

eat man theory suggests past leaders have common traits. Stogdill (1948/74) agreed that leaders possessed different traits to followers (intelligence, alertness, insight, responsibility, initiative, persistence, self-confidence and sociability), however, these personal factors were relative to a situation. Zaccaro 2007 – linked to charismatic leaders. Jung & Sosik 2006 – found charismatic leaders possess similar traits. Zaccaro et al 2004 found ‘social intelligence’ is a key trait found in good leaders. The Big 5 – consensus amongst researchers that 5 basic traits make up personality – Neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness. Judge et al 2002 found a strong relationship between big 5 and leadership.

Strengths – more research than any other theory (100 years), fits the notion that leaders are different, gives benchmarks for what is needed in a leader. Weaknesses – no definitive list of traits, failed to take situations into account, fails to look at leadership outcomes, not useful for training and development.

Transactional – Hershey and Blanchard 1969. SLII – 1985. Directive and supportive dimensions. Leader must assess the follower's competence and commitment. *S1 – Directing, S2 – Coaching, S3 – Supporting, S4 – Delegating*. Strengths – Useful in the workplace – frequently used, simple, practical, easy to understand and apply, prescriptive nature, it tells you what to do in various contexts, suggest treating each follower differently. Weaknesses – few research studies have been conducted, unclear follower development levels, changes made to model not explained, unclear how development levels were conceptualised (why do they lose commitment as they progress), fails to account for demographic characteristics, does not explain what to do in a group situation.

A study of followers as key components of the leadership process through the enactment of Followership has been largely missed in the leadership literature. Leadership is a process that is co-created in social and relational interactions between people (Fairhurst and Uhl-Bien 2012). Following behaviours are a crucial part of the leadership process, as without followers and their behaviours, there would be no leaders (Uhl-Bien et al 2014). Following behaviour represents a willingness to defer to another in some way – DeRue and Ashford 2010 – granting a leader identity to another and claiming a follower identity for oneself. Uhl-Bien et al 2014 states that an understanding of leadership is incomplete without an understanding of followership. Although a review shows that most research on leadership recognizes the follower in one way, the focus on followership as a research area in its own right has not emerged until very recently (Carsten et al., 2010, Collinson, 2006, Hopton et al., 2012 and Sy, 2010). The first, a role theory approach (Katz & Kahn, 1978), sees followership as a role played by individuals occupying a formal or informal position or rank (e.g., a “subordinate” in a hierarchical “manager-subordinate” relationship; a follower in a “leader-follower” relationship). The second, a constructionist approach (Fairhurst & Grant, 2010), views followership as a relational interaction through which leadership is co-created in combined acts of leading and following (DeRue and Ashford, 2010, Fairhurst and Uhl-Bien, 2012 and Shamir, 2012). Whereas role-based views investigate followership as a role and a set of behaviors or behavioral styles of individuals or groups, constructionist views study followership as a social process necessarily intertwined with leadership. Strengths: Moves us beyond leader-centric view to recognise the importance of follower roles, distributes responsibility for constructing leadership and its outcomes, focuses us on identifying more and more effective follower behaviours, recognises that leadership can flow in all

administrative skills – technical (things), Human, Conceptual (ideas). Different levels of skills required depending on position in company. Skills are what people can accomplish, traits are who people are. Mumford et al 2000 & Yammarino 2000 – developed skills based model of leadership. Study funded by US army over several years with 1800 officers over 6 grades. Made up of 5 components – *competencies, individual attributes, leadership outcomes, career experiences, and environmental influences*.

Strengths – Leader centred model that stresses importance of developing skills, first approach to conceptualise skills, makes leadership available to everyone, incorporate a wide variety of components, structure consistent with the curricular of most educational programs. Weaknesses – more general and less precise, including motivation, personality (addresses more than leadership), weak in predictive value does not explain cause and effect, may not be applicable to other contexts outside of the military.

Path-goal – How leaders motivate follower to achieve their goals. Emphasises the relationship between the leader's style, and the characteristics of the follower and organisational setting. By choosing behaviours that complement or supplement the organisational setting, the leader is able to cater to the follower's motivational needs. Expectancy Theory (Vroom 1954) – followers will be motivated if: they think they are capable, efforts will result in a certain outcome, payoffs of their work are worthwhile. House and Mitchell (1974) major components: **leader behaviours** – directive, supportive, participative (invited followers to assist in decisions), achievement orientated (challenges followers). **Follower characteristics** – (determine how a leader's behaviour is interpreted by followers) need for affiliation, preference for structure, desire for control, self-perceived level of task ability. **Task Characteristics** – design of follower's task, formal authority system of the organisation, primary work group of followers. Strengths – provides a useful theoretical framework for understanding how behaviours affect followers, integrates the motivation principles of expectancy into a theory of leadership, provides clear model for use. Weaknesses – Complex with many different aspects of leadership, hard to interpret, only received partial support from many studies, treat leadership as one way.

Servant – A form of leadership that shifts from self-interest to a service to others. Influence rather than power and control, focus on others' strengths rather than weaknesses, listening and long term benefits. 9 key attributes: listening, self-awareness, foresight, empathy, persuasion, stewardship, healing, conceptualisation and building a sense of community. A burgeoning new research and leadership theory that has been linked to ethics, virtues, and morality is servant leadership (Graham 1991; Lantieri and Irvin 2010; Parolini et al. 2009; Russell 2001; Whetstone 2002). Servant leadership theory's emphasis on service to others and recognition that the role of organizations is to create people who can build a better tomorrow resonates with scholars and practitioners who are responding to the growing perceptions that corporate leaders have become selfish and who are seeking a viable leadership theory to help resolve the challenges of the twenty-first century. However, Greenleaf's (1970, 1977) conceptualization of servant leadership as a way of life rather than as a management technique perhaps has slowed the acceptance of this leadership theory in academia and

facilitate goal accomplishment. Relationship behaviours – help to feel comfortable with themselves, others and situations. The Ohio State studies (Hemphill and Coons 1957) questionnaire with 150 questions given in a variety of settings, found a certain cluster of behaviours typical of leaders. The University of Michigan Studies – identified two types of leadership behaviours (employee and production oriented) believed to be on opposite ends of a continuum (Bowers and Steidlmeier 1966) later put on two different continuums. Strengths – broadens leadership research to what people do, studies validate a credibility to basic approach, allows leaders to learn about their strengths and develop. Weaknesses – hasn't adequately shown how leadership behaviours are associated with performance outcomes, failed to find a universal style of leadership that is effective in every situation, implies that the most effective type of leadership is high high, which has been proven not to be the case in many situations.

Transactional – focuses on the exchange between leaders and followers. Transformational – connection with others to create a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both parties. Inspires followers to do more than expected by: raising levels of consciousness, getting them to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the group and address high level needs. Leadership factors: idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration. Pseudo transformational – personalised leadership focuses on the leader's own interests rather than others (Bass and Steidlmeier 1999). Charismatic – leaders are: dominant, strong, dominant influence, self-confident, own moral values, strong role model, competent, articulate ideological goals, high expectations. Effects on followers: trust, similarity between followers and leaders' beliefs, loyalty towards leader, obedience, identification, emotional involvement, heightened goals and increased confidence (House 1976). Strengths – widely researched, appealing to people's pre-deceived ideas of leadership, treats leadership as a process, broader view of leadership that includes and considers other models, strong emphasis on followers' needs and morals, strong evidence that it is effective. Weaknesses – lack of conceptual clarity as it covers a wide range of activities and characteristics, treats leadership as a personality trait rather than a behaviour that can be learned, research has not been able to establish whether transformational leaders are actually able to transform followers (only that they achieve positive outcomes), does not consider that followers could be influenced by leaders, the leader is putting themselves above follower needs, potential to be abused as leader is transforming people.