



Doi: <https://doi.org/10.54702/msj.2021.20.2.0109>

Leadership theories in management and psychologist educational filed

HAYDER NAZARJAWOOSH¹,
ABEER DAKHIL HATEM AL-SELMI²

MAZINHADIKZAR³,
MOHDRADZANI ABDUL RAZAK⁴,

^{1,3} Physical Education and Sport Sciences Department, Al-Mustaqbal University
College, 51001 Hillah, Babil, Iraq, Hayder@mustaqbal-college.edu.iq¹,
mazin_kzar@mustaqbal-college.edu.iq³

²College of Physical Education and Sport Sciences for Women, University of Baghdad,
Iraq/abeer@copew.uobaghdad.edu.iq

⁴ Faculty of Education, The National University of Malaysia (UKM),43600 Bangi,
Selangor, MALAYSIA

Abstract:

All domains in this world built based on set of theories. Those theories have been responsible for interpretation of some phenomena and interlocking relationships around us. Commonly, theories are categorized by which aspect is believed. Also, can find a group of theories produced regarding to the leadership domain. This paper will be presented some of these theories like (Great Man Theory, Trait Theory, Behavioral Theories, Contingency Theories, Situational Theory, Transactional Theories, and Transformational Theories). where these theories considered the most popular and common in the field of leader and will be discussed by this work.

Keywords: Great Man Theory, Trait Theory, Behavioral Theories, Contingency Theories, Situational Theory, Transactional Theories, Transformational Theories.

Introduction:

Since the beginning of human history has begun with it the development of theories and laws that explain and determine the nature of the phenomena and the relationships surround it. From this point, many researchers, philosophers, and professors presented different theories in the leadership domain and the aim of which is covered all the positives and negatives aspects of this field. In the early part of the twentieth, the interesting in leadership area increased. First, leadership theories focused on the qualities that distinguished between leaders and followers. Whilst, later theories included other variables like skill levels and situational factors (Podolny, Khurana, & Hill-Popper, 2004; Popovici, 2012).



Initially, going to start by mentioning some of the definitions cited by the researchers on the leaders before moving to the leadership theories. numerous definitions of leadership are existing, almost as many as the scientists who work on leadership concept(Stogdill, 1974), trying to put this concept under terms of trait, behavior, influence, occupation of an administrative position, role relationship, attributions, or interaction patterns(Evans & Davies, 2002).Leadership is a word taken from the common vocabulary and included in the technical vocabulary of scientific discipline without being specifically redefine (G. A. Yukl, 2013).Thus, the definition of leadership presented in different ways by researchers due to several different factors, as who exerts influence and in what way, and the consequences of this behavior(Evans & Davies, 2002).Hemphill and Coons (1957) offered a definition of leadership it is“the behavior of an individual ... directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal”. In(1978), Katz & Kahn presented another definition it was "the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization".

While Burns introduced his definition in(1978) "exercised when persons ... mobilize ... institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers". Rauch and Behling (1984) argued that “the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal achievement”. Jacobs & Jaquesin 1990 said that "a process of giving purpose (meaningful direction) to collective effort, and causing willing effort to be expended to achieve purpose". In1992,Scheinoffered another definition of leadership it is "the ability to step outside the culture ... to start evolutionary changes processes that are more adaptive". Drath & Palus in 1994 produced this definition "the process of making sense of what people are doing together so that people will understand and be committed" .Richards & Engle in 1986 presented this definition "about articulating visions embodying values, and creating the environment within which things can be accomplished".In1999House et al. said that "the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organization...”(Evans & Davies, 2002).WhilstG. A. Yukl (2013) defined leadership as " the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives". Peter Northousein 2015 provided a definition of leadership is "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal"(G. Yukl, 2012).

All the definitions mentioned above refer to many of the central components of the phenomenon of leadership and here summarize some of them:(a)



Leadership is a process, (b) Leadership includes influence others, (c) Leadership happens within the context of a group, (d) Leadership involves attainment of certain goals, (e) These goals are shared by the leaders and their followers.

Leadership is not a trait or characteristic endowed with a few numbers of people since birth. leadership is a transactional event that happens between leaders and their followers. Showing leadership as a process means that the leaders affect and are affected of their followers either positively or negatively. It confirms that leadership is a two-way, interactive event between two factors the leaders and their followers instead of linear and one-way event where leader only affects his followers. Considering leadership as a process makes this vocabulary available to everyone and not just monopolizes to a few people who born with this trait. More importantly, it means that the leadership is not limited to just one person in the group that has the power of the official position (i.e., formally appointed leader)(Podolny et al., 2004; G. Yukl, 2012).Leadership is about the ability to influence on the bosses, the peers, the subordinates in an organizational or work context. Without this ability it is impossible to be a leader. Of course, having an impact on others means that there is a greater need on the part of the leaders to exert their influence morally. “Leadership works in groups” This sentence means that leadership is about the impact on a group of people who are involved in a common goal or purpose(Popovici, 2012; G. Yukl, 2012).

Leadership Theories

Over the decades, leadership theories have been the source of numerous studies. In fact, as well as in practice, many have tried to determine what authentic leaders can stand away from the collective! Consequently, there are many theories about leadership as there are philosophers, researchers and university professors who have studied and ultimately published their theories of leadership(Amanchukwu, Stanley, & Ololube, 2015).

Many views of leadership have been submitted as distinguish leaders from non-leaders according to some characteristic. While currently most of the research has shifted from traditional view represented by trait or personality-based theories to the situational theories, Which imposes that the situation who exercises leadership is determined by the leadership skills and qualities of the leader(Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009).all contemporary theories can be inserted under the following perspectives: leadership as a relationship or process, leadership as a collection of traits or characteristic of personality, or leadership as a given behavior or, as they are more commonly referred to skills of leadership. In even more dominant leadership theories, there is the idea that, at least to some extent of leadership is a process involving the effect with a



group of people towards the achievement of the goals (Wolinski, 2010). Charry (2012), noted that the researchers increased interest in leadership significantly during early part of the twentieth century. Where in the beginnings focused the leadership theories on the traits that distinguish between leaders from followers, whilst later theories considered other variables like levels of skill and situational factors (Amanchukwu et al., 2015; Popovici, 2012).

Theories are commonly classified by which side is believed to determine the leader the most. The most prevalent one's are: Great Man Theory, Trait Theory, Behavioral Theory, Contingency Theory, Situational Theory, Transactional Theory and Transformational Theory.

Great Man Theory (1840s)

The Great Man Theory developed around the mid-nineteenth century. This theory supposes that leadership traits are intrinsic. This simply means that great leaders are born. Heroic in History and Hero-Worship are not made. This theory believes great leaders as those who are destined by birth to become a leader. Moreover, the theory believed that the great leaders rise when faced with the proper situation. Thomas Carlyle was popularized the theory, teacher and writer. Just like him, Great Man Theory was inspired by studying the impressive Heroes. In his book "On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History", he compared a wide variety of heroes. In 1860, Herbert Spencer, British philosopher disputed the Great Man Theory by emphasizing that these heroes are simply a product of their time and their actions the results of the social conditions (Spector, 2016).

From above can say The Great Man Theory suggested that the leaders are born as great leaders and they possess qualities and characteristics are not found in the original community and does not participate the nature to refine their personal qualities. through their personal features, social potential, their ideas or actions that affect in society in their live or leave imprint after their death. These capabilities allow them to the formation of the pages of history to the development of society and these attributes and behavior make people follow great man.

Trait Theory (1930's - 1940's)

The Trait Theory considers one of the first systematic attempts to the scholars through the 20th century to study leadership. This theory presented in early part of the 20th century where leadership traits were studied to determine what made certain group of people become great leaders. During this period,



researches focused on determining the particular traits which clearly distinguish leaders from followers (Bass & Stogdill, 1990; Jago, 1982).

The Trait Theory was attacked by researchers where questioned the universality of leadership traits. Stogdill in a major review of 1948 suggested that no consisted set of traits distinguish leaders from non-leaders across a diversity of situations. For example, a person with leadership traits who was a leader in one case might not be a leader in another case. Instead of being a quality that individual possesses, leaderships image was re-visualized as a relationship between individuals in a social situation (Stogdill, 1948). The trait theory started with an assertion on identifying the qualities of great individual. Later, it shifted to include the effect of situations on leadership and current time. Then, it has shifted back to re-emphasize the crucial role of traits in efficient leadership (Akar, 2010).

Trait Theory provides a reductionist and simplistic view of leadership which consider one of limitations of this theory. As it assumed that the presence of certain personality characteristics in a leader will enable him to be effective in different situations (Glendon, Clarke, & McKenna, 2016). Whilst, this assumption has not been experimentally supported and group of 'universal' traits have not been identified (G. Yukl & Mahsud, 2010; G. A. Yukl, 2013).

Trait theory can be described as a branch of the great man theory. It imposed that leadership has specific features which could become a leader and considered these characteristics and behavioral inherent in the family and passed on genetically. Leaders can share a lot of common traits and characteristics that make them successful in leading the community.

Behavioural Theory (1940's - 1950's)

Behavioral Theory supposes that the great leaders are made not born. This theory emphasizes on the actions of leaders not on characteristics or personalities they possess. The belief is that leaders can become effective leaders by experience, observation, and teaching. From previous sentences can say that this theory focuses on how leaders act in certain situations with the thought that leaders can be conditioned to reply appropriately when faced with different situations (MacArthur & Class, 2011).

Behavioral Theory attempts to determine the style of leadership behaviors which drove to successful task performance and followers' satisfaction. Lewin (1935) said that there were three kinds of leaders: Autocratic, Democratic and Laissez-Faire. The first type of leader is autocratic. This kind of leaders make decisions without consulting subordinates. While the democratic leaders



consult their subordinates before make their decision. The final type that mentioned by Lewin was laissez-faire leader where this leader lets subordinates make decisions and thus no real leadership role other than assuming the position. Lewin thought that all leaders can fit into one of these three categories(MacArthur & Class, 2011).

the value of behavioral theory comes from that it helped shift the focus of leadership research towards understanding what the leaders are doing and the impact of their actions. This theory helped describe behaviors of leadership depending on whether they were task or relationship-oriented, and highlights the need for leaders to balance effectively these two types of behaviors (Northouse, 2015).

Behavioral theory focuses on the actions of great leaders through their ideas, experiences and ability of leadership. This theory can be the best determining factors for the success of leadership and how to guide followers' efforts towards achieving the goal through the use of appropriate behavior, which allows individuals to participate in decision-making and deal with the situation in the absence of leadership. People can learn to become leaders through training and monitoring which mean that anyone can be a leader.

Contingency Theory (1960's)

In the 1960s, Fred Fielder presented the first theory by using the contingency approach, the Contingency Theory of effectiveness. The basic idea of Fred Fielder theory is that the effectiveness of leadership in terms of group performance relies on the interaction of two factors first one is the leader's task or relation motivations and the second one is the situation aspects. Fielder in his studies identified two leadership styles, the relationship motivated and task motivated styles that should be matched to the situational control(Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1998; Mohamad, Silong, & Hassan, 2009).

Contingency Theories hold that the effectiveness of leadership is related to the interaction of a leader's traits or behaviors and situational factors. Attention of researchers focus on leadership behaviors where considered as direct predictors of leadership effectiveness. Nevertheless, the investigators did not abandon the task versus relations leadership behavior completely. Instead of that an alternative approach was developed which emphasized on critical role of the situational context where connected to the leadership behaviors or traits which led to effective outcomes. This alternative approach became known as the Contingency Theories of leadership(Hughes et al., 1998). It is called in this name because of its hypothesis that refers to a leader's effectiveness relies on how well the leader's style suits the context. To understand the performance of leaders, it is necessary to understand the situations in which they lead.



Successful leadership is contingent on matching a leader's style to the correct setting(Akar, 2010).

The style of leadership used in Contingency Theory is contingent on some factors like the situation, quality of the individuals or a number of other variables. In this theory cannot find one right way to lead the followers because the internal and external factors of the environment need the leader to adjust to the certain situation(MacArthur & Class, 2011). One of the strengths of the Contingency Theory is that it draws attention to the importance of matching specific leadership styles to specific situations and the need for leaders to adapt their behaviors according to the subordinate characteristics and the nature of the task.

Contingency theory deals with particular variables related to the environment. Which may determine the most appropriate leadership style in dealing with members. Effective leadership style in all situations depends on a number of variables, including the leader's behavior, characteristics followers and other aspects. Contingency theory focused on understanding the circumstances and situations where leadership behaviors are effective. This theory showed an existence link between the qualities of the leader and his/her behavior. Contingency theory in certain cases proposed that effective leadership do not depend only on the leadership style but on control the situation.

Situational Leadership Theory (1970's)

As the name of this approach means that the situational leadership theory focuses on leadership in situations. Fundamental premise of the theory is that the different situations require different types of leadership. From this viewpoint, to be an effectual leader needs that an individual adapt his/her style to the different situations demands. Situational leadership theory emphasizes that leadership is consisted of both a supportive and directive dimension, and each should be applied suitably in a specific situation. To determine what is demanded in a given situation, a leader ought to evaluate his/her followers and assess how committed and qualified they are to execute a particular task. According to the hypothesis that the followers' motivation and skills vary over time, situational theory assumed that leaders must change the degree to which they are supportive or directive to address the changing needs of subordinates(Akar, 2010).

According to Hersey and Blanchard (1977), they proposed that leaders have to change their behaviors according to the maturity of member. Both Hersey and Blanchard (1977) classified behaviors of leader along two dimensions: initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure, termed task behavior



was described as one-way directional connection from the leader to the members. Whilst, consideration, termed relationship behavior was described as two-way directional connection from the leader when offering social and emotional support for the members. Member readiness or maturity was defined as the willingness and ability of members to take responsibility for guidance their behavior in relation to a specified task.

Situational theory presumes to be relatively flexible. Therefore, the leaders can move up and down the continuum and from being a dictator to become a democratic according to the given situation. changing leader style from A to B is depending on number of variables, such as leader characteristic, personal factors, maturity level, intelligence and sensitivity to the events happening around him.

Situational theory saw as the actions of leaders not on mental qualities. The choice of leaders depends on the situation. There is no single leader style can be seen as the best one. The diversity of tasks so that each task may require a different leadership style. Good leadership can adapt with different situations, such as job type and nature of the group. Sometimes leader uses the autocratic behavior but in other cases dealing with members as proficient and dealing with them in a democratic way.

Transactional Leadership Theory (1970's)

Transactional Theory was defined by Eric Berne in 1977, where this theory focuses on the role of organization, supervision and collective performance and the exchanges that happen between leaders and followers. Transactional Theory establishes leadership on a system of rewards and punishments (Charry, 2012). In other words, the idea behind this theory is that the function of the leader is the creation of structures which make it abundantly clear what is expected of his followers and the consequences (rewards and punishments) associated with meeting or failure to meet the expectations. Director or leader is caretaker which defines the goal for the staff, and focuses on operation day after day (Amanchukwu et al., 2015).

In Transactions Theory, rewards and punishments rely on the performance of followers. The leaders view the connection between managers and subordinates as an exchange relationship “you give me something for something in return”. The employees receive some type of reward when they are successful, and they are reprimanded or punished in some way when they fail (Charry, 2012). Exchange relationship that appears between the leader and followers happens to achieve routine performance goals. The power of Transactions Theory comes from their official authority and responsibility in the organization. The main



objective of subordinates is to comply with the instructions of the leader (Amanchukwu et al., 2015).

Transaction's theory relies on the rational man and how to grant reward and punishment. It focusses on the performance of the leader and the group. Leader involved with group activity and show the effective interplay between the leader and followers and provide assistance to the followers' equivalent to their efforts. Transactions leaders used rewards exchange model for followers' good work and positive results. Leader relationship in transactions theory based on the exchange of the rewards to some achievements and put attention on the work of the followers to find the errors or deviations and punish offenders and try to correct errors and problems that may happen in the work. Each leader has two ways to lead the group, either by reward when individuals do a good job as leader reward individuals, or use punishment when the individual is doing a bad job as leader reprimand individuals.

Transformational Leadership Theory (1970s)

Transformational Theory focuses on the connections created between leader and followers. In this theory, leadership is a process where an individual engages with others and able to create a relationship which leads to increased motivation and ethics in all of followers and leaders. Transformational Theory is often compared with the theory of charismatic leadership where leaders with some qualities, such as confidence, extraversion, and clarity values, are seen as most capable of motivating followers (Amanchukwu et al., 2015). Transformational leaders behave as role model, mentor, inspire and motivate subordinates through helping group of people see the significance and high pros of the task. The leaders emphasize on the group members performance, but also to the every person to achieve his or her potential. The leaders of this model often have high ethical and moral criteria (Charry, 2012). The strong of this theory by offers a new perspective on leadership as far as leadership is not just depending on the actions and behaviors of the leader but is evident from the interactions between leaders and followers (Amanchukwu et al., 2015; Lekka & Healey, 2012).

Transformational Leadership theory supposed that the leader is a person who motivates and inspires followers to achieve unexpected results. Leader pays the interests and needs of individuals and changes the consciousness of followers of the issues by helping to solve old problems in a way good sharing visions of the future and to overcome the selfish personal interests. The leader is able to stir up interest his followers to make an extra effort to achieve the goals of the group. Transformational Leadership Theory raise the level of awareness of



followers to increase the value and importance of specific outcomes and ways to achieve them. The leader is the one who creates positive change in followers and work in the interest of the group. Transformational Leadership generate trust, respect and admiration of followers and that stimulate followers to perform more than expected.

Conclusion

Many scientists and researchers presented a set of theories since the mid-nineteenth century until the late twentieth century, expressing their views in the concept of leadership. Early research efforts in the field of leadership behavior focused on characteristic and traits of leaders. these efforts have resulted in deducting two theories to the scientific community represented by The Great Man Theory and The Trait Theory. But researchers failed in trying to determine specific behaviors and personality traits of effective leadership to identify universal behaviors or traits. Later investigations of leadership shifted to focus on both situational and behavioral factors, and who these factors may influence effectively on leader(Beam, 2001). These investigations by researchers led to produce the latest theories which represented by Behavioral Theory, Contingency Theory, Situational Leadership Theory, Transactional Theory, Transformational Theory. Efforts are continuing by researchers to develop the existing theories that presented in the field of leadership and try to introduce new theories in order to serve the reality of leadership in general.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thanks all the team that works on this research and especially the Dean of Al-Mustaqbal University College represented by Assist. Prof. Dr.Hassan Shakir Majdy for the financial support provided to complete this research.

References

1. Akar, A. (2010). *Transformational and transactional leadership characteristics of intercollagiate athletes and non-athletes*. Middle east technical university,
2. Amanchukwu, R. N., Stanley, G. J., & Ololube, N. P. (2015). A Review of Leadership Theories, Principles and Styles and Their Relevance to Educational Management. *Management*, 5(1), 6-14.
3. Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual review of psychology*, 60, 421-449.



4. Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*: Simon and Schuster.
5. Beam, J. W. (2001). Preferred leadership of NCAA Division I and II intercollegiate student-athletes.
6. Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2(1).
7. Charry, K. (2012). Leadership Theories-8 Major Leadership Theories. Retrieved March 23, 2014 from <http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/p/leadtheories.htm>.
8. Drath, W. H., & Palus, C. J. (1994). *Making common sense: Leadership as meaning-making in a community of practice*: Center for Creative Leadership.
9. Evans, J., & Davies, B. (2002). 2 Theoretical background. *The sociology of sport and physical education: an introductory reader*, 15.
10. Glendon, A. I., Clarke, S., & McKenna, E. (2016). *Human safety and risk management* (2nd Edition ed.): CRC Press.
11. Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*, 6, 38.
12. Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). *The Management of Organizational Behavior*. Engelwood Cliffs. In: NJ: Prentice Hall.
13. House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Falkus, S. A., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (1999). Cultural Influences on Leadership and Organizations: Project Globe. In W. H. Mobley, M. J. Gessner, & V. Arnold (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership* (2nd Edition ed., Vol. 1, pp. 171 - 233 Pages). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
14. Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (1998). Contingency theories of leadership. *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era*, 141-157.
15. Jacobs, T. O., & Jaques, E. (1990). Military executive leadership.
16. Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management science*, 28(3), 315-336.
17. Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (2nd Edition ed. Vol. 2). the University of Michigan: New York: Wiley.
18. Lekka, C., & Healey, N. (2012). A review of the literature on effective leadership behaviours for safety. *The Health and Safety Executive (HSE), Harpur Hill Buxton Derbyshire SK17 9JN*.



19. Lewin, K. (1935). *A Dynamica Theory of Personality: Selected Papers* (1st Edition ed.): New York and London, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
20. MacArthur, G. D., & Class, C. (2011). *Leadership Theories and Style: A Transitional Approach*.
21. Mohamad, M., Silong, A. D., & Hassan, Z. (2009). Participative and effective community leadership practice in Malaysia. *Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 5(1), 139-147.
22. Northouse, P. G. (2015). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th edition ed.): Sage publications.
23. Podolny, J. M., Khurana, R., & Hill-Popper, M. (2004). Revisiting the meaning of leadership. *Research in organizational behavior*, 26, 1-36.
24. Popovici, V. (2012). Similarities and Differences between Management and Leadership. *Annals-Economy Series*, 2, 126-135.
25. Rauch, C., & Behling, O. (1984). Functionalism: Basis for an alternate approach to the study of leadership. *Leaders and managers: International perspectives on managerial behavior and leadership*, 45-62.
26. Richards, D., & Engle, S. (1986). After the vision: Suggestions to corporate visionaries and vision champions. *Transforming leadership*, 199, 214.
27. Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational leadership and culture*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
28. Spector, B. A. (2016). Carlyle, Freud, and the great man theory more fully considered. *Leadership*, 12(2), 250-260.
29. Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of psychology*, 25(1), 35-71.
30. Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature*. In: New York: Free Press.
31. Wolinski, S. (2010). Leadership Theories. Retrieved June 14, 2014, from <http://managementhelp.org/blogs/leadership/2010/04/21/leadership-theories/>. In.
32. Yukl, G. (2012). Leadership: What is it. *Cases in leadership* (3rd ed., pp. 1-42). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
33. Yukl, G., & Mahsud, R. (2010). Why flexible and adaptive leadership is essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(2), 81.
34. Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th Edition ed.): Prentice Hall.