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ABSTRACT

This is a content analysis paper that audits the leadership literature, synthesizes and reports developments regarding organization leadership approaches. The paper is important because it gives updated development in the organization leadership literature for better understanding of different leadership approaches in contemporary organizations. The paper also will help readers to better understand the organizational leadership dynamics. From this development, therefore, this paper opens up opportunities for leadership research to expand within and into many fields of endeavors. In short this paper can further help the development of management practice and theory as leadership is central in the survival of all organizations.
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1.0. INTRODUCTION

The study of leadership-related issues has been on the increase. The result of a quick search of the ScienceDirect database revealed a total 109,232 journal articles; 9,711 books, and 1,631 reference works. This is indicating the amount of interest that the subject is generating. Similarly, leadership literature has recorded an increasing number of leadership approaches over the last three decades. The increased complexity in organizational work environments, technological development and the global environmental challenges may be responsible for the proliferation of the different organization leadership approaches.

Establishing effective leadership can help drive improvements in team work, quality safety, and change and innovation in contemporary organizations (Greenfield, 2007). This may be a serious challenge for organizations but one that can reap great benefits.

Effective leadership has resulted to improvements in health care practice (Rolland, 1998; Manojlovich, 2005); conflict management (Hendel, Fish, & Galon, 2005); innovation (Mahoney, 2001); and the instigation of shared governance (Doherty and Hope, 2000. Furthermore, attempts were made by different leadership scholars to classify leadership behaviors into particular categorizations often referred as leadership taxonomy. For example, Mintzberg, (1973); and Stogdill (1963) came up with initiating structure (task-oriented) and consideration (relationship-oriented) leader behaviors; and later Yukl and Falbe (1990) developed taxonomy of leader behavior which integrates several earlier taxonomies. It is observable that some leader behaviors are primarily task-oriented (planning and organizing, problem solving, clarifying roles and objectives, monitoring), while others are primarily relationship oriented (supporting, developing, networking, recognizing). Importantly, certain leader behaviors include some component behaviors that are concerned with both task and people (Yukl, 1994). This study is not concerned with further leadership classification or taxonomy, but it represents an attempt to report the much detailed sophisticated fragmentations of leadership behaviors (approaches).

Additionally, there is evidence of a great deal of research about leadership paradigms in the literature. However, there was no attempt to articulate them in one place to understand their similarities and differences. This paper is an attempt to fill in this gap by identifying and describing most of the existing leadership paradigms, new and old. This effort will make it easy for leadership theorists and practitioners to have a clear picture of the nature of the numerous modern and old leadership paradigms found in the leadership literature. This paper therefore is
important to leadership theorists in the sense that it can open up new research directions. Leadership theorists can take up the challenge of exploring the relationship of the relatively new leadership paradigms with different factors within the individual employee or the structure in the organization. Bambale, Shamsuddin and Subramaniam (2010) have found that the bulk of the leadership paradigms have not been explored in the area of organizational citizenship behaviors. This paper paper therefore will throw opportunities and challenges to people who are interested in advancing the leadership knowledge and theory across related scholarly areas.

For the sake of clarity, this paper is divided into five parts comprising of (1) introduction; (2) methodology; (3) brief discussion about leadership theory; (4) presentation and review of leadership paradigms; (5) conclusion and future research direction.

1.1. Methodology of the paper:

This paper focuses on identifying, reviewing and presenting leadership approaches. The paper is a content analysis that employed review of vast leadership literature. The paper utilized electronic online databases (ScienceDirect, EBSCOhost, Proquest, Emerald, JStor: Science & Arts and Scopus) provided by Universiti Utara Malaysia to retrieve numerous leadership articles. In addition to the stated sponsored online databases used, the Google website was also used to search for the leadership articles. In the process of the literature search a total of 169 articles were reviewed. The articles that appeared useful to the paper totaling 79 were synthesized to address the objectives of the paper.

1.2. Leadership Theory

Leadership writers often describe leadership theory as being highly diverse and lacking integration (Stogdill,1974; Bass, 1990). They believed that there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept. However, attempt to give a leadership definition that is actually unified and framed was made by one of the leading scholars in the field. The leadership concept was defined as a “tripod - a leader or leaders, followers, and a common goal they want to achieve” (Bennis, 2007, p. 3). This therefore means that leadership necessarily involves talking about leaders and followers and their shared goals; likewise, the practice of leadership is essentially the practice of leaders and followers interacting around their shared goals.

A fundamental aspect of leadership theory, which lies outside the tripod ontology, is the leadership situation (Fiedler, 1978) or the context (Avolio, 2007). Context lies outside the tripod because the terms of the tripod point to the influence interaction of individuals, who are generally assumed to have qualities and characteristics that are internally, and thus more or less independently, generated, such as personality or character. Leaders, followers, and their common goals can be, and often are, conceived independently from any particular setting. As a result, context is broadly understood as a separate variable that has certain effects on the leaders and followers who are embedded in it (Drath et al., 2008). Recognizing the tripod leadership ontology, this paper focuses on examination of the dynamics of existing organizational leadership approaches.

2.0. REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS OF LEADERSHIP APPROACHES

In this section of the paper all the leadership approaches found in the literature were synthesized; the underlying principles and research output of the approaches were discussed briefly. The approaches were grouped into 2 categories (i.e. administrative and adaptive leadership categories). The categorization was in consistent with (Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelveyh, 2007) complexity leadership theory. Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) used the term ‘administrative leadership’ to refer to formal leadership acts that serve to coordinate and structure organizational activities (i.e., the bureaucratic function), and the emergent leadership as more adaptive and integrative.
2.1. **Emergent Leadership Approaches**

On the other hand, the other category is called ‘adaptive leadership category which are the emergent leadership approaches, and they focus on enabling the learning, creative, and adaptive capacity of complex adaptive systems. These approaches may be more suitable for knowledge-producing organizations. (see table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergent Leadership Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transactional leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Righteous leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcendent leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leadership & OCB Literature, 2011

### 2.1.1. Transactional Leadership:

Transactional leadership involves interactions and daily exchanges between leadership and followers; the leader discusses with followers what is required and clarifies how goals and objectives are to be achieved and the handouts in exchange for satisfactory effort and performance (Bass & Avolio, 1993). In essence, transactional leadership is predicated upon the social exchange theory. The theory argues that employees perform positively in response to the benefits they receive from their organizations.

### 2.1.2. Transformational Leadership:

In the case of transformational leadership, Burns (1978) defines the leadership as the process of pursuing collective goals through the mutual tapping of leaders’ and followers’ motive bases towards the achievement of the intended change. Similarly, Bass (1985) defines transformational leadership as superior leadership performance that occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, and inspire followers to look beyond their own self-interest exchange of rewards for compliance. Shamir, House and Arthur (1993) state that transformational leaders motivate followers in three important ways (1) by increasing follower self-efficacy, (2) by facilitating followers’ social identification with their group or organization, and (3) by linking the organization’s work values to follower values. Many research findings about transformational leadership approaches have demonstrated significantly positive relationship between transformational leadership and positive influence on subordinate performance and commitment (Hinkin, & Tracey, 1994; Tracey, & Hinkin, 1996; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996).

### 2.1.3. Charismatic Leadership:

A related leadership approach to transformational is charismatic leadership. Avolio and Gibbons (1988) described charismatic leaders as those who influence followers through their use of symbols, images, stories and
rhetoric to perform at extraordinary levels. They are leaders who typically stood for some cause, had a vision of a better future, and are most of times willing to sacrifice everything to prove to their followers how committed they are to achieving the vision. Charismatic leadership has an interwoven relationship with transformational leadership, of which some writers present them as one thing. For the sake of clarity and convenience, charismatic leadership was described as pure charismatic while socialized charisma is more in line with the conception of transformational leadership. House and Baetz (1979, p. 399) identified a set of behaviors that distinguished the followers of charismatic leaders from others as follows: (1) unquestioning acceptance of the leader by followers; (2) followers' trust in the leader's beliefs (3) affection for the leader; (4) willing obedience to the leader; and (5) emulation of and identification with the leader. The literature revealed a significantly positive relationship between charismatic leadership and positive employee outcome including organizational citizenship behaviors (Babeck-Roberson, & Strickland, 2010).

2.1.4. Dispersed Leadership

A new leadership model that radically departs from the traditional concept of leadership that presupposes a clear demarcation between the leader and the follower is called ‘dispersed leadership’ (Gordon, 2008). Under this leadership paradigm the dualistic nature of the power relationships between leaders and followers are not visible. The new model of dispersed leadership promotes the sharing of power between leaders and followers (Gordon, 2010). The new model has been described by different leadership theorists using different titles: Super leadership (Manz, & Simms, 2001); Self-Leadership (Kirkman, & Rosen, 1999; Uhl-Bien, & Graen, 1998; Kouzes, & Posner, 1993; Bono, & Judge, 2003); Distributed Leadership (Senge, 1999); Empowerment leadership (Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, 2006) and more recently, Shared Leadership (Pearce, Manz, & Sims, 2008). As shared leadership, this leadership approach was defined as a “simultaneous, ongoing, mutual influence process within a team that is characterized by serial emergence of official as well as unofficial leaders” (Pearce, Yoo, & Alavi, 2004, p. 48). Dispersed or shared leadership may therefore be more appropriate in organizational situations where each member’s strengths is equally crucial effort to attain the overall team goal.

2.1.5. Ethical Leadership

Ethical leadership is about properly and morally influencing people in the right direction towards attaining organizational objectives. Such kind of leadership forms the foundation of effective performance and practices in organizations (Trevino, Brown, & Hartman, 2003; Bambale, 2008). Moreover, ethical behavior leaders earn the confidence and loyalty of their followers (Aronson, 2001). DeHoogh, & Den Hartog (2008) propose that employees will be more positive, hopeful, and optimistic about their organization and work and more willing to remain and contribute to its success when their leaders behave ethical. When the leader's moral integrity is questionable, the leader will more likely fail to influence followers to achieve organizational goals (Kanungo, 2001). Despite its actual and perceived relevance empirically based knowledge about ethical leadership is limited, and therefore only a few studies have tested the proposed link between ethical leadership and effectiveness (DeHoogh, & Den Hartog, 2008). Among the few number of research conducted on ethical leadership (Adebayo, 2005; Bobek, & Hatfield, 2003; Epstein, 1998) results revealed a significant negative relationship between unethical attitudes and pro-social behavior. This pattern of results suggests that ethical leaders are more likely to produce pro-social behaviors than those with unethical attitude. More recently, Piccolo, Greenbaum, Den Hartog and Folger (2010) found that employees in jobs rated high in task significance who perceives their leaders to be ethical put more efforts in their jobs and engage more in organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). A few studies have demonstrated positive relationship between ethical leadership and various employee outcomes (Piccolo et al., 2010; Walumbwa, & Schaubroeck, 2009). Research suggests that ethical leadership is related positively to pro-social behavior such as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and negatively related to counterproductive behaviors such as deviance in the workplace (DeHoogh, & Den Hartog, 2008; Mayer, Kuenzi, Greenbaum, Bardes, & Salvador, 2009; Piccolo et al., 2010).
2.1.6. Authentic Leadership

Authentic leadership is among the new leadership approach that presents an exciting leadership research context. Luthans and Avolio (2003) define authentic leadership as a process that combines positive leader capacities and a highly developed organizational context. The authentic leadership process positively influences self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of both leaders and followers, and it stimulates positive personal growth and self-development: The authentic leader is confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, moral, visionary, and gives priority to developing employees to be leaders. The authentic leader is true to him/her self and his/her exhibited behavior positively transforms or develops employees into leaders (Luthans, & Avolio, 2003). According to Avolio, Bass, Walumbwa and Zhu (2004) authentic leaders are individuals who are deeply aware of how they think, behave and perceived by others as being aware of their own and others’ moral perspective, knowledge and strengths. The good qualities of authentic leadership present potential research opportunity to further reveal hitherto unexplained relationships.

2.1.7. Spiritual Leadership

Another emerging leadership approach in leadership literature is spiritual leadership approach in this group is spiritual leadership. According to Reave (2005) spiritual leadership could be seen as an observable phenomenon occurring when a person in a leadership position embodies spiritual values such as integrity, honesty, and humility, creating the self as an example of someone who can be trusted, relied upon, and admired. Spiritual leadership is also demonstrated through behavior that is by individual’s reflective practice or in the ethical, compassionate, and respectful treatment of others. Spiritual individuals are more prone to demonstrate spiritual leadership; however individuals do not have to be spiritual or religious to provide spiritual leadership (Reave, 2005). Spirituality in the workplace could exist without pressuring individuals as spirituality expresses itself not so much in words or preaching, but in the embodiment of spiritual values such as integrity, honesty and humility as well as in the demonstration of spiritual behavior including caring and concern (Reave, 2005). Spiritual leadership and OCB research could unveil interesting research findings especially in the environment where religion dictates the people’s values and culture.

2.1.8. Legacy Leadership

To enrich the understanding of spiritual leadership, two good practical examples of spiritual leadership which legacy leadership is one exist in contemporary leadership literature. Ordinarily, the discussion of spiritual leadership should have covered them, but it would not be appropriate because individuals do not have to be spiritual or religious to provide spiritual leadership (Reave, 2005). Therefore, the concepts of spiritual leadership is only similar but different from legacy and righteous leadership that perfectly portend leaders as spiritual. Found in the leadership literature, legacy leadership is a biblical type of leadership that exists in the church and affiliate organizations. Under this type of leadership, the leader is worthy of imitation; affectionate and emotional; vulnerable and transparent; authentic and sincere; active, not passive; follower-centered not self-centered; and change lives. Ability to change followers’ lives in terms of attitude and behavior is what represents the real measure of the leader’s effectiveness. However, the legacy leader possesses boldness amid opposition, pure motive, and influence without asserting authority (Whittington, Pitts, Kageler, & Goodwin, 2005).

2.1.9. Righteous Leadership

The second model of spiritual leadership, even though different as argued in the discussion of legacy leadership, is righteous leadership. A general notion in Islam is the righteous leadership. Derived from the holy book of the Muslims (Qur’an) and and the prescriptions of the prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), righteous leadership denotes leadership by men who have strong commitment, sufficient respect, and adequate wisdom to fulfill Qur‘anic and Sunnah mandates (Rashid, 2000). Righteous leadership enjoys and promotes what is right
and good and tries to prevent evil (Unal, 2006). Further, Faris and Parry, (2011) posited that righteous leaders hasten to do good deeds as if they are competing with one another; they truly and sincerely follow Islam; they are very concerned about their followers; they are in good form of character and morals, and they are conscious of their responsibilities. Traditional leadership theory and Muslim notions of leadership and traditional leadership concept are different. In righteous leadership, followers have a religious obligation to obey their leaders so long as there is no disobedience of God and the Prophet. Because God and the Prophet have expectations upon all Muslims to be morally righteous, this requirement invariably compels leaders to be ethical and trustworthy (Faris, & Parry, 2011).

2.1.10. Servant Leadership

Servant leadership describes service to followers, the essence of leadership, as the primary responsibility of leaders (Greenleaf, 1977). Greenleaf emphasized that the servant leader is a servant first with the primary intent to ensure the other’s highest priority needs are being served, which enables followers, while being served, to become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants. The core of the servant leadership model is based on four principles of moral authority, namely: conscience, the essence of moral authority, (a) sacrifice, (b) commitment to a worthy cause, (c) teaching that ends and means are inseparable, and (d) relationships (Greenleaf, pp. 6-9). Servant leadership encourages collaboration, trust, foresight, listening, and the ethical use of power and empowerment. A reasonable number of studies on servant leadership were undertaken to explain the principles and performance of servant leadership (Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008; Geller, 2009; Han, Kakabadse, & Kakabadse, 2010; Vondey, 2010; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010). All the studies have demonstrated significantly positive relationship between the servant leadership and organizational effectiveness. Conclusively, it is worthy to note that servant and spiritual leadership are related. Spirituality (i.e. spiritual beliefs and practices) are potential factors in the formation and fostering of servant leaders (Freeman, 2011). Empirical research demonstrated support that spirituality forms the foundation of servant leadership (Dent, Higgins, & Wharff, 2005; Reave, 2005).

2.1.11. Adaptive Leadership

A relatively emergent leadership approach that has the properties for probable significant relationship with some individual and organizational factors is adaptive leadership. According to Garrity (2010) adaptive leadership involves doing activities by the leader such as articulating what is known, showing relevancy to the situation at hand, and proposing a course of action that creates a meaningful result. It involves the leaders to craft future visions that inspire others to accept change and become participants in the journey forward. An adaptive leadership competency involves moving knowledge into action.

2.1.12. Respectful Leadership

Respect has been defined as an individual’s attitude towards other people, that the individual sees a reason that, in itself, justifies a degree of attention and a type of behavior that in return engenders in the target a feeling of being appreciated in importance and worth as a person (van Quaquebeke, & Eckloff, 2010). Noticing other people means recognizing their importance and value. Respect therefore means challenging oneself with the task to find out who or what other people really are. Respect thus aims for an accurate assessment of the other person. It includes being consciously aware of the presence of the other person in one’s own environment, recognizing his or her role appropriately in the context of the situation and correctly understanding the mutual relationship.

2.1.13. Transcendent Leadership

A transcendent leader is a strategic leader who leads within and amongst the levels of self, others, and organization. Leadership of self is an emerging area in the leadership literature, while leadership of others has been the dominant focus of leadership research (Crossan, Vera, & Nanjad, 2008). Transcendent leadership
includes the alignment of three interrelated areas of business organization which are environment, strategy, and organization. In the view of (Ireland and Hitt, 2005) strategic leadership means a leader's ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, think strategically, and work with others to initiate changes that will create a viable future for the organization. The two leadership concepts, transcendent leadership and strategic leadership have the same focus and therefore mean the same as per as this analysis was concerned. A significant number of empirical findings demonstrated that characteristics and actions of strategic leaders are related to more distal outcomes such as company strategy and performance, as well as the relationships with and the performance of teams within the organization (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007; Resick, Whitman, Weingarden, & Hiller, 2009). The transcendent leadership approach is a good field for empirical research in organizations.

2.1.14. Open Leadership

Open leadership is an approach of leading employees and customers using social technologies to allow for constant learning. Open leadership is a new way of building relationships with organization’s most engaged and potentially most valuable customers and employees, especially when listening and learning that form the basic elements of open leadership are easy to adopt (Li, 2010). Open leaders are inherently curious about the world and have an insatiable need to constantly seek out opportunities to improve themselves and the world around them. They are curious about customers, about their employees, about suppliers, about industry trends, and about the wider world (Li, 2010). The new leadership approach is not simply being authentic, transparent, or real. Rather, it is a mixture of mindset, temperament, learned behaviors, and skills that build on and amplify good leadership skills (Li, 2010).

2.2. Administrative Leadership Approaches

These are the old leadership approaches that were the products of top-down, bureaucratic paradigms. The administrative models are eminently effective for an economy premised on physical production but are not well-suited for a more knowledge-oriented economy (Uhl-Bien, et al., 2007). For the purpose of this paper, therefore, six leadership approaches under the administrative category were discussed (see table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Leadership Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic leadership,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating structure and consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5 leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leadership & OCB Literature, 2011

2.2.1. Autocratic leadership

Autocratic leadership is the one in which the manager retains as much power and decision-making authority as possible (Peterson, 1997). The manager does not consult employees, nor are they allowed to give any input (De Hoogh, & Den Hartog, 2008). Employees are expected to obey orders without receiving any explanations. Aronson (2001) describes despotic leadership which is a variation of autocratic leadership as leadership based on personal dominance and authoritarian behavior that serves the self-interest of the leader, and the leader is self-aggrandizing and exploitative of others. Despotic leaders are domineering, controlling, and vengeful (Bass, 1990; House, & Howell, 1992; Howell, & Avolio, 1992; McClelland, 1975). Research demonstrates that autocratic leaders score low on the factor of consideration as identified by the Ohio State studies (Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004). This is largely because workers do not favor autocratic leaders. Empirical evidence has
shown that autocratic leaders negatively influence group stability and effectiveness (Van Vugt, Jepson, Hart, & De Cremer, 2004), group climate, and feelings of being content and happy (Bass, 1990).

**2.2.2. Democratic Leadership**

The democratic leadership style is also called the ‘participative style’ as it encourages employees to be a part of the decision making process. The democratic leader keeps his or her employees informed about everything that affects their work and shares decision making and problem solving responsibilities (Daft, 2005; Yukl, 2006). This style requires the leader to be a coach who has the final say, but gathers information from staff members before making a decision. Democratic leadership can produce high quality and high quantity work for long periods of time (Jayasingam, 2009). Many employees like the trust they receive from democratic leaders and respond with cooperation, team spirit, and high morale.

**2.2.3. Laissez-Faire Leadership**

The laissez-faire leadership style is also known as the ‘hands-off’ style. It is one in which the manager provides little or no direction and gives employees as much freedom as possible. All authority or power is given to the employees and they must determine goals, make decisions, and resolve problems on their own. Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson (2003) describe this form of leadership as the passive form of transactional leadership or passive-avoidant leadership. The laissez-faire leader does not take action or waits for problems to arise before acting; the leader fails to provide goals and standards for followers and refuses to clarify expectations for the followers (Rowold, & Heinritz, 2007).

**2.2.4. Bureaucratic Leadership**

Max Weber was prominent in describing the Bureaucratic Leadership Style. The bureaucratic leadership is based on adhering to normative rules and lines of authority (Weber, 1947). Leaders impose strict and systematic discipline on the followers and demand business-like conduct in the workplace. Leaders are empowered via the office they hold, that is the position power. Followers are promoted based on their ability to conform to the rules of the office. This style of leadership depends on the utilization of a system of files to solve problems and could be called the ‘leadership by centralization’ (Peterkin, 1996). Though, the leadership approach looks outdated, depending on the situation, the style could produce favorable employee behaviors.

**2.2.5. Consideration and Initiating Structure**

Consideration and Initiating Structure have provided a strong framework within which most modern leadership approaches have been using to theorize and expand the field of leadership. Consideration is the degree to which a leader shows concern and respect for followers, improve their welfare, appreciates their support and generally look after their personal needs. The second major style is called ‘initiating structure’, which is the degree to which a leader defines and organizes his/her role and the roles of followers, establishes goals, provides structured orientation toward goal attainment and establishes well-defined patterns and channels of communication in the organization (Schreisheim, & Stogdill, 1975). According to the findings of Ohio State Leadership studies, leaders exhibit two types of behaviors, people-oriented or consideration and task oriented or initiating structure to facilitate goal accomplishment (Schreisheim, & Stogdill, 1975). In a study of the relationship of the Ohio State leadership behaviors, both consideration and initiating structure have moderately strong, nonzero relations with leadership outcomes (Judge et al., 2004). Consideration has stronger relation with follower satisfaction, motivation, and leader effectiveness. Initiating Structure, on the other hand has slightly stronger relation with leader job performance and group-organization performance. This factor of consideration is strongly related to satisfaction, motivation, and effectiveness (Judge et al., 2004). The leadership dimensions also demonstrate significantly positive relationship to pro-social behaviors (Schake, Cochran, & Dumler, 1995).
2.2.6. Level Five Leadership

The Level Five Leadership is a leadership approach based on the idea that respect towards people, selflessness by the leader and a strong powerful commitment to achieve results help to produce the best performance from subordinates (Collins, 2001). Level 5 leaders are a paradoxical blend of fierce will and personal humility. They combined qualities including, stubbornness, ruthlessness and humility. They are humble, ambitious for their company and rarely allow their ego to be an obstacle for the success of their organization (Collins, 2001). Whenever they accomplish great things for their organizations, they attribute their remarkable accomplishments to their subordinates, external factors and sheer luck. Level 5 Leaders lead and become successful with the help of disciplined people, disciplined thought and disciplined action. Humility and will are the key ingredients of Level 5 leadership; the leaders are modest, willful, shy and fearless (Collins, 2001).

3.0. Conclusion and Implication

The paper has reviewed the leadership literature comprehensively regarding leadership styles or approaches and presented a synthesized report. Based on the existing leadership literature no study was found to have comprehensively reported both the old and emergent leadership approaches in one study, a gap which this paper adequately filled. Eighteen leadership approaches were reviewed and most of them were the emergent approaches that focused on shared and integrative approach to leadership. What was deduced from this review was that most of these leadership approaches including open leadership, legacy, righteous, dispersed, respectful, adaptive, and level 5 appeared to be under-researched. Little efforts were made to empirically investigate their relationships with some organizational and employee factors. This study has therefore exposed the huge challenges facing leadership theorists and indicated new directions for empirical leadership study. More elaborately, this paper has indicated the need for more research aimed at finding correlation between different leadership approaches and different kinds of individual and organizational factors such as job design, incentives, structure, performance, trust, commitment, job satisfaction, pro-social behaviors, et cetera. Therefore, this paper is significant because it unveiled the grey areas within the leadership body of knowledge that need further empirical validation. It also gave useful directions for new research to be undertaken for further development of leadership body of knowledge.
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