LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 The emergence of leadership

We have numerous meanings and definitions of leadership, one of the most common among them that has an ability to influence (Yukl, 1989; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). This influence may arise because of formal power vested in the leader, or because of more subtle and informal power to which they have access (Fernandez, 1991; Friedkin, 1993; Hollander & Offermann, 1990). Leadership effectiveness has been significantly focused on the research specifically behaviors, characteristics, successful leadership is effectively exercising the leaders control and influence.

Leadership emergence is another major focus area in leadership research. Leadership emergence is defined as the process by which individuals in a group perceived to be as a leader by others in their group (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). It is related to the status that is accorded by one to another (Campbell, Simpson, Stewart, & Manning, 2002), and how systems of informal control and influence emerge within groups and organizations (Sell, Lovaglia, Mannix, Samuelson, & Wilson, 2004). Result of this process is the existence of informal leaders, individuals who are able to influence others, but who do not necessarily have the most formal power in the group (Friedkin, 1993; Wheelan & Johnston, 1996); for example, managers may have a great deal of formal power and authority, but not necessarily the greatest amount of informal influence over other group members.

According to this conceptualization, it is the ability to access or exercise this informal influence which defines a group member as an emergent leader. Emergent leadership represents a potential problem for organizations, influence subordinates because it is largely outside of formal control. Organizations spend a reported $15-50 billion each year on leadership training (Raelin, 2004; Rifkin, 1996) in an attempt to advance the capability of the managers to guide their organization. In this respect, the existence of informal leaders potentially undermines that investment; such informal leaders may have their own goals and agendas not necessarily aligned with those of the organization.
Dr. J. Robert Clinton (1988) articulated in a study about leadership emergence theory on how the Christian leaders developed over a time. Clinton said that his research had two goals. The first goal was to “determine a method for organizing and categorizing qualitative life-history data so that it could form an ongoing useful database for analysis” (p. 19). Clinton’s second goal was to “integrate the findings so as to form the basis for a theory of Christian leadership development”. According to Clinton leaders should have a capacity and capability to influence various factors over time and he said that he has identified three processes for leadership development they are as follows

a. internal psychological processes,

b. external sociological and contextual processes, and

c. divine processes

It is widely acknowledged that the divine processes are the one that differentiates leadership emergence theory from other theories of leadership development.

### 2.2 Leadership Definition

John Maxwell defined leadership as "leadership is influence – nothing more, nothing less." This states that leadership is all about influencing others indirectly; it also builds in leadership character. Without maintaining integrity and trustworthiness, the capability to influence will disappear.

The definition of leadership can occasionally appear mysterious and misleading. Among them one of the several reasons is the number of definitions, theories, and investigators that exist. According to Stogdill (1974), a famous leadership investigator expressed that there are numerous definitions for leadership and many have attempted to describe and define leadership. Even though the theory of leadership can seem mystifying, its different definitions are significant to accepting the concepts and principles of leadership.

According to Hollander (1978) leadership is a process of manipulate among a leader and those who are supporters. According to Bennis (1959) Leadership is a procedure by
which a negotiator induces a subordinate to act in a required way. As per Robert Kennedy leadership is inspiring individuals to implement their most excellent qualities. According to Chemers (1997) a definition of leadership that would be extensively acknowledged by the majority of philosophers and investigators may express that leadership is a procedure of social control in which one individual is capable to procure the aid and support of others in the achievement of a general mission.

The several definitions pertaining to leadership explain its different Outcomes of Leadership Effectiveness. The definition of leadership used by the investigators and authors of dissertation is as a procedure of social control in which one individual is capable to procure the aid and support of others in the achievement of a general mission (Chemers, 1997). This definition will be utilized to revise the leadership competencies of the service departments selected for leadership task.

"Leadership is accomplishing things that reach beyond solitary abilities by acting — and getting others to act — with a maturity that surpasses limited self-interest." -- John Baker, president of READY Thinking, an organizational and leadership development firm.

"To paraphrase Dwight D. Eisenhower, 'leadership is the art of getting others to do things you want done and feel good about it.' I would go so far as to say the goal is to get the person to embrace the "mission" and own it." -- Dale Hamby, a former Army major and a teacher at Harrisburg University.

"Leadership is getting people to follow that requires engaging them passionately, from the heart, and requires persuading people to change. Management is tactical; leadership is strategic." -- Tom Kennedy, a certified management consultant and principal of The Kennedy Group.

"Leadership is when you give of yourself for the greater good of others with no expectation of reward. It's that willingness to jump in a ditch with your Outcomes of Leadership Effectiveness team so that the next time they fall in, everyone understands the best and easiest way to get out. As I deal mostly with military families who need guidance towards a sustainable future, leadership is absolutely concerned with getting
down in the trenches to do the dirty work." -- Roxanne Reed, executive director of the Military Spouse Foundation.

"Leadership is a mindset of total personal accountability for the results and outcomes produced without fault, blame, guilt or any manner of finger-pointing when results are bad. Leadership is being personally accountable whether someone is going to hold you accountable or not." -- Linda Galindo, consultant, speaker, educator and author of "The 85% Solution: How Personal Accountability Guarantees Success — No Nonsense, No Excuses" (Jossey-Bass, 2009).

"Leadership is the ability to make your followers believe that you possess superior knowledge of the situation, greater wisdom to cope with the unknown or greater moral force. Unless you seem to have more of these things than the average follower does, they won't follow you around the first corner." Tom Hopkins author of “How to Master the Art of Selling” (Business Plus, 2005).

"Leadership is self-differentiation. It’s simply setting you apart from others and often times setting an example. It’s not about being in charge or power, but rather caring for others and helping them achieve a common goal." -- Michael Flanigan, vice president at Expressionary.

"Leadership is the willingness to speak up when it's easier to stay silent, hold yourself accountable when you have excuses at the ready and inspire without intimidation or the fear another will surpass you. A leader shows more empathy than ego and remains dedicated to the betterment of the whole and not the advancement of one." -- Brenda Della Casa, director of online content and community at Preston Bailey Designs.

Good leaders to demonstrate the leadership skills should have the following characteristics

Balanced commitment- good leaders are committed to the jobs and the people who must do it
Positive influence – good leaders set positive examples at all times. They practice what they preach; they help people to achieve their goals.

Good communication skills – good leaders communicate effectively, they are good listeners, they are able to understand their followers well, and they are able to establish rapport with the followers.

Positive Outcomes of Leadership Effectiveness model: good leaders have positive trait, they are always positive in their thinking and action, they are able to form a positive aura around them, they use their hold over the followers in a positive manner, they are dependable and they are able to influence people, they excel and make others excel.

Persuasiveness – good leaders are able to use their power and communication skills to good use, they convert their power in to influence, and they use this influence to persuade people

**Fatal flaws that derail leaders**

1. Lack of energy and enthusiasm
2. Looking new initiatives as a burden
3. Rarely volunteers for any organization wide initiatives
4. Fear of change
5. Accept their own mediocre performance
6. Lack clear vision and direction
7. Being passive and avoidant
8. Having poor judgment
9. Making decisions independently without consultation that colleagues and subordinates consider to be not in the organizations best interest
10. Don’t collaborate
11. Don’t walk the talk

12. Resist new ideas

13. Don’t learn from mistakes

14. Lack interpersonal skills

15. Fail to develop others

Transformational Leadership comprises of following

• Exposing limited utility of current approaches
• Envisioning future
• Enlisting others in ‘quest’
• Empowering them to act
• Exemplifying by personal action
• Encouraging right effort

The 6 Es of outstanding leadership

• Exposing the possibility of moving away from the way things currently exist
• Envisioning what sort of future is to be created ahead in time
• Enlisting support of all others in organization
• Empowering all those who are willing to work to reach final goal
• Exemplifying right actions and behaviors for others to emulate
• Encouraging actions of others that support movement forward

Leadership traits

The early theories identified the common traits of an effective leader the later theories are focused on the characteristic of the leaders, the leadership traits are as follows
a. Ambitious
b. Energetic
c. Desire to lead
d. Self confidence
e. Intelligence & Helpful

This research has also focused on the comparative analysis of a success and unsuccessful leaders, their characteristics, ability and personality.

A recent published analysis of leadership traits (S.A. Kirkpatrick and E.A. Locke, “Leadership: Do Traits Really Matter?” Academy of Management Executive [1991]) identified six core characteristics that the majority of effective leaders possess:

- **Drive** - Leaders are ambitious and take initiative.

- **Motivation** - Leaders want to lead and are willing to take charge.

- **Honesty and integrity** - Leaders are truthful and do what they say they will do.

- **Self-confidence** - Leaders are assertive and decisive and enjoy taking risks. They admit mistakes and foster trust and commitment to a vision. Leaders are emotionally stable rather than recklessly adventurous.

- **Cognitive ability** - Leaders are intelligent, perceptive, and conceptually skilled, but are not necessarily geniuses. They show analytical ability, good judgment, and the capacity to think strategically.

- **Business knowledge** - Leaders tend to have technical expertise in their businesses.
2.3 Leadership Theories

Leadership has started becoming a buzz work during twentieth century, early leadership theories focused on what qualities distinguished between leaders and followers, while subsequent theories looked at other variables such as situational factors and skill levels. Many leadership theories are in use these theories provide management knowledge and validate the leadership function of management. The behavioral theory of leadership gives more attention towards determining the constant relationship between leadership behavior and group performance. The contemporary theories highlight the significance of situational factors such as stress level, job structure, leader’s intelligence, followers’ traits, etc.

The key important theories of leadership are as follows:

- Great Man Theory
- Trait Theory
- Blake and Mouton’s Managerial Grid
- Theory X & Y
- Likert’s management system
- House’s Path Goal Theory
- Fiedler’s contingency model
- Leadership-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory
- Hersey Blanchard Model – Situational Leadership 1
- Hersey Blanchard Model – Situational Leadership 2
- Transformational Leadership
2.3.1 Great Man Theory

This theory believes leadership is characterized by inborn ability to lead i.e. great leaders are born and not made. This theory describes great leaders as mythic, heroic and designed to accept leadership when required.

- Leaders such as Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Napoleon Bonaparte, Queen Elizabeth I, Abraham Lincoln, George W. Bush and Mahatma Gandhi differ from the rest. An important characteristic that separates them from the rest is their ambitious nature and having clarity in their mission. These leaders have inborn qualities that make them effective leaders.

- Contemporary theorists believe that leaders differ from the rest. They can be successful leaders if they have the appropriate knowledge. This view suggests an approach to the study of leadership known as the great man theory.

Assumptions

- The leaders possess inborn leadership abilities.
- Great leaders emerge when there is a great need.

Theory

A leader has a unique quality of captivating the people’s imagination (Thomas Carlyle).

The great man theory gets its name since leadership in the past was connected with the males only. However, we also had great women leaders emerging and this theory later know as the great person theory.

This theory proves that generally people assuming high position will have some special traits, a leader is capable of achieving goals amidst all obstacles. This theory indicates that leader has a special ability that helps them occupy high profile posts. Additionally, from this theory it is observed that these traits remain stable over time and across different groups. Leaders had these characteristics irrespective of their lifetime period of their prominent Outcomes of Leadership Effectiveness in the past.
Criticism

There are many traits that characterize an effective leader. However, these traits are typical masculine traits. The contemporary theorists have observed a considerable improvement in this mentality.
2.3.2 Trait Theory

The characteristics of leader are important, since these help in development of the trait model of leadership. This trait model is used for predicting leadership effectiveness in terms. The success or failure of leader can be estimated by comparing the lists of traits with that of potential leaders.

Scholars who found trait approach an interesting aspect, attempted to identify the following factors with leader emergence and leader effectiveness.

- identify physiological (height, weight and appearance)
- demographic (socioeconomic status, age, and education)
- personality
- self-confidence
- aggressiveness
- decisiveness, knowledge, judgment and intelligence
- task-related (drive, achievement, persistence and initiative)
- social characteristics (cooperativeness and sociability)

The core and key traits identified are:

- Achievement drive: High level of ambition, effort, energy and initiative.
- Leadership motivation: a strong desire to lead others to reach goals.
- Honesty and integrity: trustworthy, reliable, and open.
- Self-confidence: Belief in one’s self, ideas, and ability.
- Cognitive ability: ability to implement good judgment, strong analytical abilities, and conceptually skilled.
- Knowledge of business: Industry knowledge and other technical matters.
- Emotional Maturity: well adjusted, does not suffer from severe psychological disorders.
- Others: charisma, creativity and flexibility.
Strengths/Advantages of Trait Theory

- Naturally pleasing theory.
- Many researchers have confirmed the existence of this theory.
- Acts as a benchmark for assessing the leadership traits of an individual.

Provides in depth analysis of leader in the leadership process.

Trait Theory Limitations

- Chances of getting personal opinion while deciding the performance of leader.
- There are more than 100 different traits of successful leaders in various leadership positions.
- Aims to relate physical traits such as height and weight to effective leadership. These factors mainly correspond to situational factors.
- Very complicated theory.

Trait Theory Implications

Using this theory constructive information about leadership can be obtained and managers effectively make this information to assess and improve their position in the organization. A better understanding of their identity can be obtained and approach followed by them affects others in the organization. Main objective of this theory is to develop leadership qualities of manager by making them aware of their strengths and weakness.

Behavioral Theory

Behavioral theories of leadership are based upon the belief that great leaders are made, not born. Rooted in behaviorism, this leadership theory focuses on the actions of leaders not on mental qualities or internal states. According to this theory, people can learn to become leaders through teachings and observations.
2.3.3 Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid

Jane Mouton and Robert Blake created ‘The Managerial Grid’ and it focuses on task (production) and employee (people) orientations of managers, as well as combinations of concerns between the two extremes. A grid relies on horizontal axis represents concern for production and a grid relies on vertical axis represents concern for people. In that, production is referred by the first number and people are referred by the second number.

Figure 1
Black and Mouton Managerial Grid

Five important leadership styles are discussed in the following parts as:

Impoverished Management

In this, the leader should significantly concern with employee satisfaction, work deadlines, result dissonance and disorganization prevail within the organization. On other side, the term effectiveness is intended for the simple actions that are aimed at preserving and seniority.
**Task management**

Task management is also known as dictatorial or perishes style and the major key concern is production rather than people. Specific key style of this theory is based on theory X of McGregor that simply concludes without taking care of crucial employees. In this, the leader must not only believe efficiency results but also go through the details of all proper organizational system works and eliminate all the people when possible. Therefore, an increase in the output of organization runs due to strict policies and procedures, high labor turnover is inevitable.

**Middle-of-the-Road**

It is a compromising style in which leaders want to sustain the stability between company objectives and people needs. In organizations, leader should not be the reason for the average performance. To achieve that, it is important to fulfill neither employee nor production needs.

**Country Club**

Due to low task and high people orientation, it is considered as a collegial style. In this method, leader mainly concentrates to provide essential requirements with their family and in comfortable environment. Leader must recognize employee’s will for self-motivation by estimating their individual hard work. And he must also take the responsibility of hamper production and produce questionable results.

**Team Management**

It describes mainly about high people and their responsibilities. The theory Y of McGregor explores the most effective style along with Blake and Mouton. In this style, the leader could feel various aspects like empowerment, commitment, trust and respect to create a team atmosphere. It automatically reflects result in high employee satisfaction and performance.
2.3.4 Theory X & Y

The Theory X and Theory Y was offered based Douglas McGregor (1960) this theory encompasses style, behavior, situation and adaptation to the situation. His theory is based on the assumption that organization nature will determine the manager’s style which will lead to the most management actions which directly flows from the human behavior that the manager holds.

Theory X people are assumed to have the following characteristics

- Generally tend to me lazy
- Shows disinterest in the work
- Less ambitious
- Doesn’t own responsibility
- Trying to avoid the work wherever possible

To attain organization objectives managers must use coercion and threats of punishments, such stringent controls are required in the best of the organization (McGregor, 1960, p.33).
Theory X people are assumed to have the following characteristics:

- Focuses on work
- Concentrates on self-direction
- Seeks responsibility
- Accepts responsibility
- Motivated on the right spirit of work
- Highly creative
- Believes in physical and mental effort in work
- Participative leaders

Y leaders are participative and consultative they do this intentionally because they feel that creativity, ingenuity, imagination, taking responsibility, being on self is there throughout the organization given a proper organization culture and conditions employees tend to seek and accept responsibility (McGregor, 1960, p. 47).

Modern theory suggest that Theory Y managers are always far superior than the Theory X managers however there are multiple arguments on the same and every theory supposed undergo its own critics.

Figure 3
Theory X & Theory Y
2.3.5 Likert’s management system

Renis Likert studied the concept of learning the patterns and style of the managers over three decades along with his associates in the University of Michigan, USA and he has identified a management system in four-fold model.

Likert identified four leadership styles, they are as follows:

**System 1 - Exploitative Authoritative**

In upper level hierarchy, responsibility directly lies in the hands of high level people because superior officers do not have trust and confidence in their subordinates. So, only the decisions and other related matters are forced on employees, even they do not feel free to discuss with their higher level officers. Therefore, team work and communication is inadequate and motivation is mainly based on threats.

**System 2 – Benevolent Authoritative:**

Lower levels organizational hierarchy is not responsibility of managerial levels because superior has gracious confidence and trust in subordinates even they don’t feel free to discuss and related things about their job with their superior. Therefore, system of rewards is mainly based on motivation and an inadequate teamwork or communication.

**System 3 – Consultative:**

Various responsibilities are widely spread during the organizational behavior because the manager doesn’t have complete confidence in their team members. So, various discussions and various on the job and job related training takes place to establish the link between the managers and team members which enables to communication horizontally and vertically within them which eventually motivates to complete based on rewards and job involvement.
**System 4 – Participative:**

During organizational hierarchy, it is extensive to achieve various responsibilities of organizational goals. So, superior officers must have high level of confidence, high level of teamwork, communication and participation in his subordinates.

Likert described nature of four management systems during organizational profile and organizational characteristics this profile has four management systems when compared with any other basic organizational variables. They are:

- Leadership processes
- Motivational forces
- Communication process
- Interaction-influence process
- Decision-making process
- Goal-setting or ordering
- Control processes

Likert examined various feedback forms of several employee belong to different organizations from different managerial positions. This analysis proved that to provide units or departments. As a result, employee working in system 1 or 2 management practices are lease productive and system 3 or 4 are most productive.

**Advantages**

With the help of Likert, the profile has been developed. The field of group dynamics is become possible to quantify the results. The Likert theory is facilitate to measure the “soft” areas of management like communication and trust.
2.3.6 House’s Path Goal Theory

The expectancy theory of motivation has its roots and it was developed by Robert House. The theory which is based on premise in an employee has some common perception of expectancy linking his effort and performance. It also affects a leader’s behavior. The leader helps to achieve their rewards for group members. It also clarifies the path of goals and removing obstacles of performance. The employees complete their task and they provide detailed information, support, and other resources which are essential for employees.

House’s theory advocates servant leadership theory, according to the theory the leaders will act as a facilitator and coach to their subordinates. These are explained in figure 4 below:

![Figure 4: House’s Path Goal Theory](image-url)
Leadership Styles

The four leadership styles are:

- **Directive:** This leadership style enables leader in providing guidelines, informing subordinates of their performance, assigning performance standards, and controlling behavior when performance standards are not up to mark. Further, making well-thought utilization of rewards and disciplinary action. This style is similar to task-centered leadership.

- **Supportive:** This leadership style enables leader to have friendly approach towards team members and showing keen interest and expresses a concern on their personal requirements, welfare, and well-being. This style is similar to people-centered leadership.

- **Participative:** The participative leadership style indicates that leaders share information to subordinates and explain the rationale for his decision making thereby he gains support from the group for the decisions being made, the subordinates are consulted for work, task, goals for important decision making.

- **Achievement-oriented:** This leadership style helps the leader in assigning challenging goals and provides support to employees to give their best. It is believed that goals can be accomplished by employees. This is similar to goal-setting theory. This theory explains the leadership styles are not mutually exclusive and leaders have ability to adapt different style for different situation.
2.3.7 Fiedler’s contingency model

The theory describes the styles are effective only in certain situations. Furthermore, it explains some factors that focus on relationship between leader’s style and effectiveness.

- Employee characteristics: These comprises factors such as
  - employees’ needs,
  - locus of control,
  - experience,
  - perceived ability,
  - satisfaction,
  - willingness to leave the organization, and
  - Anxiety.

Characteristics of work environment: These consist of factors such as task structure and team dynamics that are beyond employee’s control. For instance, it is observed that a sufficient style of approach is suitable for employees performing simple and routine tasks. Employees performing non-routine tasks find participative style more effective. Supportive leadership style is used when team cohesiveness is low and some situations where performance-oriented team exists are suited for directive style or an achievement oriented style.

Contingency theory

Managers utilize behavioral theories for developing particular leadership behaviors. However, these theories offer very little guidance to understand the leadership in different situations. Researchers arrived at conclusion that there isn’t any correct leadership for manager under a specific circumstance. Main objective of developing contingency-situational theories is to indicate that the style used is dependent on various
factors such as the people, situation, task, organization and other environmental variables. The following section gives the description of theories that support this concept.

**Fiedler’s Contingency Model**

This theory suggests that managers don’t have good approach that helps them to lead. Manager will acquire leadership styles depending on the situations. Solution to any situation that managers are facing is dependent on the intruding factors on the situation.

There are three situations that define the condition of a managerial task (Fiedler):

1. Leader member relations: It informs us the relation between manager and the employees.

2. Task Structure: It assists in analyzing whether the job is highly structured, fairly unstructured, or somewhere in between.

3. Position power: It gives us an idea the authority of manager.

Managers are categorized into either task oriented or relationship oriented.

Task oriented managers perform better in situations that have good leader-member relationships, structured tasks, and either weak or strong position power; they have good scope of performance when the task in unstructured but position power is strong. Additionally, they also have good scope of performance when the leader member relations were moderate to poor and the task was unstructured.

In contrast to task oriented managers, relationship oriented managers ensure good performance in all other situations.
Hence, the manager has to adopt leadership style depending on the situation. Variables regarding to environment factors can be a coalition of favorable and unfavorable weighted options. Further a clear style depends on key environment variable having favorable and unfavorable relationship as a middle ground. It is possible for managers to match their leadership style by reforming the environment variables.

**Figure 5**
Contingency Model

![Fiedler’s Contingency Model](image)

Another feature of contingency model is that leader’s situational control is influenced by the leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. Leader-member relations are characterized by the amount of loyalty, dependability, and support of the employees towards the leader. It is determined by the manager’s perception about the employee and group of employees getting along together.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favorable Relationship</th>
<th>Unfavorable relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task is structured</td>
<td>Task is unstructured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader has authority</td>
<td>Leader has limited authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders reward</td>
<td>Scope for reward is less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders has an option to punish</td>
<td>Scope for punishment is also less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are certain power which comes with the position for instance the manager position has certain power which is given by the organization for punishing, rewarding and directing team member, this power is called as positioning power It depends on taking away (favorable) or increasing (unfavorable) the decision-making power of employees.
2.3.8 Leadership-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory

Leader-Member Exchange Theory depicts that leaders associate various group of subordinations. Leaders give kindness to subordinates who fall into one group called in-group. Members of this group would get more attention from leaders and also can access the resources of organization easily. Other subordinates would come under the group called out-group.

Based on the personal characteristics such as age, gender, or personality, leaders make a distinction among out-group and in-group members. There are certain chances for followers to become a part of in-group status, once the leaders come to know the capability of the followers. There are three stages in the LMX theory of relationship among leaders and followers they are as follows

**Role Taking:** Leader appraises the talent and abilities of newly joining members and provides spaces to exhibit their competence.

**Role making:** Work related factors such as informal and unstructured cooperation would take place between the leader and the follower a member who is disloyal would lead to move that member to out-group.

**Routinization:** In routinization stage social exchange is established between the leader and the member

The LMX 7 scale evaluates the degree to which the leaders and followers would have mutual respect for other’s potential, feel a sense of mutual trust, and have a strong obligation to one another. These aspects find out the extent to which followers are the part of leader’s out-group or in-group.
Strengths of LMX Theory

- One of best theory for leadership is LMX theory. It mainly focuses and demonstrates on the relationships among leader and subordinates.

- It is one of robust and a descriptive theory.

- LMX theory mainly concentrates on the communication parts in leadership which is very important in any kind of field. The growth, development, sustaining beneficial exchanges and improvement of the leader and subordinates can be achievable by following the medium of communication. If communication is associated with aspects such as mutual trust, respect and commitment, it will definitely make a way to effective leadership.
• LMX Theory’s approach is well accepted and practical.

Criticisms of LMX Theory

• LMX theory falls short in explaining the creation of high quality exchanges.

• LMX theory distinguishes the followers. Some followers are getting more attention from leaders and others do not have chances to draw the attention.
2.3.9 *Hersey Blanchard Model – Situational Leadership 1*

Ten years later to Fielders Theory the Situational theory was introduced the originator of this theory made an assumption that leaders far flexible than what Fielder suggested. This theory suggest that the leaders should change their leadership style and behavior as per the need of their follower and their maturity level in fact this is the first theory which made the leaders to think from a different perspective to address the need according to follower maturity. Maturity is defined as "the capacity to set high but attainable goals (achievement-motivation), willingness and ability to take responsibility, and education and / or experience of an individual or a group" (Hersey, Blanchard, 1976).

Hersey and Blanchard said that the maturity of the follower to be assessed according to a specific situation, hence at each situation the follower will have a different level of maturity so it more focused on situation based maturity level.

An effective leader fist should determine the group of the follower’s maturity level before assessing the amount of guidance that he should provide to a specific situation.

These theorists dispelled the notion that task and relationship are either / or styles of leadership. Instead, these styles can be viewed as existing on a continuum, moving from very authoritarian leadership at one end to very democratic leadership behavior at the other.
It is possible to attain effective situational leadership by adopting with supporting and directing behaviors.
Four main leadership styles of situational leadership are as follows:

- **Style 1: Telling**

  It provides clear instructions about each task's accomplishment in a crystal clear manner.

- **Style 2: Selling**

  It provides direction in association with limited input which would be attained from team members before making the decisions.

- **Style 3: Participating**

  It supports the development and improvement of followers by guiding skill development and acting as a source of advice.

- **Style 4: Delegating**

  It provides nominal direction and support to followers as they take for granted high degrees of autonomy and responsibility for their work.
2.3.10 Hersey Blanchard Model – Situational Leadership 2

Ken Blanchard presents crystal clear guidelines for managing people according to their abilities and commitment.

In Situational Leadership the manager diagnoses each team member’s developmental level for a particular task and adjusts the leadership style to the level of the team member in order to produce effectiveness and efficiency.

The goal is to provide appropriate levels of direction and support to help the employee grow and become more independent. Leadership style changes according to need of the employees or as employee develops. This kind of approach achieves a great power when paired with Blanchard’s One Minute Manager formula of Partnering for Progress

Situational Leadership recognizes four categories of developmental and corresponding leadership levels:

D1: It’s a Level of the employee where is at low competence and high commitment (initial enthusiasm)

S1: Directing style leadership provides structure, teaching and supervision

D2: Level of the employee where he is at low competence and low commitment (early excitement is over)

S2: Coaching style of leadership provides direction and support to help employee regain their motivation and commitment level

D3: It’s a Level of the employee where he is at moderate to high competence and variable commitment
S3: Supporting style of leadership provides patient listening, appropriate praising and facilitation to help them to solidify their commitment level

D4: It's a Level where the employee is at high competence and high commitment

S4: Delegating style of leadership helps the employee to take more responsibility and produce desired results for daily decisions

Performance review begins with performance planning, continues through daily coaching and concludes with performance evaluation. The goal is to help the employee succeed by staying in touch at the appropriate level, instead of setting goals and only intervening when something goes wrong.

The Partnering for Progress formula includes goals, praising and reprimands. First, the manager meets with each employee to decide together on three to five key goals and performance standards for each goal over three to six months. Each goal must be specific and measurable, linked to the intrinsic motivation of the employee, reasonable so that people can stretch their abilities without becoming discouraged, relevant to an activity that will affect overall performance, and include record to track performance.

Next the manager and employee analyze the employees’ developmental level for each goal and agree on the type of leadership style the employee needs to perform at the desired level (succeed). As the employee grows, leadership style is renegotiated to suit the increased levels of competence and commitment.

The goal of praising and reprimands is to provide employee with to Outcomes of Leadership Satisfaction for success. Praising stimulate employees to reach higher developmental levels and allow managers to change leadership style gradually from more to less direction and support. Manager and employee decide together on how praising will be delivered, for example meeting a D3 level employee for lunch each week to listen
to and support his/her actions. Reprimands are used to stop poor performance. If a reprimand is needed, the manager may need to increase direction and/or support.

The book is presented as the parable of an overwhelmed entrepreneur learning from an expert. Its lessons apply to daily life, managing Extension employee, and working with colleagues, clientele and administrators

Figure 8

Situational Leadership Model II
In recent times, creating high-performance work force is considered as significant. For achieving high-performance work force, leaders should be in a position to guide their members to surpass task requirements. Consequently, new leadership concepts and theories have emerged. In the current era one of the newly emerged leadership concept is Transformational Leadership.

It is possible to identify transformational leadership at all levels of the organization such as teams, divisions, departments, and organization. Leaders should be inspiring, visionary, daring, risk-takers, and caring thinkers. It is also required to have a charismatic appeal. But, only charisma won’t help for changing an organizational process. For making changes to the organizations transformational leaders should show signs of the following four factors:

**Figure 9**
Transformational Leadership Model
**Inspirational Motivation**

The promotion of consistent vision, mission and set values to the employees in the organization is the main objectives of transformational leadership. This objective enables the members to obtain information required from every interaction. So, the followers look up to transformational leaders for any guidance. They show their enthusiasm in their work and cultivate the spirit of teamwork and commitment.

**Intellectual Stimulation**

In intellectual stimulation leaders constantly support their followers to inculcate innovative and creative thinking skills and allow them to express their ideas. Even though the followers commit some mistakes, the leaders don’t criticize them publicly. More focus is solving the problem rather than blaming it.

**Idealized Influence**

A leader creates an impact on the followers only when they practice what they preach. The followers look up to leaders for inspiration and have respect for them. The leaders give high priority for the follower’s requirements. These leaders exercise their power for achieving the goals of the organization.

**Individualized Consideration**

Followers refer to leaders as their mentors. The leaders encourage them for their creative and innovative thinking. Talent and knowledge are the factors that distinguish the followers. They have the authority on decision making and have the support of the leaders to implement their decisions. Mahatma Gandhi and Obama are considered as transformational leaders.
Criticisms of Transformational Leadership Theory

- Transformational Leadership uses impression management. Hence, it results in encouraging leaders’ self promotion.

- The theory is a mix of many leadership theories. Hence it is very difficult to understand this theory.

Implication of Transformational Leadership Theory

Transformational Leadership is applicable when the environment is characterized by uncertainty, global turbulence, and organizational instability. These leaders encourage their followers to have high levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment and involve in organizational citizenship behaviors. The followers show lot of involvement while working. This is helpful since leadership is effective in transforming organization.

Transactional Leadership

An important point to be noted is the usage of particular performance criteria for measuring leader effectiveness. Most researches have a keen observation on productivity as the measure of leader effectiveness. Effective leadership assists mutually beneficial exchanges between parties for optimizing mutual benefit that comprises of achievement of organizational tasks.

The main objective present in many organizations have is enhancement of profitability. Therefore, effective leaders are helpful in achieving tasks. Another characteristic of leader effectiveness is employee satisfaction, high employee satisfaction is dependent on the reward received appreciating the effort.
The following themes are commonly used relating to productivity,

- group performance
- individual performance
- task attainment
- working to deadlines
- motivation
- efficiency of resource allocation, etc.

Researchers tried different innovative ways to measure leader effectiveness.

Transforming leadership aids in transformation of followers to leaders and convert leaders to moral agents. It occurs when leaders and followers engage in upliftment of each other to higher levels of motivation and morality. (James MacGregor Burns).

Burns takes inspiration from the humanistic psychology movement and suggests that the transforming leader shapes, alters, and elevates the motives, values and goals of followers aiming for change in the process. Transforming leadership involves transformation of leaders and followers into persons having strong modal-values and end-values. Burns observes that transforming leadership is more noble and different from charismatic leadership. He termed charismatic leadership as heroic leadership, and executive or business leadership however it is amusing that these two types of leadership constitute the majority of Burns’ work.

According to Bass, Transformational leaders are able to

- Expand a follower’s portfolio of needs
- Transform a follower’s self-interest
- Increase the confidence of followers
- Elevate followers’ expectations
• Heighten the value of the leader’s intended outcomes for the follower
• Encourage behavioral change
• Motivate others to higher levels of personal achievement (Maslow’s ‘self-actualization’).

There has been volume considered by researchers of different perspective as per ‘Transformational Leadership’ built ahead work of Burns and Bass in organizational and work contexts. This paper describes the hybrid nature of transformational leadership due to personality. The behavioral process explores the learning concept is capable of life form process.

Transactional Leadership has been traditional model of leadership with its extraction from an organizational or business perspective in ‘bottom line’. Stephen conveys writing in ‘Principle-Centered Leadership’ said that transformational leadership mainly focuses on ‘top line’ and offers contrast between two.

2.4 Leadership and Outcomes: Employee Commitment and Employee Satisfaction

2.4.1 Employee Commitment

As Meyer and Allen (1991) Commitment is categorized into:

• Emotional commitment (emotional attachments)
• Rational commitment (costs associated with leaving the organization) and
• Normative commitment (moral obligation to remain with the organization)

The analysis appears that employees are predictable to surpass their job necessities are committed to the organization with an effective manner most of the time. However, such
workers include in organizational citizenship activities like loyalty, obedience and participation.

It defined as an individual’s identification with engaged on particular organization. It differentiates by a robust notion in and acceptance of the organization’s objectives, a willingness to apply significant effort on its behalf, and a strong desire to maintain attachment.

Here, the business scenario one of the challenges facing recent organizations involves maintaining employee commitment. Such organization tries to attain by developing a new work contract. As Bergmann, Lester, De Meuse & Grahn, 2000, stated at present days, workplace employees face more doubt on regular activities and decreased job security. Without promising of continued employment, in other areas, employees are expected more beliefs. For example, employees expect employers to manifest in terms of pleasant working conditions, provision of a safe working environment, access to training and growth and a balance among work and employees commitments outside the workplace. According to Bragg (2002) the employee commitment is reliant on three drivers which are:

• Fairness

• Trust and

• Concern for employees

Such commitments can be decided by the employers in ways that employees identify as fair, trusting and caring. The consequence of employee commitment is apparent if one considers prior research into the rapport among the job satisfaction and commitment (Bateman & Organ, 1983), workplace justice (Moorman, Niehoff & Organ, 1992), perceptions of supervisor fairness (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) and trust in and loyalty to the leader (Deluga, 1994).
2.4.1.1 Affective commitment

The affective commitment bond plays a vital role in an organization, characterized in not only identifying but also involving (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Mowdays, Porter, & steers, 1982; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986). In all the three components, affective commitment has received a lot of attention by the researchers. (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002) and on the other hand, there is a huge support for the following factors and they are as follows:

- Antecedents,
- correlates,
- effects,
- cross-cultural generalizability

Although various researchers conducted to link demographic features like age, tenure, gender and education to commitment, the relations were neither strong nor consistent, the reason being several variables like status of job, work rewards and values moderating the membership. In some studies, it examined the correlation among the features of organizational and commitment.

However, research demonstrates that affective commitment is related to decentralization of employer and formalization of strategy policies. In difference to personal and organizational features interviewed into membership between work experience variables and affective commitment. It recognize to connect with affective commitment which encompasses equity in reward distribution (Rhodes & Steers, 1981), supervisor consideration (Glisson & Durick, 1988), role clarity and freedom from conflict (Glisson & Durick, 1988), based on the performance of fairness rewards and job challenge (Meyer & Allen, 1987), opportunity for progress (O’Reilly & Caldwell, 1980) and participation in decision making (Rhodes & Steers, 1981). Research to date suggests work experiences are significant role in employees’ decisions to remain with an organization.
2.4.1.2 Continuance Commitment

The continuance commitment to a person who needs to stay up with an organization, due to a reason that costs of forgoing benefits are associated with a role investment in an organization. It must be associated with turnover intentions but not with behaviors beyond those required to maintain membership (Meyer & Allen, 1991; 1997). This view is empirically supported (Meyer et al., 2002).

2.4.1.3 Normative Commitment

Normative commitment is when an employee’s feels obligation of being in the company, the employee is committed to the organization normatively because they would have got some reward in advance which make them to feel comfortable staying in organization for example the organization could have given college tuition fee, training reimbursements, emergency loans etc. These small reward and recognition made by the organization cause the employees to feel the obligation to reciprocate they are committed to the organization (Scholl, 1981).
Figure 10
Mayer & Allen Commitment Model

2.5 Leadership Styles

2.5.1 Transformational Leadership and its outcomes

Transformational Leadership is a kind of leadership that occurs when leaders “broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and the mission of the group and when they stir their employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group” (Bernard Bass, 1990). Yukl (1994) considered that transformational leadership is the change in the attitude of leaders who influence the organizational members and that it establishes a commitment to the mission and objectives of the organization. Burns' view is that Transformational Leadership is more effective than Transactional Leadership.

Transformational Leadership had been used to investigate leadership behavior across a wide variety of many organizations for example in a business institution (Carless, Mann, and Wearing, 1996), military or law enforcement (Atwater and Yammarino, 1993; Densten, 1999; Singer and Singer, 1990), informational technology (Thite, 1999; Sosik, 1997), educational setting (Ingram, 1997), and health care industry (Medley and Larochelle, 1995; Pillai, 1995). In addition, the theory is not only widely used in the U.S. but also had been employed in several countries such as Australia (Parry and Sarros, 1996; Carless, 1998), New Zealand (Singer, 1990), the Netherlands (Den Hartog et al., 1997), Canada (Avolio, Howell, and Sosik, 1999), Austria (Geyer and Steyrer, 1998) and the U.K. (Coad and Berry, 1998) and translated into over a dozen languages (Bass and Avolio, 1997).
In evaluating leadership performance, Bass and Avolio (1997) also proposed the three leadership outcomes that showed how transformational leadership, transactional Leadership, and non-leadership related to the success and performance of the target leaders.

The three leadership outcomes are presented below:

1. Extra Effort reflected the extent to which the “rater” exerted effort beyond the ordinary as result of the leadership behavior.

2. Effectiveness reflected how effective the “rater” perceived the target leader to be at different levels of the organization.

3. Satisfaction reflected how satisfied the “rater” was with the target leader’s methods and styles and how satisfied he/she was in general with the leader.
2.5.2 Real Time Leaders and Transformational Leadership

The objective of Transformational Leadership is to drive/transform/impact people & largely their followers & supporters. In specific a Transformational Leader should:

Promote & propagate change

Drive a vision

Leads a vision

Transformational Leaders are those who have the ability to not just motivate, engage & optimize their team ability, those who can create an impact & also create similar transformational leaders in their teams.

It is vital for organization to set goals that are high standards in mind when they set the goals for transformational leaders as they are expected to exceed typical standard. Any transformational leader would surely encourage high levels of commitment from their team/supporters, they seek such high level of commitment towards achievement of either shared goals or organizational goals.

In Transformational Leadership there are 4 “I” which are enumerated below:

• Idealized Influence - Being a charismatic role model who builds confidence and trust

• Inspirational Motivation - Providing meaningful work and setting high standard

• Intellectual Stimulation - Encouraging creativity by questioning common assumptions and beliefs

• Individual Consideration - Being a mentor by responding to individual needs
James Macgregor Burns was the first author to clearly define Transformational Leadership & Transactional Leadership. He defined transformational leadership as “leaders and followers help each other to advance to a higher level of morale and motivation.”

He further elaborates it as transformation leaders always motivates others to change their values, beliefs in appositive way, while Transactional Leaders only operate on barter system.

Bass in 1985 elaborated further on the theory developed by Burns. He indicated that all good leaders have both the quality of Transactional & Transformation Leader his theory further judged by the MLQ or the Multifactor Leadership Quiz, this quiz is still used as a primary tool to evaluate & identify good leaders.

The theory of Bass points out that good leader should possess the required charisma & influence on their supporters. According to Bass a good should motivate his followers in such a way that the followers are inspired to challenge the current status quo.

2.5.2.1 Gandhi and Transformational Leadership

Prima facie Gandhi was a paradigm case of transformational leadership. Gandhi as a transformational leader recognized and harnessed the needs and demands of followers to higher purposes.

Gandhi’s way of transformational leadership

- He influenced the people to elevate the goals and values of his ashram
- He empowered his mates to achieve the higher level through empowerment
- He inspired the followers to follow his foot paths
- He brought in a social change that satisfied the followers needs
- Service to the motherland (Thomson, 1993)
• He believed in the philosophy of open discussion to develop all the transformative goals for the ashram which gained a trust by his followers
• He unearthed the needs of others and the needs of his followers
• His first priority was always to develop the culture and he believed that’s the foundation of the building, character of pupil.
• Gandhi’s scheme of education was based on the principles of self-support and economic self-sufficiency, the managerial effectiveness of his ashrams was assessed not merely in terms of economic profit (Thomson, 1993).
• Gandhi was always committed to his work, he showed a passion and love in all the works that he has done people admired his enthusiasm level and it acted as a self motivation for his followers to perform at their highest level.
• He acted as reflection for his followers
• He demonstrated a forward thinking which transformed everything
• He has always encourage innovation and creativity
• He always made ethical decisions
• He had a compelling vision which provided his followers with a sense of purpose and encouraged commitments.
• He always acted as a mentor and encouraged participation
• He empowered and gave autonomy to his followers which encourage them to take ownership and responsibility of their work (Varkey, 1939), he also allowed his followers to make decision.

2.5.2.2 Bill Gates Transformational Leadership Process

It’s widely known throughout the world on how Bill Gates has transformed the entire information technology through his transformational leadership he became the youngest and wealthiest CEO in a short span of time.

It is evident that he had many in qualities within him was one of the most important for his success in both the organization that he created.
• Be innovative to your best
• Think big and think future
• Create world best products

Were few of his mantras for his business he had excellent analytic ability to distinguish the features of each if his products

After he retired from Microsoft he started his next venture “The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation” and the aim of starting this organization was to be support and do philanthropic initiatives in the areas of global health and learning, with the hope that in the 21st century, advances in these critical areas will be available for all people”. In few years this organization was success and this was second innings in his career and he choose to be in philanthropy this time.

He ensure the following in his organizations known to everyone

• Organization vision, mission and purpose

• Every stakeholder is not left in dark

• Goals are made clear for everyone on-board (Hughes, Pg 437 “Goal specificity)

Communicating with Followers

Transformational leaders build trust in their leadership and attainability of their goals through an image of seemingly unshakable self-confidence, strength of moral conviction, personal example and self-sacrifice, and unconventional tactics or behavior. They are perceived to have unusual insight and ability to act in a manner consistent with their vision and values (Hughes 2009, Pg 582). It is important for Bill Gates to share his vision to his followers.

The exemplary skills and mindset that Bill Gates made him to be one of the most influential transformational leaders, who inspire the masses of whom he shares his vision. Not all charismatic leaders can be transformational leader but he possesses both; being transformational leader and charismatic. Success has already been established and vision
has been accomplished by gates in his first innings we can expect more to follow in Philanthropy.

2.5.2.3 Impactful Transformational leaders s: Post Globalization

The importance of leadership has been demonstrated repeatedly throughout history. Countless examples of extraordinary leaders, ranging from Mahatma Gandhi to Vladimir Lenin and Mao Tse-tung to Barack Obama, remind us of the effect one or a small group of political leaders can have on a society. These great historical figures are transformational leaders because they were able to spearhead fundamental change within their societies.

While the inspirational and forward moving variant of leadership is well documented, it has also been known to go awry. Leadership positions have been abused by many leaders, what James McGregor Burns would characterize as power-holders in countries throughout the world. This chapter is an endeavor to understand what goes into the creation of a successful leader, and how those characteristics can be implemented in political leadership today. It is an attempt to demystify the sometimes perplexing leader follower relationship.

Globalization has brought with it many new challenges and opportunities for societies all around the world. Leaders have had to react to these new developments; their reactions in turn affect the lives of people both within their societies and around the world. These challenges and opportunities vary according to context, yet there are certain threads of similarity. One phenomenon that most societies have had to deal with, albeit to varying degrees, is the creation and/or sustenance of multicultural societies. This essay examines the way in which leaders in the Netherlands and South Africa have responded to forced societal change brought about by global economic, social, and/or political pressures. It then questions how these leaders contributed to the multicultural project within their respective societies.

The case studies will look at two Transformational Leadership political leaders: F. W. de Klerk in South Africa and Pim Fortuyn in the Netherlands these leaders were selected for
several reasons. First, under their influence, tangible change occurred within their respective societies, be it legislatively or within popular discourse. Second, both of these leaders are highly controversial figures. Although de Klerk was heavily involved in the negotiations for the new South Africa and was awarded a Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts, several different factors have led to a divided perception of him in the South African collective memory.

Fortuyn, on the other hand, was central to a major swing in public discourse regarding immigration, role, and political correctness in the Netherlands. He provided a voice that was previously taboo in the country, which has proven to have both positive and negative outcomes. This analysis begins with a presentation of the definitions and broad theoretical framework in which it is situated it will then delve into the case studies, looking at the societal contexts in which both leaders were operating, personal characteristics of these men, and a discussion of their overall contributions in building a multicultural society. It will provide a comparative analysis of both societies and their leaders.

Finally, the conclusion will reflect upon implications of these findings for leadership studies and globalization, and contribute suggestions for further research.

2.5.2.4 Multiculturalism and Leadership: A Theoretical Framework

Multiculturalism is defined here as a theory of societal organization made up of individuals and communities from different backgrounds such as religion, race, or any other form of social distinction in which people live side by side harmoniously in a cosmopolitan spirit of respect and mutual growth. The multicultural project, therefore, is the constant endeavor to create this spirit and society. Burns put forth the famous distinction between transformational leadership and transactional leadership.

Transactional leaders sometimes referred to today as managers, are those that implement what they are assigned, they operate within the status quo and generally do not attempt to alter it. Alternatively, Burns describes transformational leadership as occurring when leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality.
He places a strong emphasis on morality and higher order values, which will fundamentally transform both the leader and the followers.

An example of this type of leader is Mahatma Gandhi. This theory is extended by Bernard M. Bass, who proposes that the transformational leaders motivate their followers to commit and to realize performance outcomes that exceed their expectations. Unlike Burns, however, Bass sees transformational leadership as amoral and universally applicable. He postulates that transformational leaders use their authority and power to fundamentally reshape.

The dimensionality of charisma in leadership has been highly contested. Max Weber identified three cycles of pure leadership that all societies must undergo: the charismatic, the rational-legal, and the traditional. He characterizes charismatic leaders as those distinguished from ordinary people by their heroic and seemingly superhuman qualities. Since Weber, subsequent attempts to study charismatic leadership have resulted in considerable variation. For some scholars, charismatic leadership should be examined as a phenomenon separate from transformational leadership. Others take it as a component of transformational leadership, or consider them as one and the same.

Different authors have treated charisma as a personality trait of the leader, an attribution bestowed upon the leader by the followers, or a combination of the two. Nevertheless, in the debate regarding charisma and leadership, there is a consensus that the relationship between leader and follower is crucial. I will agree with Conger and Kanungo in the understanding of charismatic leadership as a form of transformational leadership; indeed, it is the most exemplary form that transformational leaders can assume that not all transformational leaders are charismatic, but a charismatic leader is de facto a transformational leaders.

To place the distinction in more concrete terms, I will briefly utilize the contemporary case of the campaign of the 44th President of the United States, Barack Obama, as an example. For the purposes of this study, transformational political leadership is defined as any leadership that brings about fundamental change in the political, economic, or social
institutions of a polity. It is an amoral force that is utilized for the purpose of a fundamental alteration of the existing status quo.

In other words, the emphasis is placed on the idealized vision and ultimate attainment of a specified goal. In the case of President Obama’s campaign, his message was clear from the slogan “Change We Can Believe In”. His consistent reiteration of the message of change is an example of how leaders articulate a radical message. By attaining the goal (which he clearly stated in one line at his victory speech: Change has come to America) he became a transformational leader. Charismatic leadership, however, is essentially defined in terms of the followers it is a form of transformation in which followers view their leader as extraordinary and capable of bringing about fundamental change this form of leadership is also about the articulation and implementation of some higher order goal, but it is more leaders centered.

Followers identify with the cause because of the personal characteristics they have attributed to the leader. Conger identifies two important factors of this attribution: leaders taking personal risks and exhibiting unconventional behavior. Returning to our example, Obama is a charismatic leader and a transformational leader because his followers identified the movement with him personally. They saw him as extraordinary, taking personal risks, and exhibiting unconventional behavior. The following sections will examine the two case studies for this project in detail. The nuances between the charismatic and the transformational leaders will be further articulated.

2.5.2.5 Case Studies

A. Apartheid’s Last Ringmaster: F. W. de Klerk

From the beginning, F. W. de Klerk seemed destined to enter a life of politics. He was raised in a political family, with his father being a long-standing parliamentarian and his uncle having served as Prime Minister of South Africa. In his autobiography, The Last Trek: A New Beginning, he recounts being interested in politics and public affairs from a
young age. His upbringing was also strongly rooted in the Dutch Reformed Church and steeped in conservative religious morality. Like many of his Afrikaner schoolmates, in his youth he was highly supportive of Dr. Verwoerd’s creation of the independent Bantustans. From his initial appointment to Parliament in 1972, he quickly rose in rank to eventually take a ministerial position.

He served in numerous portfolios, including mineral and energy affairs (which exposed him to the issues of labor conditions within the mines) and as Minister of Home Affairs from 1982–1985. He explains how his experiences, particularly in the latter post, began to chip away at his previously held assumptions on the validity of the Bantustan system. Throughout his rise up the political ladder de Klerk acquired the reputation of being situated in the conservative camp. He refutes this claim in his autobiography, stating that he would often challenge plans at reform that were too hastily proposed, taking on the role of devil’s advocate. As he puts it, it was his drive for rationalization that had him labeled as a spoiler of reform and garnered him the conservative (or verkramptes) label. A major part of this perception was his strong support of the concept of own Affairs, which was the idea that each racial group should be responsible for their designated own activities.

In 1989, having served as leader of the National Party (NP) for almost two years, de Klerk took the office of state president after Botha had been forced out of office due to a stroke. Upon becoming president, de Klerk faced a host of problems. The infrastructure of apartheid was crumbling. The country had been under a state of emergency for several years, and the strength of the African National Congress’s (ANC) support base was undeniable. The economy was in a fast decline; the political instability in the country had resulted in much capital flight, and normal business activity was being disrupted. Global pressures were also bearing down from outside the country. Economic sanctions and consumer activism were forcing the economy and the political sphere into a crisis.

Although South Africa was in fast decline, the country was not on the abject failure. The state still retained a strong security infrastructure, either through covert or conventional means. The various sacrosanct were a powerful and ominous presence. De Klerk came into office in September 1989 with the determination to launch a democratic
transformation process because, he claims of the necessity of action on the government‘s part and also personal conviction.

In the first few months of his presidency, he worked to normalize the security forces, lifted the ban on peaceful public protest, and began the systematic release of some high profile political prisoners.

An important development was that the beginning of de Klerk‘s presidency coincided with the fall of the Berlin Wall in November of 1989. The communist threat in southern Africa, specifically the Soviet Union‘s influence on the ANC and the South African Communist Party, had all but disappeared, allowing space for a more adventurous approach.

Undoubtedly the most important moment of de Klerk‘s political career came on February 2, 1990, when, in dramatic fashion, de Klerk delivered a speech at the opening of Parliament unbanning the ANC and thirty-one other organizations, as well as announcing the unconditional release of famed political prisoner Nelson Mandela. This speech set in motion a process of transferring power to majority vote on the principle of one-man, one-vote, which brought Mandela to power in 1994.

The actual negotiations were a long and arduous process, consuming nearly four years, with both sides making considerable concessions to meet in the middle. The biggest challenge for both de Klerk and Mandela was maintaining a strong center while controlling the violent factions on both sides. When examining de Klerk‘s style of leadership during the transition, he can be categorized as Transformational Leader but not charismatic. He was certainly instrumental in bringing about the fundamental change that occurred in South Africa, and is usually acknowledged as an important figure in the nation‘s history, but he has at no point in time been granted the attribute of charismatic leader.

There are at least three important reasons for this eventuality. First is the ambiguity of the circumstances surrounding his decision to begin the entire process heralded by his speech to Parliament. Alex Callinicos suggests three possible reasons why de Klerk undertook the project. Firstly, there were the objective constraints on the regime. The most
important of these was South Africa’s international political impasse and the
deteriorating economic conditions within the country. Secondly, and the one most
stressed by de Klerk and his fellow party members, was a change of mind about the
validity of the system.

To put it succinctly, they had ceased to believe that apartheid was morally defensible.
The third element in his decision was de Klerk’s ruthless strategic calculation. As Ronald
Aronson puts it, de Klerk’s brilliant maneuver was to release Mandela, unban the ANC,
begin the negotiations, and move to end before he was forced to, by putting himself one
step ahead of an obviously sinking ship, he ensured his instrumental position in the
creation of the new order and, perhaps unintentionally, secured himself a spot on the right
side of history.

The second reason why de Klerk cannot be characterized as a charismatic leader was the
impression he left on the South African public during the negotiations and in the
Government of National Unity (GNU), with the ultimate culmination of the Truth and
Reconciliation Commission (TRC). Though both de Klerk and Mandela were committed
to reaching a negotiated settlement, certain propositions on the part of the NP, such as the
notion of group rights, prompted the image of a party desperately trying to hold on to
some vestige of the old ways. Third, de Klerk was not endearing personality-wise,
particularly when compared to the nation’s hero, Nelson Mandela. He was certainly
intelligent, rational, and a good listener, however none of these attributes contribute to a
charismatic public persona.

He has been described as bland by journalists in South Africa. No matter how the party
tried to reestablish itself by opening up membership to all races and other such reforms,
the fact remained that this was still the same National Party that was synonymous with
apartheid in the eyes of most South Africans. De Klerk represented the old order, the
government that had conceded defeat to the ANC. Mandela, on the other hand, was the
survivor against all odds, and the man who spent over a quarter century of his life behind
bars for the purpose of achieving freedom for all South Africans.
Shifting attention away from public perceptions of de Klerk and his leadership, how should one weigh his involvement in the transformation of his society in terms of building the new South Africa as a stronger, more multicultural society? From the beginning, de Klerk had been gravely concerned about the protection of Afrikaner rights in an all-inclusive democracy. A central concern of the Afrikaner community was the country’s economic conditions, but even more important was anxiety for cultural identity and personal security. Yet de Klerk is frequently accused by many Afrikaners of not having upheld the promises of his initial referendum and that he granted too many concessions during the negotiations.

A crucial part of locating de Klerk in the political history of South Africa came during the hearings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The TRC was an important endeavor in the reinvention of the nation. De Klerk’s testimony was underwhelming in the eyes of the majority. He took no personal blame for any wrongdoing, attributing the atrocities instead to rogue elements in the government. Conger and Kanungo identify unconventional behavior as a character trait of charismatic leaders. This includes exemplary acts of heroism involving personal risks and self-sacrifice. At the TRC; de Klerk conveyed none of these elements. He responded predictably and the public, particularly the black population, was not favorable to his sentiments.

Context is also important in understanding de Klerk’s role as a leader. In a recent interview, he claimed that the 1980s were a time of self-analysis within the National Party: When I became leader, it was my privilege to say, ‘We have this new vision, what we must now do is to implement it. If indeed the National Party and the Afrikaner elite had come to the gradual realization that apartheid was a morally reprehensible and pragmatically unsustainable system, then de Klerk’s personal role seems to be diminished. Coupled with the considerable pressure placed upon the regime from both internal and external sources, his detractors have argued that de Klerk was merely a leader in Transformational Leadership times that the actions taken by the government were forced upon them and that their moral about-face conveniently coincided with this development.
Yet, he did undertake a considerable amount of initiative, which was not always popular with his constituency. As a study conducted in 1992 illustrates, the Afrikaner community was not ready to accept the changes brought by de Klerk’s government. His February 2, 1990, speech and his continued commitment to reach a negotiated settlement did require a considerable amount of political courage. De Klerk’s government could have taken the despotic route and continued on with the mass suppression that marked his predecessor. The infrastructure to do so was certainly in place. Instead, he took the path of reform and negotiated himself out of power, thereby laying the groundwork for the future democratic South Africa. Whether one takes the position of critic or admirer is a matter of interpretation, but none can dispute that under his watch, South Africa turned the historical corner and entered into a new era.

B. Pim Fortuyn: Dutch Political Dandy

By 2001, the Netherlands had a widely admired international reputation as being among the most tolerant and outward-oriented countries in the world. Politically, the country is notable for its historical Polarization model, which necessitated a culture of consensus politics. The self-segregation of different pillars based on religious and ideological differences within the society meant that there was no majority, forcing the government to operate on a consensus basis. In everyday society as well, the Dutch were accustomed to living within their own separate but parallel pillars. Due to the increased secularization of society, by the late 1960s the system had collapsed. Politically, however, the legacy of the polarized system remained largely intact within the established parties, with the country’s historic Purple Coalition created in 1994.

It was into this political setting that Pim Fortuyn was to make his sensational appearance in 2001. His time in Dutch politics lasted hardly a year (dating from mid- 2001 to his assassination on May 6, 2002), yet within that period he acquired a massive following throughout the country and political victory in his hometown of Rotterdam. He shocked the established parties and Dutch society as a whole with a message and political personality new to the Netherlands. He was a populist who played on the fears of the less educated lower and middle classes. Whether one agreed with him or not, his flamboyant
dress and lifestyle, coupled with his confrontational manner of debate, rarely failed to captivate anyone watching.

Fortuyn did not, however, come into this role overnight. He began his catapult into Dutch public life as a sociologist and lecturer at the University of Groningen, where he was (like many at this time) an advocate of Marxist socialist philosophy. Fortuyn never fit comfortably into academic life, however, and moved on for a stint in the business world. His brash mannerism and insistence on doing things his own way made it difficult for him to find employment, and he subsequently spent several years without any permanent position. He earned a living writing freelance and taking public speaking engagements. According to political ally and friend Marco Pastors, this was when many of his opinions on issues were formed. Fortuyn came into contact with people all over the Netherlands and spent much time debating and listening to the concerns of the everyday Dutch person.

This would later provide him a competitive edge in his political career. His emergence from outside of politics and his ability to relate to those people who felt their concerns had been brushed under the rug were a huge part of his attraction. His ideas were different from anything previously expressed in Dutch public life. In a country where cultural sensitivities were acute after World War II, the dramatic statements he made about Islam and integration were shocking to the average Dutch citizen.

Fortuyn was deliberate in his choice of timing to enter formal politics. Economically, the country was doing well, which made his sudden popularity puzzling for most observers. Yet Fortuyn ran on a platform of issues the established parties mostly skirted: criminality, unemployment, and the integration of minorities. All of those issues were deemed politically incorrect. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, no doubt were an important part of it suddenly cultural differences seemed ominous enough to trump all else. Fortuyn vocalized the inner concerns and hesitations of a large part of the population. Fortuyn’s challenge to and critique of the Dutch political establishment and discourse place him squarely within the realm of Transformational Leadership.
Like many populist politicians, he had a passionate following among the lower and middle classes, but he also attracted a group of nouveau riche around him as well, who were seeking social recognition by being associated with the radical leader. The passion and devotion to Fortuynism were also witnessed after his murder, which saw an outpouring of emotion on the part of the Dutch public, both from his supporters and otherwise. Though there is no doubt that Fortuyn sent shockwaves through Dutch society with his message, his murder, as the first political assassination since 1672, gained an even more important position in the popular memory. He was now a martyr of freedom of speech and the war against political correctness, punished for saying what he believed. Although the statement that Holland lost its innocence with the murder of Fortuyn may be an exaggeration, it certainly alerted Dutch citizens to the problems that existed within their society.

Whether one agrees with his opinions or not, it is indisputable that Fortuyn served Dutch society by broadening the political spectrum in terms of what could and could not be said. As Dick Peels put it, Dutch political discourse was never allowed to go beyond a certain point towards the right. Fortuyn shattered that barrier, in the process shocking all and offending many. What made Fortuyn distinct was that he did not care about respect in the language he used. He had a point to make and he was going to make it, regardless of what people thought or whom he upset along the way. He opened up the space for debate by defying the rules of polite politics, and he gave a large segment of society something they could actually relate to in politics—a person who had his faults and who had an opinion.

Fortuyn was the first to put forth the image of a fatherless society. The Dutch had lost their way and needed to return to the father’s house. This brought about an increased sentiment of Dutch nationalism, or national communitarianism, based on liberal Enlightenment values. Fortuyn also introduced to the established political parties and the Dutch public a new type of politician that offered a personalized politics. He showed that to be successful in politics one need not adhere to the traditional means practiced thus far in the Netherlands. His skillful and entertaining debate style, coupled with his flamboyant lifestyle and persona, turned him into a celebrity, creating a distinctly Pim Fortuyn brand.
He was on television nearly every night, with guaranteed high ratings for whichever station had him appear. It seemed the public simply could not get enough of Pim.

Considering his effect on the multicultural society, Fortuyn and his movement are central to the present day debate taking place on this topic in the Netherlands. The first thing he did was challenge the government by claiming that what had previously been accepted as right was wrong. Jeroen DeWulf explains that, He equated more multiculturalism with a steadily less progressive society, whereas before multiculturalism was viewed as part of Dutch progressiveness. Fortuyn warned about the Islamization of Dutch culture, labeling Islam a backward religion, and those that adhere strictly to it as a threat to modern Western societies. Since Fortuyn, this idea seems to have slowly permeated Dutch political culture, with politicians such as Geert Wilders regularly making derogatory statements against Islam. Even those people inclined toward the political center have become more attentive to cultural differences that deem Islam and Western society irreconcilable. Pim Fortuyn was the first contemporary public figure to challenge the status quo, but several have followed, including Wilders and Theo Van Gogh. On the immigration and integration front, however, there is a notable difference between Fortuyn and his most important political successor, Wilders. While Fortuyn supported tightening control on immigration to the Netherlands, he also placed equal emphasis on better integrating the already present populations, even calling for a general amnesty for those already in the country. Fortuyn wanted to invest more money in schools and social infrastructure for immigrants, demanding that they make an effort to integrate in return.

In contrast, Wilders’ party proposes spending on deportation back to the countries of origin. At the time when Fortuyn entered the public eye and began to gain fame and notoriety, the question of Islam was mostly confined to the white Dutch population. Since then, however, and particularly after the dramatic events surrounding Theo van Gogh’s murder, minority communities are becoming more and more politicized. In the right environment, this can create an opportunity for fruitful debate. Fortuyn contributed to a new openness in democratic debate by providing an entirely new space into which discourse could venture.
As for the political legacy Fortuyn left behind, he fundamentally questioned the boundaries of freedom of speech in the Netherlands. Some would argue that he brought the Dutch to the realization that this freedom was not really valid, as saying what you believed would ultimately get you punished (murdered like Fortuyn and van Gogh, sued like Wilders). What is clear is that he forced people to question their own political preconceptions of what freedom of speech and respect for minorities meant for them, and ultimately what it meant to be Dutch.

He was first in beginning to re-essentialize Dutch identity, thereby excluding all those that did not fit into his categorization. Fortuyn’s presence fundamentally altered public discourse. His ideas are no longer peripheral but squarely situated in the everyday consciousness of Dutch society he is not likely to be forgotten any time soon.

2.5.2.6 Comparative Leadership

Comparing F. W. de Klerk and Pim Fortuyn, there are a few stark contrasts between the two styles of leadership. The first, and most apparent, is their personalities. De Klerk is usually soft-spoken and deliberative, and he presents himself in a rather composed manner. He was never a crowd pleaser like Mandela, who took to singing songs and leading chants with his supporters. From the time of his announcement of Mandela’s release and the onset of the negotiations, he was constantly compared to and always outshined by this great figure. Despite his best attempts, de Klerk was never able to fully disassociate himself from the legacy of the old regime. No doubt his race had much to do with it; the country was just emerging from a long and painful period of white rule.

Black South Africans would not be quick to embrace a white man as hero of the country. Yet de Klerk’s political opposition to the ANC and his unwillingness to completely denounce apartheid also kept him in that unfavorable light. Watching Fortuyn, on the other hand, was like its own form of entertainment. His manner of dress, his lifestyle, and the way in which he always made his debate opponents seem stuffy and old-fashioned drew in the viewing public. Even if you did not agree with what he was saying, it was difficult to ignore this distinctly Fortuyn brand.
The second point of comparison is the context in which the two leaders found themselves. As the academic literature on leadership suggests, context can be an important element in the rise of Transformational leaders. In and of itself, the existence of a crisis is neither a necessary nor a sufficient cause. However, crisis situations are conducive to the rise of Transformational Leadership. De Klerk emerged as a leader at a time when South Africa was in deep conflict. Years of suppression of the majority had led to an unstable system, and a solution to the problem was ultimately unavoidable. Fortuyn is a good example of a Transformational leader who rose to power in a time of little to no perceived crisis. Economically, the Netherlands was doing relatively well.

Significant minority communities had been present in the country since the time of the guest worker system in the 1970s, and Dutch policy and discourse were always in line with the celebrated value of Dutch tolerance. Fortuyn concerned himself with the issues that were politically incorrect. In doing so, he effectively created a crisis in the minds of the Dutch public. He identified a problem and was able to convince people that it was an urgent issue that needed to be addressed.

In terms of context, then, the central difference between the two leaders is that de Klerk operated within an already established crisis situation, which is conducive to the emergence of Transformational leaders, although not necessarily sufficient for their rise. Fortuyn, on the other hand, awakened the public to a novel idea and discourse that had previously not existed in Dutch public life. He created a new conflict-type situation that challenged people to define Dutch identity, which ultimately also meant excluding those that did not fit into the category. The third point of comparison is the means by which both leaders inspired and motivated their followers. Fortuyn was, at the end of the day, a populist. He used rhetoric defining us against them, arousing sentiments of Dutch nationalism. His message fueled the fears of the everyday Dutch person against the political elite as well as the ominous other.

When de Klerk made his speech on that February 2, he knew that he could not expect a positive response from the entire country. The ANC and their supporters were quick to claim victory over apartheid while the white far-right was enraged. For de Klerk, his relationship with the South African public seemed to be an almost entirely uphill battle.
His biggest victory in terms of support was arguably his 1992 referendum, in which the white population voted in support of continuing negotiations.

De Klerk may not have been the most popular of leaders at the time, but he did prove to be committed to finding a solution to the country’s instability. As his political allies point out, riding with the popular tide was not enough in this case; he had to be one step ahead of his constituency. An interesting question to investigate here is the source of legitimacy of each of these leaders. Who, and what institutions, provided them with the legitimacy that they carried in each of their societies? For Fortuyn, it was undoubtedly the Dutch public that supported him. Although his party won decisively at the city level in Rotterdam, it had yet to gain any form of national elected seat in Parliament at the time of his murder.

Yet the reactions to his murder, the resonation of his ideas with Dutch public and political life, and his party’s victory in the parliamentary elections are resounding proof of his place and significance in the modern history of the country. De Klerk’s legitimacy was also granted by the people, in that his party was democratically elected, but it was only the white populations that partook in this decision. Legitimacy was not accorded to him by the entire country, however, and even the support he initially received from the white voters’ referendum seemed to quickly wane once the actual process of negotiations had begun. The difference in legitimacy of de Klerk and Fortuyn is one of the central distinguishing factors between transformational leadership and charismatic leadership.

A fourth point of comparison between Fortuyn and de Klerk is the legacy they left to the creation of a multicultural society. De Klerk obviously paved the way on behalf of the National Party for negotiations to take place. However, after the negotiations, the GNU, and the TRC, it seems that de Klerk was mostly ignored in the eyes of the people. He had served his purpose, but now he no longer had much of a place in South African memory. Mixed reactions to his being awarded the Nobel Prize along with Mandela indicate this ambiguous status, but history will probably be kind to de Klerk and remember him most for his February 2 speech.
Pim Fortuyn was also central to the transformation of discourse and policy surrounding multiculturalism. His open and frank criticism of Islam has seemingly been transferred into mainstream political discourse, and policies such as the creation of examinations for those seeking Dutch citizenship have reflected this change. The idea of forcing, or at least strongly urging, immigrants to integrate into Dutch society has become increasingly accepted. Yet by challenging some of the basic assumptions of Dutch political life (for example, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, protection from verbal or physical abuse), he opened up a discursive space in which discussion and debate can occur on sensitive yet important issues.

Leadership has been defined in many ways. It is possibly one of the most researched subjects in the world today. It has been estimated that around 25,000 books are published on this subject in the United States alone. Though so much as been said and written, it is still difficult to describe ‘Leadership’ even today. Vivekananda has been called a monk, a prophet, a social reformer, a nationalist, a philosopher, a yogi, a prolific writer, and an orator par excellence, an educationist and so on. There has been very little analysis or research done on Vivekananda as a Leader.

Swami Vivekananda was an exceptional leader whose qualities are only now beginning to be gradually understood. Many of the qualities he manifested is now being described and taught by leadership experts in business schools today. Though there are many definitions of leadership, most people agree that developing and living an enabling and empowering vision is the very essence of effective leadership. Vision statements are the inspiring words chosen by successful leaders to clearly and concisely convey the direction of the organization.

By crafting a clear vision statement, one can powerfully communicate one’s intentions and motivate the team or organization to realize an attractive and inspiring common vision of the future. One can only think strategically and outline a vision after having a complete understanding of the existing reality. Max de Pree, businessman and leadership expert states unequivocally that the first responsibility of a leader is to define reality. Adi Shankara in his Viveka Chudamani observes that the highest form of discrimination is to be able to distinguish the real from the unreal.
While Max de Pree wrote in the context of the reality of the external world, Shankara focused on the more subtle and absolute notion of reality. Vivekananda was one of those rare persons who could straddle both worlds and created a remarkable vision which not only unified the external with the internal, but also reconciled it and gave a sense of purpose to people struggling to discover their true inner nature. He at once created a vision which kept in mind the harsh reality that India was in and gave the young of the country a sense of purpose in working towards the upliftment of the masses. And through this work, he wanted them to discover their true inner selves. An understanding of this reality and his vision based on this reality can be seen from the letter he wrote to the Maharaja of Mysore in June 1894. He said, “The one thing that is at the root of all evils in India is the condition of the poor.

The only service to be done for our lower classes is to give them education, to develop their lost individuality. That is the great task between our people and princes. Up to now nothing has been done in that direction. Priest-power and foreign conquest have trodden them down for centuries, and at last the poor of India have forgotten that they are human beings.”

In another place he writes, “And, oh, how my heart ached to think of what we think of the poor, the low, in India. They have no chance, no escape, and no way to climb up. The poor, the low, the sinner in India, have no friends, no help – they cannot rise, try however they may. They sink lower and lower every day, they feel the blows showered upon them by a cruel society, and they do not know whence the blow comes. They have forgotten they too are men. And the result is slavery.”

The Visionary Vivekananda had two separate visions – national and global. At the national level, his vision was to uplift the Indian masses materially, with the help of an education that was tempered with the flavor of Indian Spiritual heritage. He expressed his global vision in the World Parliament of Religions in one his speeches on Hinduism as the concept of a universal religion. He said, “It will be a religion which will have no place for persecution or intolerance in its polity, which will recognize divinity in every man and woman, and whose whole scope, whose whole force, will be created in aiding humanity to realize its own true, divine nature.”
2.6 Emotional Intelligence and Emotional Performance

An emotionally aware leader has the ability to supply subordinates with a clear set of values within which to operate. Superior levels of emotional intelligence allow leaders to create a mutually agreed set of values to facilitate the development of employee potential in the organization (Amos and Ristow 2004). Additionally, leaders who exhibit an elevated level of emotional intelligence are likely to create a suitable context in which their subordinates are empowered to deliver superior performance (Amos, et al., 2004). Research by Palmer, Walls, Burgess and Stough (2001) indicates that Transformational Leadership is considered to be more emotion based than Transactional Leadership. These findings are consistent with work by Barling, Salter and Kelloway (2000) and Palmer, et al. (2001) and support Goleman (1995) and Stein and Book’s (2000) contention that effective leaders are socially adept.

Martinez (1997) refers to emotional intelligence as an array of cognitive skills, capabilities and competencies that influences a person’s ability to cope with environmental demands and pressures. Goleman (1998) suggested that there are five critical pillars or competencies of emotional intelligence, these being self-awareness, self-regulation, self-motivation, social awareness and social skills. Goleman (1995) developed the 137-item Emotional Quotient (EQ) Test, which effectively measures these five dimensions of emotional intelligence. Bar-On’s (2000) non-cognitive model defines emotional intelligence as an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures.

Bar-On (2000) developed the self-reporting Emotional Intelligence Inventory, a 133-item questionnaire with a five-point rating scale. From this questionnaire, five subscales are generated: intrapersonal, interpersonal, adaptability, stress management and mood (Bar-On, 2000). Furthermore, Wolmarans (2001) scanned literature and practices in the area of
emotional intelligence, and developed a matrix of the competencies and skills reported on by various authors and service providers.

Employee plays a pivotal role in organizational success (Collis and Montgomery, 1995.). Further, Collis and Montgomery (1995) argued that, employee performance has been shown to have a significant positive effect on organizational performance. The only major pitfall in most organization occurs when managers believe their organizations are constantly operating at the highest level of efficiency, or that they do not require input from their employees (Foot and Hook, 1999).

Quality of the workplace is the principal influence on the organization’s performance. For organizations to accomplish their goals, they must continually look for better ways to organize and manage their work. Since most organizations have realized that people are the most valuable assets in an organization, the importance of performance management has been pushed to the fore (Armstrong, 2006). If managers are to manage complex organizations, they require viewing performance in several areas simultaneously. The performance measurement system employed in an organization must therefore measure the performance of all assets including the human ones.

2.7 Transformational Leadership and High Performance Teams

There are eight characteristics which were validated within this study to be positively correlated to high-performance teams:

1. A Clear, and Elevating Goal:

2. Results-Driven Structure

3. Competent Team Members

4. Unified Commitment

5. Collaborative Climate

6. Standards of Excellence
7. External Support and Recognition

8. Principled Leadership