bureaucratic authority. Such a type of leadership focuses on task completion, and relies

on rewards and punishment. Transformational leadership differs from transactional leadership (Jung, Avolio 2000:949-964). It is concerned more about progress and development, it enhances the effects on followers (Stone et al. 2003; Bass 1985b, 1990a; Stone *et al.* 2003:350).

2.5.8. Servant leadership

Stone (2003:352) acknowledged Greenleaf's (1904-1990) initiative of servant leadership. Basing their argument on Greenleaf's (1969:284-338; 1977) legacy, Stone (2003:352), further commented that leadership should primarily meet the needs of others (Spears 1995:1-14, McInnes 2010:59ff). The focus of servant leadership is on 'others'. Self-interest should not motivate servant leadership; rather it should ascend to a higher plane of motivation (Greenleaf 1977; Pollard 1996). The primary objective of servant leadership is to serve and meet the needs of others. This should be the prime motivation of leadership (Russell and Stone 2002: 145ff; Jones 1989:21). Servant leaders develop people and help them to strive and flourish. Servant leaders provide vision, gain credibility and trust from followers, and influence others (Farling *et. al.* 1999:49-72). In an attempt to give cohesion to the development of a theory, Stone, et al., supported Russell and Stone (2002:147) for establishing a practical model of servant leadership. The role of servant leadership is acknowledged (Russel 2001:76-83).

Research on this type of leadership has focused mostly on the comparison between the servant leadership concept and other leadership methods and characteristics of leadership (Farling *et* al. 1999: 49-42; Giampetro-Meyer *et al*. 1998: 1727ff; Laub 1999; Russell 2000; Tice 1996:6). Farling *et al.* (1999:53) presented a concept of leadership based on the variables of vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service-characteristics of servant leadership. They concluded that servant leaders find the source of their value in a spiritual base. By empowering followers it allows the servant leader to act on his or her embedded values (Stone et al. 2003:358).

Russell (2000; 2001:76) has focused on understanding the values and attributes of servant leaders. He hypothesised that servant leaders possess different personal values from non-servant leaders. These personal values are tied to the attributes of leadership (cf. Greenleaf 1977:289). His research provided evidence of a relationship between values and leadership; however, the results indicated the need for additional empirical studies to examine and validate the link further (Spears 1996:34).

2.5.9. Synthesis

Leadership is also referred as authority. The notion of authority has been a matter of concern ever since. This authority has been expressed in various ways. Among them, the following has been described as types of leadership: charismatic, traditional, legal-rational, intellectual, political, transformational and servant leadership. These types of authority have been referred when discussing the development of leadership in the biblical world. Of all the types of leadership, servanthood is a model of biblical leadership.

2.6. Styles of leading

2.6.1. Introduction

One may argue that types and styles of leadership are one and the same thing. While there is not much difference between the two, the latter refers to a leader's behaviour. It is the result of the philosophy, personality and experience of the leader. The following styles of leading are noted:

2.6.2. Autocratic or authoritarian style

The autocratic leadership style thrives in highly structured, hierarchical chain-of-command environments such as the military or very bureaucratic organizations. This type of leader exercises almost absolute power and commands strict compliance and conformity. The autocratic leader generally has a well-defined and controlled disciplinary process with an emphasis on punishments for noncompliance (. This leader determines

prescribed policies, procedures, rules, and goals. He or she is the decision maker and such self-directed decisions are final. In this environment, little interaction or communication is expected among associates (Bell 1965:395ff). Out-flowing information is highly restricted while in-flowing communication is well filtered and defensive. Autocratic leaders are usually rigid in their thinking and perceptions. They believe that employees have minimal abilities and capabilities and need close supervision and direction, and that controls are needed to assure their compliant behavior. The autocratic leaders believe their style is highly efficient. Unfortunately, this style of leadership results in minimal or no innovation, and virtually no personal or organizational change, growth and development. Cooperation, commitment and achievement are stifled (Conger 1997:215-232). Most individuals are familiar with the autocratic leader because such leaders are prevalent even today. It is generally not considered one of the best methods of leadership; however, the autocratic leader definitely is the preferred style in the military, police, andother organizations where individuals may be in dangerous situations (Reed 2004: 67; Ashforth 1994:755).

Under the autocratic leadership style, all decision-making powers are centralised in the leader, as with dictator leaders. They do not entertain any suggestions or initiatives from subordinates. The autocratic management has been successful as it provides strong motivation to the manager. It permits quick decision-making, as only one person decides for the whole group and keeps each decision to himself until he feels it is needed to be shared with the rest of the group (Ingrid Bens 2006).

2.6.3. Toxic leadership

The terms toxic leader, toxic manager, toxic culture, and toxic organization appear with increasing frequency in business, leadership, and management literature (Reed 2004:67).Toxic leadership refers to a process in which leaders, by dint of their destructive behavior and/or dysfunctional personal characteristics inflict serious and enduring harm on their followers, their organizations, and nonfollowers, alike. Defining toxic leaders can prove vexing, at best, since one individual's toxic leader is another's heroic savior,

given that context, history, and perspective weigh heavily in such judgments (Lipman-Blemen *et al* 2005: 1).

A toxic leader is someone who has responsibility over a group of people or an organisation, and who abuses the leader-follower relationship by leaving the group or organisation in a worse-off condition than when s/he first found them. The consequences of toxic leadership are detrimental to both the people and to the organization (Tepper 2000: 178-190). The notion of toxic leadership rest upon the intensity level of their toxicity, the types of destructive behavior in which they engage, the types of dysfunctional personal qualities that drive their decisions and actions, and the significance of the consequences of their decisions and actions. Two types of toxic leaders are identified, namely intentional toxic and unintentional toxic leaders. Leaders of the former category deliberately injure others or enhance themselves at others' expense (Whicker 1996:11). In contrast to the latter category, leaders cause significant negative effects by their carelessness, or reckless actions, including incompetence. Toxic leaders exhibit diverse types of destructive behavior, dysfunctional personal qualities, and degrees of toxicity. Besides, the consequences of their toxic decisions and actions also may differ considerably.

Toxic leadership necessarily also depends upon the followers, many of whom recognize but tolerate it. Just why so many followers accept, often prefer, and sometimes even create toxic leaders by pushing non-toxic leaders over the line requires an analysis of three key sets of forces: those internal to the individual's psyche, those in the individual's external environment, and those psychosocial forces that arise from the interaction between the individual and his or her social environment (Lipman-Blemen et al 2005: 1).

2.6.4. Narcissistic leadership

Narcissistic can be described as an unconscious *active* behavioural response to deep, unrecognised feelings of inadequacy. It refers to leadership by a narcissist and the co-dependent relationship it involves between the leader and his closest circle of followers (cf.Seidman 1950:229ff). In this form of leadership, there is a tendency by some people

who feel down that they are not good enough and believe they might make mistakes if they try anything bold. As a result, they would prefer not to take a risk to avoid failure and humiliation. Narcissists however, may respond to their feelings of inadequacy in the opposite way. They may strive to succeed in public, to be better than others, to have more than others, to feel superior and win others' respect, admiration and acclaim. The key feature of the narcissist is that their drive to succeed comes from a hidden sense of inferiority and inadequacy. Since most narcissistic leaders are preoccupied with inferiority complex, they tend to gather around them people who bolster their self-esteem. Equally important the followers depend on their leaders (Maccoboy 2000:68ff). This interaction relationship is important as there is usually co-dependence between the narcissistic leader and his followers because very often they too suffer hidden feelings of inadequacy. Without realising it, they cluster around the narcissistic leader to feel better about themselves by association. After all, they are working with the impressive, important leader so they too must share these qualities to some degree – or so they believe. There is a mutual relationship for both narcissistic leader and followers in their relationship. Narcissistic leadership is an excessive or erotic interest in oneself, one's physical features.

2.6.5. Laissez-faire or free rein style

Laissez-faire leadership can be defined as an interactive process that provides guidance and direction that are needed managerial positions. Maccoby (2000) highlighted three interacting dynamic elements which are crucial in one leadership. They are: a leader, a follower(s) and a situation. Every leader has to know his or her role for the betterment of effective service delivery and the smooth running of the organisation. Active participation among the followers is encouraged an ideal, interdependency is an ideal. The role of a leader includes variety of responsibilities, such as influence and providing directions to the followers. Furthermore, a leader provides the support needed in the organization. World, political, religious, and military leaders have led multitudes, and even countries, to victory against seemingly insurmountable odds (Maccoby 2000). Free rein style refers to the theory of practice of governmental abstention from interference in

the workings of the market, etc. A free-rein leader does not lead, but leaves the group entirely to itself as shown; such a leader allows maximum freedom to subordinates, i.e., they are given a free hand in deciding their own policies and methods (Maslow 1998).

Different situations call for different leadership styles (Conger et al 1999). In an emergency when there is little time to converge on an agreement and where a designated authority has significantly more experience or expertise than the rest of the team, an autocratic leadership style may be most effective. However, in a highly motivated and aligned team with a homogeneous expertise, a more democratic or laissez-faire style may be more effective (McCantey 2003). The style adopted should be the one that most effectively achieves the objectives of the group while balancing the interests of its individual members (George 2006: 778-794). Various academics such as Kets de Maccoby and Thomas have identified narcissistic leadership as an important and common leadership style.

2.6.6. Participative or democratic style

Democratic leadership is sometimes referred to as enlightened leadership (Gastil 1994: 954-971). An individual manifesting this type of leadership recognizes each person's self-worth and esteem. The leader's actions are based upon trust, integrity, honesty, equality, openness and mutual respect. Democratic leaders show consideration and concern for others by empathetic listening and understanding (*Iss* 2007:243-262). They foster open communication among all employees at all levels. Reasons and circumstances pertaining to decisions that affect the employees, department, or organization are shared in a timely fashion. Under such leadership, a highly positive, motivation-oriented environment is established to help satisfy the higher-level self-esteem and self-actualization needs as defined by Abraham Maslow (1998; *Iss* 2007:243ff)) in his hierarchy of needs.

The democratic or enlightened leader practices employee involvement in considering important issues and exercises influence in reaching consensual decisions (Adorno

1965:417ff). Employees participate in establishing goals—both common goals for the good of the organization and goals for their own personal self-growth, learning and development (Anderson 1959:201-212). The role of the leader/manager is to guarantee each employee's success in accomplishing these goals. A feedback system is instituted whereby each employee has the responsibility of informing the leader/manager of any obstacle that prevents successful achievement of the goals, and the leader/manager subsequently removes the hindrances. The decisions of the democratic leader are not unilateral as with the autocrat because they arise from consultation with the group members and participation by them (George 2006:778- 794). The question whether democracy is normal or good lies on the manner in which leaders lead(s) the organization (Minier 2001:996).

2.6.7. Synthesis

Leadership style refers to the behaviour of a leader. The leader's way of exercising leadership is crucial and it reveals his or her personality. Autocratic, toxic, narcissistic, laissez-faire or free rein style is classified as styles of leadership. In most cases a leader's behaviour is influenced by a number of factors: environmental, historical background of both a leader and of an organisation(s) or institution, followers, political and economic factors.

2.7. Competitive leadership

2.7.1. Transformational leadership versus servant leadership

Stones et al. (2003:350-361) examined transformational leadership and servant leadership. Their aim was to determine what similarities and differences exist between the two leadership concepts (Lowe and Kroeck 1996:385-425). They posted that the primary difference between transformational leadership and servant leadership is the focus of the leader (Stephens et al. 1995:123-143). According to Behr (1998:51-55) it is crucial for a leader to act from the centre. The transformational leader's focus is directed toward the organisation, and his or her behaviour builds follower commitment toward

organisational objectives. The servant leader's focus is on the followers, and the achievement of organisational objective is a subordinate outcome (Kim and Yukl 1996: 36:51; Whetstone 2002:385-393). When the leader shifts the primary focus of leadership from the organisation to the follower, this classifies the leader as either transformational or a servant leader (Stone et. al 2003:3491; Bass 1990b:19-31). Stone et al. (2003:349) cited that transformational leadership has become a popular concept to date.Meindl (1995:329ff) is of the view that the concept of transformational and servant leadership are related. Behling & McFillen 1996:163-191) associate transformational with transformational leadership.

To sum up, transformational leadership focuses more on organisational objectives while servant leadership focuses more on the people who are followers. This tendency of the servant leader to focus on the followers appears to be the primary factor that distinguishes servant from transformational leadership. Autocratic leadership is viewed as the dark side of leadership (Conger 1990:44-45; Bass 1996).

2.7.2. Autocratic leadership versus participative leadership

Yukl (1999:35) identified the distinction between autocratic and participative leadership. He is of the opinion that participative leadership is more effective than autocratic leadership. Power sharing is an important aspect of leadership. Two extremes of leaderships, namely autocratic and participative and their impact are noted (Leana *et al.* 1990:137ff; Yukl 1999:35; cf. Conger and Kananga 1987:637-47).

2.7.3. Leadership versus management

Some theorists differentiate between leaders and managers according to their objectives and time orientation (Bennis & Nanus 1985; Zaleznik 1977:67ff). To lead and to manage are seen as two mutually exclusive processes requiring different skills and personality traits (Bryman1988:13-30). These theories emphasise that "leaders" are oriented towards change and long-term effectiveness, whereas "managers" are oriented towards stability and short-term efficiency (Barling 1996:827-832). People with a managerial profile are assumed to be incapable of inspiring and leading major changes in organisations. People

with a leadership profile are viewed as unwilling to accept the existing strategy (even when appropriate) and work to refine it (Yukl 1999:35). People can use a mixture of leading and (positive) managing behaviour (Hickman 1990; Kotter 1990). A successful executive must be skilled enough to understand the situation around the neighbourhood and flexible enough to adjust the mix of behaviour as the situation changes (Roberts 1985:1023ff).A key situational variable determining the optimal mix of behaviour is the external environment faced by any organisation (Miller & Frisen 1984; Tushman & Romaneli 1985:171ff).

To change leadership seems to be more appropriate in terms of environmental turmoil, and when making necessary strategic changes to deal with major threats and opportunities (Blake and Mount 1982: 207-210). A 'managerial' orientation seems more appropriate when the external environment is relatively stable, when the organisation is prospering. It is essential to maintain efficient, reliable operations (e.g. high productivity, high quality, low cost, on time delivery).

2. 8. Important characteristics of a leader

2.8.1. Gender aspect

A leader could be defined as one who guides or who is in command or one in a position of influence or importance. Yet the question that one should ask is what characteristics these leaders have? Leaders are known to have their own leadership style. People in leadership positions are thought to be more men than women. Leadership has been categorised on gender.

Men were believed to be objective, competitive, logical, independent, aggressive, responsible, rational, and ambitious, whereas stereotypes of women often include characteristics such as being gentle, emotional, intuitive, dependent, sensitive, passive, illogical, nurturing, warm, and accommodating (Dubno 1985; Eagly & Wood 1991; Dennis & Kunkel 2004:155-172). These stereotypes help to illustrate why many think of leaders to be more masculine. A woman leader who is perceived as tough and focused is thought to be unfeminine. One who shows emotion or is perceived as compassionate is

criticised for being too soft (Lips 2001:799-813). Is this a fair characteristic to make? The stereotypes of the female role still seem to place women with little to no power and below the stature and capabilities of men. Talking about leadership is not easy; nevertheless it is a key matter in the direction of a community and, in particular in the business environment.

Effective leaders always find solutions to the problems, set strategies, encourage, commit in a mission, influence positively, build culture, transform and produce to get results with others' assistance. A leader becomes almost obsessive with his/er compliance with objectives and has a permanent commitment with him/her and the others. His/her attitude is never passive and behaves within the frame of excellence (Lowe *et al*. 1996:385-425). It is a visionary and ingenious person. Aristotle's reflective capacity productive inventive and Leonardo Da Vinci's geniality serve as reference to this leader definition and to that of thought leadership. They were innovators, creators. They, with their geniality, experimental and maybe innate, change thought concepts (Tice 1996:16).

All these characteristics define a leader and it could be said that while it is easy to recognise a leader, it is not easy to find good leadership. However, the essence of leadership is not reduced only to a series of personal attributes, nor is it even limited to a particular set of functions. As a member of a community, even more if s/he leads it, the leader has a social responsibility. S/he must commit themselves to administer the community's resources and richness on an optimal basis without saving any effort to obtain the best benefit from the combination of the resources and his/er (skills). The leader must build values and principles through his/her way of living, self-control and social consciousness.

2.8.2. Consciousness, confidence and flexibility

Leadership characteristics sometimes go beyond the personal traits and hit on areas such as organisational consciousness or knowledge. These are leaders that understand what the organisation wants to achieve and know how it can be accomplished. They create networks within the organization to help their groups get things and are just adept at breaking down organizational barriers to progress.

Leaders need to carry themselves with confidence and not to be afraid to take ownership for both popular and unpopular decisions. They must be able to learn from criticisms and are often acutely aware of their own shortcomings. Confident leaders are able to maintain a calm demeanour even during emergencies and this can be contagious when it needs to be. Another important characteristic of leaders is their ability to remain flexible and adapt their leadership style to meet the demands of the current work environment. They must be able to work with others to meet organisational goals and shift focus as necessary.

2.8.3. Creative mind and zeal for achievement

Leaders demonstrating a creative mind are able to develop innovative solutions to old problems. Creative mind can be associated with the term broad- mindedness. The term '*broad-minded*' can be defined as being tolerant of varied views and inclined to condone minor departures from conventional behaviour (Bower 1997:8). Bower further attested that the attribute of broad-mindedness is closely related to being open-minded, adaptable, and flexible. Other aspects of broad-mindedness includes: being undisturbed by 'little things', willingness to overlook on certain errors, and approachable. The diversity they build in their organisations helps them to develop more comprehensive answers to routine questions.Creative and broad-minded leaders are able to translate technical information into solutions that are understood by everyone. The last leadership characteristic we're going to discuss is achieving results. Leaders just don't set the example for others to follow; they also play a big hand in achieving the goals of the organisation. Through their leadership skills, they maintain a high level of performance in their organisations and are able to help keep their workforce motivated even when faced with a seemingly impossible situation (Gardner 1987:15; Steers *et al* 1996:8). Since they have a deep understanding of what an organisation needs to accomplish they are able to quickly identify and solve the important objectives of an organisation. The notion of creative and broad-mindedness in leadership is the art of empowering others (Conger 1989:17-24).

2.8.4. Passion for success

Purpose and passion go hand in hand. To be an effective leader, one must first care. When one cares deeply, one has a passion that is more than simply the spark that gets

started; it is the fire inside that will sustain a leader. It is a commitment so compelling that you're whole self: body, mind, and spirit are engaged. Passion is not the same as a single-minded determination to get what one wants or to create the changes one thinks should be made. Rather, passion for a higher purpose is characterised by an openness to possibilities and the innate belief that people want to work together to create the best future imaginable. Passion plus possibilities gives you courage!

2.8.5. Authenticity and credibility

Authentic implies to be sincere and anchored by internal factors, such as self identity.. Authenticity allows an individual to be frees and to be everything one supposed to be. It creates a room for self evaluation (admit our shortcomings and recognise strengths), and live who we are. When someone feels the need to behave in a particular way while at work and not the person they know themselves to be at home or with friends, something has to give. The result is either an implosion or an explosion of the self. I believe that much of the disconnectedness we sometimes feel grows out of a need for authenticity. We long for genuine, trustworthy interaction where we live and work, and we experience fulfillment when our relationships with others are honest, grounded in the truth of who we are.

Credibility begins with being authentic and is manifested in the actions you promise and deliver. Credibility entails doing what one promises do to especially when such a promise is made in public. As a leader, his or her reputation as a credible person develops as a direct result of the trust others have in him or her to follow through. A leader should act on what he or she has committed himself or herself to do. It is being accountable for what you say you will do. Whereas authenticity is grounded in personal integrity, credibility is the choice you make for interpersonal integrity.

2.8.6. Ethics and good moral values

The question of ethics is one that is linked with the history of mankind, it deals with the character and conduct and morals of human beings, it also evaluates conduct against some absolute criteria and put negative or positive values on it (Hanekom 1984:58).

Ethics refers to standards of behaviour that explains to act rightly, honestly, and fairly and fairly in different circumstances[22]. Chandler and Plano (1998:17) regard ethics as the branch of philosophy that deals with values relating to human conduct with respect to the rightness or wrongness of a specific action and to the goodness or badness of the motives. Schumann (2001:94) regards moral principle to be the guidelines people use to make moral judgment, to decide what is ethical and what is unethical.

The social teaching of the religious organisation insists that human community, including its government, must be actively concerned in promoting the health and welfare of every one of its member so that each member can contribute to the common good of all (. The teaching is encapsulated in the principle of the common good and its corollary principle of subsidiary. Three essential elements are highlighted: *respect for persons*, Good moral values obligates public authorities to respect the fundamental human rights of each person. Secondly, *social welfare*: the infrastructure of society is conducive to the social well being and development of its individual members. In this respect, it is the proper function of public authorities to both arbitrate between competing interests and to ensure that individual members of society have access to the basic goods that are necessary for living a truly human life, whether with food, clothing, health care, meaningful work and education. Fourthly: *peace and security:* peace and security accompanies a just social order. Public authority should be used to ensure, by morally acceptable means, the security of society and its individual members[23]. It requires adjustments in the actions and attitude of the public manager in relation to his/her colleagues and the public as well as in relation to self (Haynes 1986:1). Lastly, *stewardship:* Stewardship requires every leader to appreciate the two great gifts that God has given: the earth, with all its natural resources, and our own human nature, with its biological, psychological, social and spiritual capacities. This aspect is based in the presupposition that God has *absolute Dominion* over creation, and that, insofar as human beings are made in His image and likeness. Human beings have been given a limited dominion over creation and are

[22]http://wwww.chutattien.net/english/Ethic Awarness.htm retrieved on 20 April 2012.
[23] Document of Vatican II, Gaudium et Spes, n. 26; USCC, NCC and Synagogue Council, " The Common Good: Old Idea, New Urgency," *Origins* 23(June 24, 1993):81-86)

responsible for its care. The gifts of human life and its natural environment are used to cultivate nature and environment.

Leaders have at the centre of their belief system a high regard for human worth and dignity. They make decisions and take action in accord with these deeply held values and beliefs. Service to others and a commitment to the greater good for more people is the essence of what it means to be ethical (Cameron & Stone 1995). Being ethical is a choice one makes when passion, authenticity, and credibility are aligned with a belief system which is grounded in service to the global community.

2.9. Synthesis

A journey through chapter two has made it possible to grasp the nature and attributes of leadership. The concept of leadership has been discussed. Through the discussion, it has been discovered that *leadership* has been a focal point of debate from time and immemorial. Historians and philosophers have given their views on the subject whereby theories of leadership have emerged. Since the term leadership is wide and complex an attempt to develop a unique definition has not been an easy task. Nevertheless, several definitions of leadership have been provided. Characteristics, types, styles, and qualities of leadership remain a focal point. Among the types of leadership, 'servanthood' is one of the most crucial. Five essential elements are regarded as the building blocks of good principles which a leader should strive to fulfill: firstly, *respect for persons*, secondly, *social welfare*, thirdly, *peace and security*, fourth, *to seek divine help and guidance*, lastly, *stewardship*.

The reader should keep in mind that the intention of this document is to portray David as a role model for leadership, whereby leaders in Africa, South Africa, local communities, family set ups, and religious organisations including the Church could learn. David's leadership character will be evaluated based on whether the following five essential features: seeking divine guidance, respect for persons, social welfare, peace & security and stewardship are found. In order to discuss the qualities qualifying David as an ideal leader, there is a need to explore the concept of leadership in the Ancient Near East and

in the Old Testament respectively. In the following chapter, the focus is mainly on how the ancient world, with special emphasis in the regions of Near East and the Old Testament viewed the ideology of leadership.