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Leadership, and the study of this phenomenon, has roots in the beginning of civilization. Our work, work environment, worker motivations, leaders, managers, leadership style, and a myriad of other work-related variables have been studied for almost two centuries. Over time, organizations have evolved from those with an authoritarian style to ones with a more comfortable work environment, and then to organizations where people are empowered, encouraged, and supported in their personal and professional growth. This paper examines how leader focus has changed over time, the nuances of leader focus as captured in the progression of leadership theory.

Leadership, and the study of it, has roots in the beginning of civilization. Egyptian rulers, Greek heroes, and biblical patriarchs all have one thing in common—leadership. There are numerous definitions and theories of leadership, however, there are enough similarities in the definitions to conclude that leadership is an effort of influence and the power to induce compliance (Wren, 1995). Our work, work environment, the motivation to work, leaders, leadership, leadership style, and a myriad of other work-related variables have been studied for almost two centuries.

The organizational focus of the leader has evolved over this same period. Early organizations with authoritarian leaders who believed employees were intrinsically lazy transitioned into ways to make work environments more conducive to increased productivity rates. Today, organizations are transforming into places where people are empowered, encouraged, and supported in their personal and professional growth throughout their careers. As the focus of leaders has changed over time, it has influenced and shaped the development and progression of leadership theory.

Early Leader Studies

The Industrial Revolution shifted America's economy from an agriculture base to an industrial one and, thereby, ushered in a change in how leaders would treat their followers. The Industrial Revolution created a paradigm shift to a new theory of leadership in which “common” people gained power by virtue of their skills (Clawson, 1999). New technology, however, was accompanied and reinforced by mechanization of human thought and action, thus creating hierarchical bureaucracies (Morgan, 1997).

One major contributor to this era of management and leadership theory was Max Weber, a German sociologist who “observed the parallels between the mechanization of industry and the proliferation of
bureaucratic forms of organization” (Morgan, 1997, p. 17). He noted that the bureaucratic form routinized the process of administration in the same manner that the machine routinized production.

Classical Management Theory and Scientific Management

Weber’s concerns about bureaucracy, however, did not affect theorists who set the stage for what is now known as “classical management theory” and “scientific management.” Classical theorists focused on the design of the total organization while scientific managers focused on the systematic management of individual jobs. In contrast to Weber, classical theorists such as Henri Fayol and F. W. Mooney, staunch advocates of bureaucractization, devoted their energies to identifying methods through which this kind of organizational structure could be achieved (Bass, 1990; Morgan, 1997). Collectively, these theorists set the basis for many modern management techniques, such as management by objectives.

Scientific management, an approach heralded by Frederick Taylor, was technological in nature (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996). Taylor fused the perspective of an engineer into management with a strong emphasis on control, ruthless efficiency, quantification, predictability, and de-skilled jobs. He initiated time-and-motion studies to analyze work tasks to improve worker productivity in an attempt to achieve the highest level of efficiency possible. Consequently, he has been accused of viewing people as instruments or machines to be manipulated by their leaders. The function of the leader under scientific management theory was to establish and enforce performance criteria to meet organizational goals; therefore, the focus of a leader was on the needs of the organization and not on the individual worker.

Although the classical and scientific approaches were different, the goals were similar—organizations are rational systems and must operate in the most efficient manner possible to achieve the highest level of productivity (Morgan, 1997). Both theories relied on the machine metaphor with a heavy emphasis on mechanization of jobs, which undermined the human aspect of the organization and failed to recognize organizations as complex organisms.

Although mechanistic organizations proved productive, there were limits to hierarchical bureaucracy. Emerging theorists encouraged leaders to recognize that humans were not machines and could not be treated as such. A postbureaucratic shift in the mid-1940s moved toward everyone taking responsibility for the organization’s success or failure (Heckscher & Donnellon, 1994). Researchers began to examine the relationship between leader behavior and follower satisfaction level and organizational productivity and profitability.

Hawthorne, Maslow, and Herzberg—Environment and Worker Needs

Much organizational research during this era focused on overcoming the perceived shortcomings of the classical and scientific schools of management. Elton Mayo’s Hawthorne Studies focused on the work situation and its effect on leaders and followers, indicating that the reactions of human beings influence their work activities as much as the formal design and structure of the organization. Early on, leaders could focus their attention on the environmental factors of their organizations. The early theories and studies provided researchers with tangible and measurable performance outcomes that were directly transferable to profitability and spreadsheet bottom-lines. A new theory of organizations and leadership began to emerge based on the idea that individuals operate most effectively when their needs are satisfied. Maslow’s (1959) Hierarchy of Needs posited that once a worker’s physiological, security, and social (intrinsic) needs were met, productivity would only be possible if the employee’s ego and self-actualizing (extrinsic) needs were also met. Leader focus became redirected toward worker needs.

Herzberg’s Dual Factor Theory, the evolution of intrinsic and extrinsic needs, furthered Maslow’s work stating that employees’ intrinsic and extrinsic needs could, and should, be met simultaneously. Herzberg’s (1966) Motivation-Hygiene Theory furthered the work of Maslow by providing insights into the goals and incentives that tend to satisfy a worker’s needs. Herzberg concluded that people have two categories of needs, which he termed hygiene (environmental factors such as working conditions, company policies, etc.) and motivators (factors involving the job itself). According to Herzberg, an employee’s intrinsic and extrinsic needs could and should be addressed simultaneously.
The Shift to Behavioral Factors

Leader focus had moved to understanding the relationship between a leader’s actions and the follower’s satisfaction and productivity. Theorists began to consider behavioral concepts in their analysis of organizational leadership. For example, Chester Barnard was instrumental in including behavioral components (Bass, 1990). Barnard’s work emphasized the ways in which executives might develop their organizations into cooperative social systems by focusing on the integration of work efforts through communication of goals and attention to worker motivation (Hatch, 1997). Barnard, for example, identified an effective organizational leader as one who determined objectives, manipulated means, initiated action, and stimulated coordinated effort (Bass, 1990, p. 31). Barnard (1938), whose work focused on the functions of the executive, was instrumental in including behavioral components in his analysis of organizational leadership, which claimed that leadership involves accomplishing goals with and through people.

The theorists of this age argued that in addition to finding the best technological methods to improve output, it would behoove management to address human affairs as well. It was claimed that “the real power centers within an organization were the interpersonal relationships that developed among working groups” (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996, p. 100).

A new theory of organizations and leadership began to emerge based on the idea that individuals operate most effectively when their needs are satisfied. Additionally, when this happens they are more likely to increase their productivity which in turn impacts the organization’s bottom line.

According to McGregor (1960), the traditional organization with its centralized decision making, hierarchical pyramid, and external control of work is based on certain assumptions about human nature and human motivation. He dubbed these assumptions Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X assumes that most people prefer to be directed, are not interested in assuming responsibility, and want safety above all else. Accompanying the Theory X philosophy is the belief that people are motivated by money, fringe benefits, and the threat of punishment. Managers who espouse Theory X assumptions attempt to structure, control, and closely supervise employees. Although McGregor himself questioned whether Theory X was an accurate view of human nature, the assumptions persisted for a long time in leadership theory circles because it explained some, though not all, of human behavior within organizations (Pugh & Hickson, 1993). Drawing heavily from Maslow’s (1959) Hierarchy of Needs, McGregor ultimately concluded that Theory X assumptions about human nature, when universally applied, are often inaccurate and that management approaches that develop from these assumptions may fail to motivate individuals to strive toward organizational goals (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996).

McGregor (1960) believed that management needed practices based on a more accurate understanding of human nature and motivation. The resulting concept, Theory Y, proposed that individuals are not, by nature, lazy and unreliable. People can be self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated (Pugh & Hickson, 1993). Therefore, an essential task of management is to unleash this potential. (See Table 1 for a comparison of Theory X and Theory Y Assumptions.)

Consequently, the goal of effective leadership was evolving and moving away from the earlier concepts of the classical and scientific management theories that treated workers as machines. Leaders were now challenged to actively involve followers in achieving organizational goals. McGregor (1960), whose work was closely linked to that of the behavioral theorists, is a reflection of that era, providing a foundation for the future emergence of transformational leadership.

McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y assumed that employees and leaders had progressed beyond Taylor’s productivity models and that employees could find ways to satisfy their needs within the organization’s structure. McGregor assumed employees were far more complex than the trait and behavioral theories of leadership assumed and that their complexity and the leaders’ response to that complexity would affect how and whether the leader and followers worked in tandem to reach mutual organizational goals.

McGregor proposed a replacement of direction and control of employees with humanistic motivation. The resulting concept, Theory Y, proposed that individuals did not inherently dislike work and, that under
certain conditions, work could actually be a source of great satisfaction. Theory Y assumed individuals would exercise self-direction and self-control, accepting and seeking responsibility (Pugh & Hickson, 1993). The essential concept McGregor and other behaviorists proposed was that organizations are interacting groups and that leaders are a part of those groups. The leader’s interaction and relationship with the employee must be a supportive relationship so all members of the organization feel the organization’s objectives and their achievement, are of personal importance to them (Pugh & Hickson, 1993).

Table 1
Assumptions about Human Nature that Underlie McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY X</th>
<th>THEORY Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work is inherently distasteful to most people.</td>
<td>1. Work is as natural as play, if the conditions are favorable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Most people are not ambitious, have little desire for responsibility, and prefer to be directed.</td>
<td>2. Self-control is often indispensable in achieving organizational goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most people have little capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems.</td>
<td>3. The capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems is widely distributed in the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Motivation occurs only at the physiological and security levels.</td>
<td>4. Motivation occurs at the social, esteem, and self-actualization levels, as well as at the physiological and security levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most people must be closely controlled and often coerced to achieve organizational objectives.</td>
<td>5. People can be self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson (1996)

Situational/Contingency Theory–The Circumstantial Focus
Unprecedented social change in the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s shifted societal focus from increasing economic wealth to ensuring social rights and equality. Along with this social change, technology was again preparing to jolt American businesses. The advent of the computer age was shifting employee requirements from brawn to brains. Leadership became an intricate process of “multilateral brokerage” where leaders were forced to focus on constituencies within and without the organization to survive (Vanourek, 1995).

Figure 1. The circle of constituencies that force leaders to focus on “multilateral brokerage”
The internal and external environments of organizations were changing. The transference of power from those doing the work to those possessing knowledge about how to organize work more closely leveled the playing field for leaders and followers. Society acknowledged that traditional methods of leadership were no longer effective.

McCollum (1995) implied that companies in the information age were unsuccessfully trying to conduct their business using obsolete industrial age leadership theories. Change was the only thing of which everyone could be sure, a factor requiring leadership research and society to consider contingency/situational approaches to leadership if businesses were to remain successful and profitable in an ever-changing and increasingly complicated environment (Contee-Borders, 2003).

Researchers defining the situational/contingency theory of leadership acknowledged that leaders did more than simply “act”–they often had to “react” to specific situations, and thus, the situational/contingency theory of leadership evolved.

Hersey and Blanchard (1996) proposed a contingency/situational theory advocating a leader's use of differing leadership behaviors dependent upon two interrelated maturity factors: (a) job maturity–relevant task and technical knowledge and skills, and (b) psychological maturity–the subordinate’s level of self-confidence and self-respect (Yukl, 1998).

An employee who has a high level of job and psychological maturity requires little supervision; while an employee who has a low level of job and psychological maturity requires hands-on attention.

Fielder's contingency theory is viewed as the opposite of Hersey and Blanchard’s theory, maintaining that leaders are less flexible in their ability to change their behavior based on followers’ maturity (the basic concept of Hersey and Blanchard’s theory) (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1993). Fielder’s contingency theory posited that leader effectiveness is determined not by the leader’s ability to adapt to the situation, but by the ability to choose the right leader for the situation (though this theory does not identify who would be responsible for making this choice). Some leaders are simply better for specific situations than others and the situation determines the identified leaders’ success, though leaders would need to be capable of understanding when they were not right for the situation and remove themselves—a task of humility.
TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP—LEADER FOCUS ON PERFORMANCE

In the late 1970s, leadership theory research moved beyond focusing on various types of situational supervision as a way to incrementally improve organizational performance (Behling & McFillen, 1996; Hunt, 1991). Research has shown that many leaders turned to a transactional leadership theory, the most prevalent method of leadership still observed in today’s organizations (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991; Seltzer & Bass, 1990). Transactional leaders lead through specific incentives and motivate through an exchange of one thing for another (Bass, 1990). The underlying theory of this leadership method was that leaders exchange rewards for employees’ compliance, a concept based on bureaucratic authority and a leader’s legitimacy within an organization (Tracey & Hinkin, 1994; Yukl, 1998).

Avolio, Waldman, and Yammarino (1991) suggest that transactional leadership focuses on ways to manage the status quo and maintain the day-to-day operations of a business, but does not focus on identifying the organization's directional focus and how employees can work toward those goals, increasing their productivity in alignment with these goals, thus increasing organizational profitability. The idea of transactional leadership is shortsighted in that it does not take the entire situation, employee, or future of the organization into account when offering rewards (Crosby, 1996).

Figure 3. Transactional leadership focuses on leaders managing day-to-day business operations (L=Leader and F=Follower)

Transactional Leadership theory focuses on the specific interactions between leaders and followers (Burns, 1978; Heifetz, 1994). These transactions are a method by which an individual gains influence and sustains it over time. The process is based on reciprocity. Leaders not only influence followers but are under their influence as well. A leader earns influence by adjusting to the expectations of followers. Transactional interactions comprise the bulk of relationships between leaders and followers (Burns, 1978).

The underlying theory of this leadership method was that leaders exchange rewards for employees’ compliance, a concept based in bureaucratic authority and a leader’s legitimacy within an organization (Tracey & Hinkin, 1994; Yukl, 1998). Examples of this reward exchange included the leader’s ability to fulfill promises of recognition, pay increases, and advancements for employees who perform well (Bass, 1990). Transactional leadership is a theory considered to be value-free; however, Heifetz (1994) contends that the values are simply covert.

Transactional leadership focuses on ways to maintain the status quo and manage the day-to-day operations of a business. It does not focus on identifying the organization’s goals and how employees can work
toward and increase their productivity in alignment with these goals, thus increasing organizational profitability (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991).

Transactional leaders approach followers with a goal of exchanging one thing for another (Burns, 1978). The concept of transactional leadership is narrow in that it does not take the entire situation, employee, or future of the organization in mind when offering rewards (Crosby, 1996). Transactional leadership focuses on control, not adaptation (Tracey & Hinkin, 1994).

The focus of effective leadership began to change. Leaders were no longer required to measure work and ensure that the most effective person did it in the most efficient manner—which did not always increase the organization’s productivity and profitability anyway. Leaders now needed active involvement from the followers to achieve the organization’s goals. Douglas McGregor, closely linked to the work of the behavioral theorists, provided a basis for a new emerging theory of leadership—transformational leadership.

Transformational Leaders Focus on the Organization

The literature reviewed suggests that traditional power, derived from a leader’s position in a bureaucratic, hierarchical structure, is becoming obsolete and that effective leaders work from the “inside out” to transform their organization and workers (Burns, 1978). The job of the transformational leader is not to make every decision within the organization, but to ensure that collaborative decision-making occurs (Badaracco & Ellsworth, 1989; Book, 1998; Dixon, 1998; Wheatley, 1994). This type of leadership motivates individuals to work together to change organizations to create sustainable productivity (Dixon, 1998).

In contrast to focusing on where the organization is today and only maintaining the status quo (the end result of transactional leadership), transformational leaders look at where the organization should be heading and determine how to handle internal and external change and employee needs to reach that goal (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991; Pawar & Eastman, 1997; Tichy & Devanna, 1986). Transformational leadership is an expansion of transactional leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994). In the field of leadership studies, transformational leadership has been the theory of choice for the past several decades (Patterson, 2003; Pawar & Eastman, 1997; Rainey & Watson, 1996). The theory originated with Burns (1978), was expanded by Bass (1985), and has been further refined by Bass and Avolio (1994).

As conceived by Burns (1978), the transformational leader asks followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the group, organization, or society; to consider their long-term needs to develop themselves, as opposed to their immediate needs; and to become more aware of what is really important. Through this interaction, followers are converted into leaders. Bass and Avolio (1988) conclude that transformational leadership is closer to the ne plus ultra that people have in mind when they describe their ideal leader and is more likely to provide a role model with whom subordinates want to identify.

Burns (1978) touts Mahatma Gandhi as the best modern-day example of a transformational leader because he aroused and elevated the hope and demands of millions of his countrymen whose lives were transformed in the process. Yukl (1998) reports that transformational leadership focuses on a leader’s understanding of their affect on how followers feel trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect toward the leader and how followers are motivated to do more than expected. This type of leader broadens and elevates the interest of his followers by modeling the expected behavior and “stirring” followers to look beyond their own immediate, personal needs to embrace the needs of others (Ackoff, 1999; Avolio, Waldman, & Einstein, 1988; Bass, 1990; Bennis, 1989a; Hunt, 1991; Keeley, 1995; Keller, 1995; Miles, 1997, 1998; Sosik, 1997; Yukl, 1998).

Bass and Avolio (Bass, 1985a; Bass & Avolio, 1990) developed Burns’ (1978) ideas and posited the formal concept of transformational leadership. Transactional leadership is based on bureaucratic authority, focuses on task completion, and relies on rewards and punishments (Tracey & Hinkin, 1998). Transformational leadership differs substantially from transactional leadership. It is concerned more about progress and development. Furthermore, transformational leadership enhances the effects of transactional leadership on followers (Bass, 1985b, 1990a).
Figure 4. Transformational leadership (L=Leader; F=Follower)

With transformational leadership, the leader's focus is directed toward the organization, but leader behavior builds follower commitment toward the organizational objectives through empowering followers to accomplish those objectives (Yukl, 1998). While transactional leaders focus on exchange relations with followers, transformational leaders inspire followers to higher levels of performance for the sake of the organization (Burns, 1998; Yukl). The very definition of transformational leadership states the building of commitment to the organizational objectives (Yukl). The primary focus is on the organization, with follower development and empowerment secondary to accomplishing the organizational objectives. The result, nonetheless, is enhanced follower performance (Burns; Yukl).

Their work built not only upon the contribution of Burns but also those made by Bennis and Nanus (1985), Tichy and Devanna (1986), and others. Bass (1990b) specified that transformational leadership occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group, and when they stir their employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group. (p. 21) Bass (1990a) stipulates that this transcending beyond self-interest is for the "group, organization, or society" (p. 53). In essence, transformational leadership is a process of building commitment to organizational objectives and then empowering followers to accomplish those objectives (Yukl, 1998). The result, at least in theory, is enhanced follower performance (Burns, 1998; Yukl, 1998).

Burns (1978) considered leaders to be either transformational or transactional, while others view leadership as a continuum with transactional leadership at one end and transformational leadership at the other. Bass (1990a) said that transactional leadership occurs when leaders “exchange promises of rewards and benefits to subordinates for the subordinates’ fulfillment of agreements with the leader” (p. 53). Whereas,
the transactional leader, according to Daft (2002), recognizes followers’ needs and then defines the exchange process for meeting those needs; both the leader and the follower benefit from the exchange transaction.

Transformational leaders, however, transform the personal values of followers to support the vision and goals of the organization by fostering an environment where relationships are formed and by establishing a climate of trust where visions are shared (Bass, 1985a). Avolio, Waldman, and Yammarino (1991) established four primary behaviors that constitute transformational leadership:

1. idealized influence (or charismatic influence),
2. inspirational motivation,
3. intellectual stimulation, and
4. individualized consideration.

Ultimately, transformational leaders can develop a very powerful influence over followers. For example, several research studies have documented the power of transformational leadership in establishing value congruency and trust (Jung & Avolio, 2000; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Shamir, 1995). Followers respect and trust transformational leaders, so they conform their values to those of the leaders and yield power to them.

Peters and Waterman (1982) assert that the true role of leadership is to manage the values of an organization; hence, all leadership is value-laden. For this reason, it is paramount that leaders using the transformational leadership theory understand how their values affect the organization (Grubbs, 1999). Likewise, Barnard (1968) also understood this concept when he wrote, “the endurance of an organization depends upon the quality of leadership; and that quality derives from the breadth of the morality upon which it rests” (p. 282).

Through the influence of a leader’s values, transformational leadership requires the leader to balance multiple constituency needs along with individual and organizational values and beliefs (Carlson & Perrewe, 1995).

Figure 5. Transformational leadership process

(Carlson & Perrewe, 1995)
The transformational leader articulates the vision in a clear and appealing manner, explains how to attain the vision, acts confidently and optimistically, expresses confidence in his followers, emphasizes values with symbolic actions, leads by example, and empowers followers to achieve the vision (Yukl, 2002).

Table 2 summarizes the four primary or functional areas of transformational leadership and identifies the attributes that, according to the literature, accompany these primary characteristics.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTIONAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>ACCOMPANYING ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Idealized Influence/Charisma</td>
<td>1) Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Risk-Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>6) Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7) Commitment to Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8) Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9) Enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>10) Rationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>11) Problem-Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12) Personal Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13) Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14) Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15) Empowering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keller (1995) suggests that the transformational leader is able to help the employee achieve esteem and self-actualization needs. Consequently, the followers of transformational leaders are quicker to adapt to changing internal and external environments. Their ability to quickly adapt to change allows them to function well in an increasingly complex environment.

A leader must be fully committed to the transformation and the commitment must be visible to organizational members and external stakeholders. Table 3 summarizes some of the strategies and characteristics of transformational leaders proposed by different researchers.

Trust between a leader and his or her followers is a cornerstone of transformational leadership. Covey (1989) writes, “Trust is the highest form of human motivation because it brings out the very best in people” (p. 178). It creates a moral foundation for extraordinary, values-based transformational leadership, creating effective, sustaining leadership that leads to profitable and successful organizations (Ford, 1991). Leading from a moral basis allows full organizational transformation to occur as all of the leader’s skills emerge to positively influence followers (Bottum & Lenz, 1998; Clawson, 1999). This moral basis starts, and ends, with trust. Trust relies on the leader’s character, which makes values-based leadership possible (Maxwell, 1998).
Table 3

Transformational leadership strategies and characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention through vision</td>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>Challenging the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning through communication</td>
<td>Inspiration</td>
<td>Inspiring a shared vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust through positioning</td>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>Enabling others to act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment of self</td>
<td>Individualized consideration</td>
<td>Modeling the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging the heart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996)

The Servant Leader Focus on the Followers

Transformational leadership and servant leadership are both high-order evolutions in leadership paradigms. Both theoretical frameworks emphasize a high concern for people and for production. Servant leadership, however, involves a higher concern for people because the primary focus of the leader is upon his or her followers.

Block (1993) posits that there is a deep hunger within our society for organizations in which people are treated fairly and humanely and supported in their personal growth and where leaders can be trusted to serve the needs of the “many” rather than the “few.” Block called for a new model of leadership based on teamwork, community, values, service, and caring behavior. This approach to leadership based on the concepts of servanthood serendipitously serves organizations the best in the long run (Caldwell, Bischoff, & Karri, 2002).

Servant leadership is a logical extension of transformational leadership (Stone & Patterson 2004). Servant leaders lead an organization by focusing on their followers, such that the followers are the primary concern and the organizational concerns are peripheral. In contrast to transformational leadership, servant leaders focus first and foremost on their followers. Servant leaders do not have particular affinity for the abstract corporation or organization; rather, they value the people who constitute the organization.

This is not an emotional endeavor but rather an unconditional concern for the well-being of those who form the entity. This relational context is where the servant leader actually leads. Harvey (2001) states that "chasing profits is peripheral; the real point of business is to serve as one of the institutions through which society develops and exercises the capacity for constructive action" (pp. 38-39). The servant leader does not serve with a focus on results but rather on service. Lubin (2001) proffers that the servant leader's first responsibilities are relationships and people, and those relationships take precedence over the task and product. Servant leaders trust their followers to act in the best interest of the organization, even though the leaders do not primarily focus on organizational objectives.

According to Bass (2000), servant leadership is "close to the transformational components of inspiration and individualized consideration" (p. 33). However, the stress of servant leadership is upon the leader's aim to serve. This desire to serve people supersedes organizational objectives. Servant leadership is a belief that organizational goals will be achieved on a long-term basis only by first facilitating the growth,
development, and general well-being of the individuals who comprise the organization. Harvey (2001) contends that the servant leader’s primary objective is the workers and their growth, then the customer base, and finally the organizational bottom line.

Robert K. Greenleaf (1904-1990) is credited with originating the servant leadership concept among modern organizational theorists (Spears, 1995, 1996). In Greenleaf’s (1969,1977) opinion, leadership must primarily meet the needs of others. The focus of servant leadership is on others rather than upon self and on an understanding of the role of the leader as a servant (Greenleaf, 1977). Self-interest should not motivate servant leadership; rather, it should ascend to a higher plane of motivation (Greenleaf, 1977; Pollard, 1996). The servant leader’s primary motivation is to serve and meet the needs of others, which should be the prime motivation for all leaders (Russell & Stone, 2002). Servant leaders develop people, helping them to strive and flourish (McMinn, 2001). Servant leaders provide vision, earn followers’ credibility and trust, and influence others (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999).

According to Stone and Patterson (2004), the principal difference between transformational leadership and servant leadership is the leader’s focus. The overriding focus of servant leaders is on service to their followers. The extent to which leaders are able to shift the primary focus of their leadership from the organization to the follower is the distinguishing factor in determining whether the leader may be a transformational or servant leader.

There is greater emphasis upon service of and to followers in the servant leadership paradigm. Servant leaders gain influence in a nontraditional manner that derives from servanthood itself (Russell & Stone, 2002). In so doing, they allow extraordinary freedom for followers to exercise their own abilities. They also place a much higher degree of trust in their followers than would be the case in any leadership style that required the leader to be somewhat directive.

Patterson’s (2005) research has led to a servant leadership model encompassing seven virtuous constructs exhibited as behaviors by a servant leader and their interaction. These seven behaviors are agapao love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service. These virtues become constructs when activated within the context of servant leadership behaviors. The model is based in virtuous construct of agapao love, although the desire to serve has to be present to be a possible outcome.

*Figure 4. The theory of servant leadership model*

![The theory of servant leadership model](image)

The servant leader’s motive is not to direct the activities of followers. Instead, the servant leader’s behavior motivates, influences, inspires, and empowers followers to focus on ways to serve others better. It is a humble means for affecting follower behavior. Servant leaders rely upon service to establish the purposes for meaningful work and to provide needed resources. It is a characteristically unique method for stimulating and
influencing the behavior of others. Servant leaders, however, derive influence from service itself. They develop relationships where followers are encouraged to follow their lead of service. McKenna (1989) notes that servant-power is a category of influence outside the traditional kinds of power. Real servanthood is a leadership style that relies upon the influence of self-giving without self-glory.

Summary

According to Kuhn (1970), "in the development of any science, the first received paradigm is usually felt to account quite successfully for most of the observations" (p. 64). However, Kuhn shows when there are phenomena not explained by an existing theory, a new theory emerges. The literature on leadership offers different theoretical perspectives regarding the understanding of leaders (Bass, 1990; Daft, 2002; Yukl, 2002).

Just as Theory Y explained phenomena that Theory X did not, the theory of servant leadership functions today as a logical extension of transformational theory, based on Kuhn's position that a new theory develops when a theoretical position no longer explains phenomena. Such has been the nature of explaining the workplace since work first needed to be done. Through each phase of leader theory development, leader focus has influenced the nature of the theoretical constructs. Each element of workplace and leader behavior opens the door for empirical investigation, including the development of instruments to measure the theoretical constructs. According to Spector (1992), the theoretical constructs provide the path for scale development.

The overwhelming availability of data and information in the workplace could very well be the variable that next influences leader focus in a new or different direction. There will certainly be others, and only time will tell where the dynamics of the organization take us next. Future leader focus research will most certainly continue to consider the role of the follower as an integral part of the relationship.

The Industrial Revolution shifted America’s economy from an agriculture base to an industrial one. Thereby, it ushered in a change in how leaders viewed and treated their followers. It created a paradigm shift to a new theory of leadership in which “common” people gained power by virtue of their skills (Clawson, 1999). New technology, data and information at our fingertips, and globalization of the workforce are reshaping human thought and action in the workplace. Leader focus is already being teased and coaxed to look off center from where it views the organization and its workers today, with the theorists pulling and tugging to see which constructs will fit best into the new framework.
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