

MAPPING LEADERSHIP STYLES IN THE WORLDVIEW SPACE

Tatiana KRAWCZYŃSKA-ZAUCHA

Uniwersytet Pedagogiczny w Krakowie; tatiana.krawczynska-zaucha@up.krakow.pl,
ORCID: 0000-0001-6530-4206

Purpose: The purpose of this article is to identify the theoretical sources of the process of acquisition and development of leadership styles represented by managers in many industries.

Design/methodology/approach: The article analyzes five distinct management paradigms and leadership styles as emerging from five distinct worldviews currently present in the world.

Findings: It turns out that the realization, conscious or unconscious, of one paradigm of reality implies the adoption of a particular management style, which then influences the actions with groups, teams and entire organizations. Worldviews form a specific loop with a leader's mindset, which influences his actions and performance.

Research limitations/implications: The major limitations of this analysis are its theoretical nature and the question of whether it can be confirmed by a real life research.

Practical implications: Understanding the sources of behavior has implications for how organizations operate and can significantly impact the design of recruitment, initial training, and development programs as well as on what curriculum business schools offer..

Social implications: People interpret the reality around them through the worldview. It influences their values, beliefs, communication or management style. Companies with knowledge of the sources of management styles can intentionally create these styles through organizational culture and thus influence the surrounding community.

Originality/value: Sources of management and leadership styles as a prelude to the Industrial Revolution 4.0.

Keywords: paradigms of management, leadership styles, worldviews, Industrial Revolution 4.0.

Category of the paper: Research paper.

1. Introduction

Today's world provides many challenges for managers and leaders. In particular, the pandemic and resulting lockdown have exposed managerial competency gaps at unprecedented levels, and, although managers typically have access to training, mentoring, and coaching opportunities, these gaps are not shrinking or being altogether eliminated (Garcia

et al., 2020; Peters, 2020, WEF, 2020). Due to its complexity and unpredictability, managing in a VUCA (Krawczyńska-Zaucha, 2019) world presents leaders with novel challenges on an ongoing basis. Today, special attention is being paid to the: what is necessary for teams to function effectively and efficiently; organizations' true levels of communication; what actually motivates employees; and how leaders' behaviors contribute to their own professional development. Moreover, post-pandemic studies have shown that employees and managers who worked from home during the pandemic do not necessarily want to return to the office now but would appreciate the opportunity to continue working from home, where they can work flexible hours, lower stress levels, and increase work-life balance (Bailey, Rehman 2022). To satisfy this desire, some companies have adopted a four-day work week, and, based on research-study findings indicating that the average employee spends only 20% of his or her time in the office working effectively, seems to be a step in the right direction (Pelta, 2022).

Unfortunately, many managers who are highly skilled in hard competencies exhibit deficiencies in such soft-competency areas as communication, professional relationship building, planning, delegating authority, receiving and giving feedback, and team building (Parker, 2020). Furthermore, as also indicated in published research (Gallup, 2019), some do not fully understand what is expected of them, as, for instance, a manager that has difficulty delegating complex tasks because he/she is unsure what those tasks actually are. Problems with such soft skills as delegation extend to all levels of management, including the highest. However, as employees, including managers, typically participate in training and have access to ample coaching and mentoring opportunities, access to knowledge is not the cause of managerial soft-skill deficiency. Instead, we argue in this paper, managers' and leaders' competency levels, and the degree to which these are developed in any given individual, depend primarily on the individual's own beliefs and values.

Every individual and society has a particular worldview, and those that have appeared throughout human history and that exist today have been studied extensively. Upon close examination, most of the theories advanced in these studies are compatible with or complement one another or else broaden our perspective on or understanding of the worldview concept. However, the influence of individual worldview on managerial mindset has not yet been studied even though this relationship appears to be strong. That a manager's worldview significantly influences his/her mindset constitutes the first hypothesis explored here. The second is that leaders construct their mindsets within one of at least five reality paradigms, and the particular paradigm selected then influences a manager's choices with respect to managerial-competency development, including its level. The five worldview paradigms are discussed in detail below, and the specific behaviors of leaders resulting from this choice and the management and leadership styles they adopt as a result provide the starting point of this analysis.

It is worth noting that the subject of leadership paradigms affects many related fields, such as business ethics or leader's performance. If a leader's mindset, including his/her managerial competencies and the level of their development, is assumed to depend on the worldview he/she

has adopted, then every worldview existing today is the source of attitudes that influence level of behavior. Hence, their worldviews influence the ethical behaviors of managers, employees, and executives—an important point because, as is shown later in the paper, an individual is typically unaware of his/her particular worldview, which is an unconscious choice and which results from the individual's upbringing and education.

2. What is a worldview?

Originally a philosophical concept, the word “worldview” is now widely used and transdisciplinary. Kant first used the German term *Weltanschauung*, literally translated as “worldly view,” in his *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, to denote a concept implied by his philosophical system that could be reflected upon (Kant, 2013). Kant's approach makes it possible for an individual to recognize that he/she is constructing the reality around himself/herself (Copleston, 1996). Employing it in a broader sense than Kant had, Hegel used it to refer to the collective and historical subject, and his synthesis of history made worldview dependent on the collective cognitive subject and historical moment. The notion of worldview has since been linked to constant change, dynamism, and the laws governing cultural evolution.

Wilhelm von Humboldt postulated an unbroken link between worldview and language, stating that language subjectivizes cognition and so reflects the worldview of a collective entity such as a community or nation. His theses were later developed by many ethnolinguists, leading to claims that language itself encompasses a particular worldview. “Language is a factor that shapes people's ideas about the world. The language of a community organizes its culture because it classifies and organizes the impressions people receive from the world, structuring, as it were, a particular reality” (Polanski, 1993, p. 209).

The notion of worldview entered 20th century humanities thanks to the theory of worldviews formulated by Wilhelm Dilthey, who sought to analyze the reality of philosophical systems that had been in conflict for centuries and who questioned whether one of these was, in fact, the correct one (Dilthey, 1954, 2002). However, the creator of the theory of worldviews claimed that such a choice is impossible, because an individual's choice of any worldview system is determined by his/her own worldview, a tendency that, according to Dilthey, is conditioned by environmental and personality factors (Dilthey, 2002).

In his theory, Dilthey distinguishes between several types and forms of worldviews. However, only the structure that binds these worldviews together, which he describes as follows, is of interest in the context of this discussion:

All worldviews have ... essentially the same structure. This structure is each time a system, in which on the basis of a certain image of the world it is possible to solve the question about the meaning and sense of the world and on this basis to derive an ideal, the highest good, the most general principles governing life (Dilthey, 1954).

However, the conclusions that can be drawn from Dilthey's theory are crucial to the present analysis. When choosing a certain worldview, an individual falls into a vicious circle because this choice constitutes both a cause and an effect; the choice of a reality paradigm is made based on a foundation of values and beliefs that exist because of the reality paradigm already chosen. In addition, this "choice" is the result of an unconscious process determined by environment and personality.

Max Scheler also discussed the concept, stating that worldviews are: not necessarily, by way of reflection, realized and known, each time factual forms of looking at the world and ordering of visual data and data from the sphere of values by social entities (peoples, nations, cultural circles). These worldviews can be found and studied in the syntax of languages, but also in religion, ethos, etc. (Scheler, 1973).

According to Scheler, the worldview construct consists of two dimensions: a cognitive, conscious layer and unconscious presuppositions. Providing a succinct definition of the notion in question, Sire described it as a set of attitudes, values, narratives, and perceptions concerning the surrounding world that influence an individual's every thought and action. Worldview is therefore expressed in a person's ethics, religion, philosophy, scientific beliefs, and so on (Sire, 2004).

For the purposes of this analysis, "worldview" is treated as a paradigm of reality and hence is defined here as "a view on the world" (*Weltanschauung*, world view, or worldview). Moreover, the term is not viewed as referring to a fragment of reality only but rather to the entire spectrum of possible and existing things and phenomena, including man—with "man" denoting both an individual and humanity in general. Thus, in the context of this analysis, the term 'worldview' acts as a universal explanation of the world, simultaneously incorporating and intertwining the values and beliefs that constitute it and the values and beliefs, metaphysical assumptions, and conception of man that it implies and underlies. At the same time, the term gives all of these meanings within their own contexts and uses a particular semantics to express and describe the whole that, in fact, defines the worldview and serves to interpret reality.

Due to the existence of a worldview, individuals and societies do not come to know the world as such, but only through their presuppositions concerning it. In effect, we do not live in the real world but rather in our idea of what that world is like. Thus, *de facto*, we live in a specific interpretation of the real world, chosen either consciously or unconsciously, that our mind has created based on specific beliefs, values, presuppositions, concepts, and theories, and, in addition, we use specific semantics to describe and explain a given image within this context.

3. The worldviews that exist today

Starting with Maslow, who described the evolution of needs, many researchers have pointed to the evolution of individuals and societies. Thus, theories have been developed on the evolution of identity (Loevinger, 1976), morality (Kohlberg, 1985, Gilligan, 1977, 1982), values (Graves, 1970), spirituality (Fowler, 1981), consciousness (Gebser, 1985), and leadership (Kegan, 1982; Torbert, 1991). Evolution, however, is associated with the replacement of something by something different, i.e., with succession. Meanwhile, worth emphasizing is that, with respect to all evolution concerning the human mind, i.e., the sphere of emotions or spirituality, one should speak not about succession but rather about coexistence and development. In the case of such broad and multidimensional concepts as worldview, too, one should begin to think in terms of coexistence, not substitution. While Gebser spoke of mutations in consciousness, we are convinced that what was meant was, instead, the co-existence and co-evolution of worldviews. Here, co-evolution means different worldviews influence one another. This situation can occur through an individual's use of words characteristic of another worldview, although in this case they then do not have the same meaning as they do in that individual's own paradigm, or by the individual's changing to another paradigm when the one in which he/she was raised proves insufficient for his/her coherent realization of reality, a situation that, however, occurs, with extreme rareness (Wilber, 2000). Today, no single coherent worldview exists, and the belief in its existence is merely an illusion. Thus, the definition of a worldview should contain values, beliefs derived from values, and predispositions, assumptions, and theories that gather the above elements into a fairly coherent whole, expressed in a paradigm-specific language.

Beginning with the management and leadership styles known and used today, employing induction to isolate existing worldviews and proceeding through values and semantics reveals the worldviews that exist today. A leader's actions that treat people as only a means to achieve a goal set by the leader indicate the 'boss' style of management; these people are not respected; their needs, feelings, and aspirations are marginalized; and their worth in the leader's eyes rests only in their contribution to achieving the goal that he/she seeks to achieve. It is he/she who issues the orders, defines the goals, and sets the tasks and scope of the work, which he/she expects his/her subordinates to perform without discussion, suggestions for improvement, or refusal. Also crucial to recognizing this style of management is that the goal being worked toward satisfies only the leader's needs, which typically involve possession and attaining boundless power.

The values underlying these needs are typically power and money; and rule is exercised through fear, violence, and force. Beliefs arising from these values are easy to formulate: the world is a jungle, a place ruled by the stronger, richer, and more powerful; position must be won, no matter the cost; the weak are unimportant, do not count, and can be manipulated and

used by the leader to achieve his goals. The contextual worldview for this style of management is that the world is a place of struggle where winners are stronger, smarter, richer, and more influential and have better connections than their rivals.

Paradigms of reality affect an individual's entire perception of reality, and so his/her extending the 'boss' approach to other spheres of his/her life is inevitable. Here, relationships are important only insofar as they benefit his/her; trust is lacking, and compliance is obtained through exercising control, giving a reward, or, far more frequently, meting out punishment for noncompliance. The leader views the world as beginning and ending with him/her.

Within this paradigm of reality, the environment is seen as a place to be ruthlessly subjugated and exploited to the greatest extent possible to benefit an individual, a group, or a community. Graves' theory terms this paradigm "impulsive," and his students, who have called it "red" because such a worldview can color the world red not only figuratively but in some instances literally, further describe it as egocentric, imperialistic in structure, and exploitative in approach (Beck, Cowan 1996). Although it might seem that there is no place for leaders of this type in the twenty-first century, nothing could be further from the truth, as they can be found in almost every corporation and organization at various levels of management and in politics and science. Thus, this reality paradigm exists and appears to be flourishing.

The second style to be discussed that of 'director,' and individuals having this style are characterized by beliefs such as these: My authority is based on my position; I am right and know better than my subordinates how things should be done; I must, however, listen to those in authority above me in the hierarchy. To the 'director' type, another individual's value is directly proportional to the position he/she holds, the place he/she occupies in the social hierarchy, and the connections he/she has. One should not fraternize with those lower than oneself, he/she believes. The goal is to fulfill the duties belonging to the position, but quality in doing so is not a consideration; rather, it is to complete them, even if they are done poorly.

Three main values motivate the 'director' paradigm: rootedness in tradition ("It has always been done this way and so it works"); absolute submission to the hierarchy of positions, or seniority; and obedience to orders even if they seem unreasonable. Employees are seen merely cogs in an eternal mechanism of work and must perform in accordance with the scope of their duties, completing it within a specified time and displaying the expected behavior. Their feelings, thoughts, and emotions are not important; these must be kept hidden, and the world must be shown a cheerful face in spite of everything. The managerial context of such a paradigm is therefore a hierarchical world structured according to a particular pattern, idea, or key. Each individual occupies a specific place in such a structure, and this place defines the duties which he/she must perform. Everything that falls within the hierarchy, structure, or paradigm is good; what is outside it is bad. The world is seen as black and white with good fighting evil. If people do not fulfill their duties or do not behave according to expectations and duty, they have been tempted by evil in various forms or possessed by it, and they must atone

and return to the right way, even if they must sacrifice themselves. Beck and Cowan called this worldview “purposeful” with “an absolutist style of thinking, a pyramid structure, and an authoritative process” (Beck, Cowan 1996).

An achievement approach, termed “target achievement” by corporate employees, characterizes the ‘manager’ style of management (Beck, Cowan, 1996). A manager having this style is interested in what others think and feel when working with them but with the aim of utilizing their abilities to their full potential to achieve a set goal, which is to ensure that the manager, the organization, and the people working within it achieve well-being and an appropriate, i.e. a lavish, lifestyle. Should this not be the case, it is necessary to take out loans in order to achieve an adequate standard of living and to be able to show on social media that the company exists, because it has followers. This approach encourages consumerism and living beyond one's means, i.e., “work hard, play hard” slogans, using nurseries that teach toddlers three languages to prepare them for excellent primary schools, etc. The ‘manager’ style is characterized by several values: achievement, success, striving for a goal (often at any cost), ROI, a business plan, etc.

The characteristic features of the paradigm of reality from which this approach derives is the conviction that an individual can achieve anything if he or she invests the correct amount of work, commitment, and self-denial in doing so. The hierarchy or structure that gives everything its shape is not rigid, as in the earlier paradigm, but open, so that “from zero to hero” is possible. The world offers many opportunities for development, but not everyone is able to cope with the associated challenges and problems and are therefore “corpses on the side of evolution,” as Darwin said. In such a world, only the best win, the right strategy and the available technology must be utilized, and an individual must continue to pushing forward. Considered more broadly, this paradigm enables the development and progress of science and technology, because it allows questioning of the status quo and is characterized by multifaceted thinking, delegative structures, and strategy-based process (Beck, Cowan 1996).

The next style to be considered, the leader paradigm, encompasses qualities lacking in a manager's style, including noticing and appreciating the efforts of those working under him/her and not just the accomplishments attained through those efforts. To the leader, the path selected to achieve the goal is more important than actually achieving the goal, and he/she and the members of his/her team can travel this path together, supporting one another, even if those comprising the team differ. In fact, such diversity gives the team its strength, because, qualitatively, the team is more than the sum of its members’ abilities. The beliefs that provide the leadership style its foundation revolve around everyone’s ideas, which can be realized in concert, including weaker individuals, because everyone brings something unique to the team or community. The key values forming the “green” (Beck, Cowan, 1996) paradigm of reality are the following: community, team, group, togetherness, ideas, the good of all, respect, trust, and the attitude that everyone has the right to live. While this paradigm causes its possessor to treat everyone with respect, it also broadens spaces of respect, embracing the animal world and

all of nature, both animate and inanimate. Crucial to relationships is an awareness of the futility of judging others according to one's own criteria and achievements, because not everyone has access to the same opportunities to succeed and so not succeeding is not always the fault of individuals or even of entire societies. Children born in the slums of Cape Town have a completely different start in life and different opportunities than children born into the middle class in New York or the suburbs of Paris. The 'leader' paradigm is therefore grounded in pluralism and egalitarianism.

The "shared style" paradigm is an extremely rare leadership style. However, due to globalization and easy access globally to courses, training, and high-quality coaching, awareness of this style is becoming increasingly widespread, and some companies are now consciously and intentionally striving to reinforce this style among their management. It is not only the most employee-friendly style but also the most effective over the long term (Laloux, 2010).

Shared leadership is based on the belief that responsibility should not be strictly concentrated in only one person but, rather, dispersed among several people. The governing bodies of companies are typically made up of many people, assembled into boards of directors and supervisory boards, or divided among several stakeholders. Underlying this sharing of responsibility is the belief that combining the skills, competencies, and experiences of many people may prevent mistakes, and all focusing on one goal can create a new quality of interaction. The key values of this worldview are authenticity, building on strengths, collaboration, co-determination, and transitive decision-making (based on differing competencies) or synthetic insights. The shared leadership style has a dimension that the styles discussed previously lack—a holistic view, often referred to as "seeing the big picture" in management, which encompasses a perception of the time factor, i.e., it perceives a system as evolving and changing over time. The paradigm of reality on which this style is based is a systemic picture where even the smallest element is connected to the whole and can affect it, a concept analogous to chaos theory, where the movement of a butterfly's wings in China can affect the formation of a hurricane on the east coast of the United States.

This style is a global and ecological paradigm (Beck, Cowan, 1996), where the descriptor "ecological" is employed in its literal sense based on its etymology. The word "ecology" is derived from two Greek words: οἶκος (oikos), meaning "house" and the suffix -logia, derived from the Greek λόγος (lógos) meaning "word," "subject of discussion," or "science". Thus, translated literally, ecology is the science of home. The etymology of the word "ecology" thus reveals the perspective and approach of "the teal paradigm" (Wilber, 2000). It is a systemic interaction of all elements. In the context of leadership, it means no hierarchy and working together for development – holocracy.

4. A loop in the worldview

The discussion above reveals the sequence stemming from a leader's realized worldview and ending with his/her behavior: This worldview provides the specific values to be pursued, and these and other, life values define his/her beliefs, which, in turn, then determine his/her behavior. Every leader, however, is born into a particular worldview that shapes his/her and that reflects the worldview of the community, group, and family into which he or she was born. Being raised and educated in one paradigm causes an individual to accept it as being valid or even as being the only valid paradigm. Therefore, behaviors or mistakes made by members of a family may be repeated by other family members, generation to generation. Even some stages of the educational process may not be able to change an individual's beliefs regarding the paradigm into which he/she was born, especially since primary and even secondary education often takes place in communities that implement the same paradigm or some variant of it.

Thus, although the aforementioned discussion presents its adoption by an individual as a linear sequence, worldview is, in fact, multidimensional and can change slightly over time. It is comprised of an entire system of beliefs and values that are reflected in a system of word meanings, including their interpretation and explanation, which support and reinforce each other and thus form a reasonably coherent picture of the world that enables an individual to pursue his/her daily life and work. Once again, we employ the term "reasonably coherent" because no worldview is fully coherent or provides a complete explanation of reality. Each suffers from limitations, some uncertainties, logical or semantic errors, and even contradictions. However, this does not prevent whole communities from pursuing and simultaneously creating a paradigm over the years.

A key challenge for leaders is to allow for the existence of other paradigms, a trait based on the ability to view oneself and one's own worldview from a different perspective. This perspective must, at the very least, be that of a third person and preferably should be a systemic, or even a changing systemic, perspective. Research indicates that the ability to perceive another's perspective by adopting their point of view is extremely rare, and only 1.5 people out of 100 possess the ability to see the big picture, which typically changes over time. Following acceptance of other worldviews, the next step, which often requires significant developmental work, is to accept the possible validity of other worldviews, which is actually a matter of changing semantics. For instance, one point of view may understand the meaning of the adjective "right" used to describe something as meaning that this something is completely correct. However, another point of view, even a privileged one (because it is mine), allows for other points of view, or even an infinity of them, to also be valid. In practice, this implies openness to new solutions, ideas, and willingness to engage in discussion. So, in order for an individual to consider other points of view as sufficiently valuable to be considered, a paradigm shift is needed, and this, as we know, happens rarely.

The type and degree of an individual's managerial and leadership competencies are dependent on the paradigm that the individual lives by. A manager functioning in the "manager" paradigm will not consider the opinion of his/her employees as having any value whatsoever and will not consider it worthwhile to listen to them. The fact that he/she occupies a managerial position implies that he/she is right, and anyone who claims otherwise is incorrect. Such a manager will therefore see no need to develop his/her communication skills; after all, why should he/she? Even if his/her subordinates' feedback is negative and the HR department has sent his/her to communication training, he/she will not gain much from it, because his/her beliefs, based on the values of his/her given worldview, will block any progress toward learning in this area. He/she may well practice certain behaviors that he/she has been trained in, but without their being grounded in his/her personal beliefs and professional values, these will be viewed as contrived or simply as training situations. When in difficult or challenging situations or when having to act under pressure, he/she will fall back on his/her reactive, belief-based behaviors.

Training, which typically focuses on imparting knowledge or modifying behaviors rather than on transforming worldviews by changing beliefs and values thus tends to have a very low ROI. Moreover, during managerial training in soft skills, lack of knowledge is typically not an issue. The level of managers' knowledge may be high, usually higher than they realize in fact. Instead, the problem is lack of the skills needed to apply this knowledge in specific situations. The knowledge then seems to be a "package" lacking context and context, analogous to a suitcase to which the owner has lost the key and so is unable to use its contents, which may be valuable. Only when opened by a person who is aware of its contents (context) will it prove useful, e.g., during a specialist conference or in an SPA hotel (situation).

Managers may have a great deal of knowledge but may not know how to use it, because it is incompatible with their paradigm of reality and so does not fit into their system of values, beliefs, and language, rendering them unable to actively and effectively use it. Therefore, we believe, a manager's development of personal and professional competence is less influenced by the studies and training to which he/she has been exposed and more influenced by his/her personal belief regarding the potential usefulness of the particular competence to him/her. Studies and training may open a leader to a different worldview, but without developmental work on his/her mindset, these will not succeed in changing his/her values and beliefs, and, even if he/she learns to use different words to express his/her aspirations, these words will have different meanings for him/her, or perhaps even be meaningless to him/her, because they are not compatible with his/her given worldview.

Thus, worldview influences managers' mindsets, forcing them to choose and develop specific competences that the point of view imparted by their given paradigm of reality causes them to deem important. Additionally, this paradigm allocates value to a competency through the prism of its own value system, employing its own semantics.

5. Discussion

The intent of this paper was to demonstrate that managerial competence can depend on one of the five worldviews identified and described here. Approaching the issue analytically, this research contributes to the theoretical conversation on leadership style that is based on one of the at least five worldviews that exist today. Isolating the beliefs and values expressed in particular semantics enabled analysis of the leadership style resulting from each worldview and identification of the worldview itself. Each of these worldviews, extrapolated to other aspects of individual and community life, thus emerged as a paradigm familiar to all from published research.

Our study nonetheless suffers from some limitations. One, the question arises as to whether the results of such a study can be confirmed by research. Other questions concern the percentage of each worldview that can be found in the world today and the percentage of managers that change their worldview? Moreover, is there an algorithm that enables or accelerates such a change? And finally, in light of the studies cited previously, is analysis of management and leadership style possible? That is, will a researcher's worldview, perhaps one not identified here, allow a genuine analysis to be performed?

The research of Beck and Cowan addresses the practicalities of worldview analysis. According to Wilber's nomenclature, although many portals exist that allow worldview or level of consciousness to be tested, no well-designed studies based on scientific standards exist. However, it would be worthwhile to conduct this research strictly involving only managers and preferably employing a cross-sectional analysis in different communities, countries, or organizations having differing cultures.

Another area for analysis is the contribution particular worldviews make within a particular context, a question answered by Wilber in *The Theory of Everything*. This answer was, however, given twenty years ago, and the views of both individuals and societies have changed significantly since that time. The global balance of political forces in the world has changed so significantly over twenty years and in such ways that no one from that time would have dared to predict. Therefore, we cannot assert that we have reliable data on the percentage of particular paradigms in today's world, let alone among today's business managers. This immediately raises the question: do the worldview distributions within corporations, NGOs, small- and medium-sized companies, etc., differ or are they homogeneous? Similar questions arise with respect to the percentage of managers who change worldview and whether these changes occur with any sort of regularity. Related questions concern what leads to such changes and whether they can be induced or accelerated. Only well conducted research can answer these questions.

An interesting issue within the worldview context involves managerial and business ethics. In a sense, each paradigm of reality creates its own ethics, sets its own boundaries, and establishes its own criteria to measure what is acceptable, and managers do not always

consciously adopt these in implementing particular paradigms. The influence of his/her worldview, therefore, extends beyond an individual leader's professional life. Moreover, within his/her professional life, it encompasses his/her team, subordinates, co-workers, and, in some cases, others. Would it not then be worthwhile to consider adoption of education in more integral ethics designed to show managers and leaders the broad spectrum of ethics that results from differing worldviews, along with the consequences of particular choices?

6. Conclusion

The Our study of the sources of leadership style paints a multi-dimensional picture of worldviews influencing every aspect of people's lives, including their ethical and communication choices, their relationship-building styles, the degree of delegation they practice, and even their approach to people. While the research raised many questions that remain unanswered, its findings suggest a broader look at the sources of managers' and leaders' behavior in companies and organizations. Awareness of the sources of behavior has implications for how organizations operate and can significantly impact the design of recruitment, initial training, and development programs as well as on what curriculum business schools offer. In light of the analyses described above, it is important to remember that knowledge is secondary to worldview, and the desire to acquire or deepen it correlates with an individual's personal and professional beliefs and values. Thus, the values of the best business studies, an MBA, or training must be measured by its compatibility with the paradigm in which the manager lives and works. If the knowledge he/she acquires is from a worldview differing from his/her, then it will most likely lack context for him and confer no ability to be applied to specific work situations. It remains useless.

The importance of evolving management and leadership styles in today's post-pandemic world remains a key issue, and the consciously designed change discussed herein could possibly be the focus of the fourth industrial revolution. This paper has clearly shown the origins of the various management styles and has isolated the key elements by which a particular style can be identified. Thus, we have the end of Ariadne's thread in our hands; it is now up to us to cooperate in escaping the maze.

References

1. Bailey, J.R., Rehman, S. (2022). How to Overcome Return-to-Office Resistance. *Harvard Business Review*, <https://hbr.org/2022/02/how-to-overcome-return-to-office-resistance>.
2. Beck, D.E., Cowan, Ch. (1996). *Spiral Dynamics: Mastering Values, Leadership and Change*. Blackwell Publishing.
3. Copleston, F. (1996). *Historia filozofii, t. 6*. PAX.
4. Dilthey, W. (1954). *The Essence of Philosophy*. University of North Carolina Press.
5. Dilthey, W. (2002). *The Formation of the Historical World in the Human Sciences*. Princeton University Press.
6. Fowler, J. (1981). *Stages of Faith: The Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning*. HarperOne.
7. Garcia, J., Maples, G., Park, M. (2020). Closing the capability gap in the time of COVID-19, *McKinsey Quarterly*, 11.
8. Gebser, J. (1985). *The Ever-Present Origin*. Ohio University Press.
9. Gilligan, C. (1977). *In a Different Voice: Women's Conceptions of Self and of Morality*. *Harv. Educ. Rev.*, 47(4), 481-517. DOI:10.17763/haer.47.4.g6167429416hg5l0.
10. Gilligan, C. (1982). *In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory And Women's Development*. Harvard University Press.
11. Graves, C. (1970). Levels of Existence: An Open System Theory of Values. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 10(2), 131-155. DOI: 10.1177/002216787001000205.
12. Kant, I. (2013). *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Harvard University Press.
14. Kohlberg, L. (1985). *Essays On Moral Development*. Harper & Row.
15. Krawczyńska-Zaucha, T. (2019). A new paradigm of management and leadership in the VUCA world. *Organization And Management Series*, 141, 221-230.
16. Laloux, F. (2014). *Reinventing Organizations*. Nelson Parker.
17. Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego Development*. Jossey-Bass.
18. Parker, S.K., Knight, C., Keller, A. (2020). *Remote Managers Are Having Trust Issues*, HBR 07, <https://hbr.org/2020/07/remote-managers-are-having-trust-issues>.
19. Pelta, R. (2022). <https://www.flexjobs.com/blog/post/remote-flexible-companies-with-4-day-workweek/>.
20. Peters, E., (2020). Reinventing Workers for the Post-Covid Economy. *N.Y. Times*, Dec. 4, 2020, <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/01/business/economy/workers-jobs-training.html>.
21. Scheler, M. (1973). *Selected philosophical essays*. Publisher Evanston, Northwestern University Press.

22. Sire, J.W. (2004). *Naming the Elephant: Worldview as a Concept*. InterVarsity Press.
23. Torbert, W.R. (1991). *The power of balance: Transforming self, society, and scientific inquiry*. Newbury Park Sage.
24. Wilber, K. (2000). *A Theory of Everything: An Integral Vision for Business, Politics, Science, and Spirituality*. Shambhala Publications.
25. World Econ. F., The Future of Jobs Report 2020 6 (Oct. 2020), http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Future_of_Jobs_2020.pdf.