Article:	**The Notion of Individuality of CEO and Organizational Thinking: Responsive/Reflexive Process in Case of Apple Verses Microsoft Computers**
Author:	Malik Umer Ayub
Online Published:	October 2017
Article DOI:	10.32350/OTR.0101.05
Article QR Code:	Malik Umer Ayub
To cite this article:	Ayub, M. U. (2017). The notion of individuality of CEO and organizational thinking: Responsive/reflexive process in case of Apple verses Microsoft. *Organization Theory Review, 1*(1), 41–55. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32350/OTR.0101.05

The Notion of Individuality of CEO and Organizational Thinking: Responsive/Reflexive Process in Case of Apple Verses Microsoft Computers

Malik Umer Ayub

University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan

Abstract

Responsive or reflexive process thinking versus systemic process thinking in organizations has been a point of great discussion among different researchers and scholars. The following paper is aimed to discuss responsive process thinking in terms of two different leadership styles in their respective organizations and along with its consequences. A responsive process has been proactive in Apple computers, and responsive process has been reactive in Microsoft computers. Individualists define the idea of self for a self-determining organization that is separate from groups and collectivists explain the self in relations to its connection to others. The role of individual in the form of Steve Jobs as a proactive leader in case of Apple computers and the role of team work in the form of Bill Gates as a reactive leader in case of Microsoft computers is discussed.

Keywords: responsive/reflexive, systemic, individualists, collectivist

Introduction & Literature Survey

Researchers and scholars have a deep consensus that interaction among individuals is essential for the successful operations of the organizations (Stacey, 1992). The latest restructuring of work and organization related to cross functional and cross-disciplinary teams along with the increase in inter-organizational collaborations and international alliances has stressed the need for collaborations even more (McAllister, 1995). In the literature, scholars summarize four defining attributes of individuals and collectivists (i.e., about those who believe in team work) in organizations. First, the idea of self for the individualists is a self-determining unit which is independent from groups; while collectivists define the self in terms of its links to others in various in groups (Chen et al., 1998). Secondly, personal goals are preferred over group goals in individualism, while they are considered secondary to the combined goals in collectivism (Realo et al., 2002). In case of differences between individuals and collectivists' interests, individualists see it as an opportunity to themselves, while collectivists find it essential to give importance to collective interests (Chen et al., 2002). Thirdly, individualists are more expected to be driven by their own beliefs, attitudes, and values (Moorman & Blakely, 1995), while societal conducts of collectivists are more expected to be driven by duties, obligations and social norms. Finally, individualists are more apprehensive about task accomplishment occasionally at the cost of relationships; meanwhile collectivists give more importance to delightful relationships, sometimes at the cost of task fulfillment (Moorman & Blakely, 1995).

According to systemic view an organization is perceived as an entity detached from people, an entity that the managers can provide direction, and the movement around in time and the conceptual space (Stacey, 2007). The moment one takes a responsive process view he or she starts thinking of an organization as nothing but more or less interaction patterns between human individuals.

According to Stacey (2007), social responsive process thinking advanced in reaction to Kantian philosophy. As it is already mentioned, Kant argued that humans come to know fact through the scientific method, showing that these humans take positions of the unbiased observer outer to the phenomenon to be identified, formulate a hypothesis regarding them and assess the hypothesis in trial action. Kant described systems as self-

organizing whole including parts that intermingle with one other for creating both the whole and themselves. Moreover, the whole advances with time in goal-directed or purposeful style moving from emergent to mature stage in developmental phases. The system or process is assumed as describing the resolution or established form attributed to, or enfolded in, the idea behind the system or process. According to Kant, the material of strategy is believed as the design for intentional drive via system with deliberate changes to the procedure over the periods of time by an evaluator standing external to them. Here strategy is all about dealing with the systems and scheming process (Jeannerod & Pacherie, 2004).

2. Responsive Process Thinking

Based on perspective of Kant, it will be likely to attain position that is exterior to societal collaboration and neutrally observe it. From the perspective of the romantic idealists, this is not possible, since all insecure individuals always participate in shared activity, even while thinking of observing the phenomenon from an external position (Burkitt, 2008). In Hegel's system of beliefs, the evolution of idea takes place by way of contradiction among the people and the people's experienced world is the one that is created in their minds (Paletz & Peng, 2009). Hegel debated that individuals are basically social practitioners as whatever they think say or do is carried out in the background of social practices, where these practices furnish the required resources, object of desire, skills and procedures. In contrast to Kantian thinking, Hegel puts a perspective in which he argues that the individual and social duality cannot be separated.

As a matter of fact, individual awareness and self-consciousness arise in the social relations, which are being simultaneously constructed. This notion is obviously an inconsistent perspective in which the minds of individuals concurrently shape and are shaped by social associations. This presents a different concept of causality which may

be called transformative causality (Johannessen & Stacey, 2005). Hegel's thought also influenced Elias as the conception of social responsive processes is reflected in his sociology. He recommended that a connection must be identified between social and individuals specifically if we decline to learn the processes of development, of their be-coming. Elias contended in contradiction of the notions of civilization like some sort of 'whole', debating that the social lives of human beings are full of conflicts, pressures and outbursts than being pleasant as idea of 'whole' implies (Stacey, 2003).

In order to understand the nature of human interaction, Elias conducted an in-depth study on changes in the means that western individuals have experienced over years and highlighted the emergence of social direction in interaction among people. Elias indicated western civilization must not be considered as the consequence of any sort of predetermined strategic planning. Individuals did not shape a purpose to alter development; rather they gradually becoame conscious of intention through means of logical purposive actions. This is unconceivable that evolution of civilization can be attributed to a result of any planning as assumed by contemporary calculation, rational individuals with a kind of self-mastery previously existed centuries back, whereas Elias's findings that each individual was not supposed to exist then however, were, rather, themselves the outcomes of social evolution (Stacey, 2007). Social changes manufactured rational planning of people. Elias discusses a tendency and direction in the development of the consequences regarding interweaving of one's own purposes, strategies and aims, likewise, the idea about spontaneous organizing of the self and its emergence.

3. Core Issues

In the history, most researchers considered the scientific revolution as a movement of thought in which people come to hold that the eternal laws of nature can be unstated not through exposure, but through human

reason (Worley, 2011). For instance, in the earlier sixteenth century, Copernicus and some other researchers examined and tried to measure the movements of planets and thus advanced theories on the rules and laws constituting their movements. Galileo captured that idea and started doing work on it in ear-ly seventeenth century as did Newton and Leibniz at the end of seventeenth century (Kuiper, 2009). Meanwhile during this same period, the philosophers like Bacon and Descartes effectively expressed the manner by which individuals continued to experience themselves as people carrying minds inside them (Note et al., 2005).

In the mid of eighteenth-century Hume took a radical stance and expressed that the mind inflicts its own order on the perceptions coming from outside apparent world. However, that this order is simply a link of thoughts and habits of man's creativity, by which it considers causal connections (Kant, 1998). Philosopher Kant was influenced by the forward movements in people knowledge carried out by the scientific method, however, he also accepted that it wasn't enough to dogmatically hypothesize that reality is known directly. Hence he agreed on that we know what we know by sensation arriving from the factual world and that the intellect imposes an arrangement of its own upon the sensation and due to which one may not know reality directly. He thus postulated the dualism (Hollis, 1996). If on one side there was a reality that he termed nominal, then on other side there was manifestation of this reality in the form of sensations that he termed phenomenal. Kant went further than offering a philosophical justification of the mechanistic understanding of nature supplied by scientists. He seized that while it was useful to comprehend in animated nature in this manner, it was not sufficient for an understanding of living organisms. He proposed that organisms could be more usefully recognized as self-organizing systems that are very different from mechanisms.

Till this point, the conversation has been around some of the responses to the scientific method and some key aspects of its development, specifically, the move from mechanistic and reductionist ways of thinking to holistic and systemic styles of thinking. Of course these developments are reflected in thinking about organizations and their management during twentieth century. The mechanistic and reductionist approach of the preliminary scientific revolution is quite evident in what has come to be known as scientific management. Taylor (1911) and Fayol (1916) were supposed to be the founding figures of scientific management and they were engineers (Stacey, 2007).

The management science discipline equated the scientists with the managers, and organization with phenomenon which the scientist is related with. The specific approach that the managers alleged to control organization is that of the scientist, called the objective observer, who considers the phenomenon similarly to mechanism. The whole mechanism is considered to be the aggregate of its parts. The conduct of every part is considered to be governed by enduring laws. Hence, an organization is considered to be governed by efficient (if then) relationship and the main concerns of managers are with these causally related rules. A quite clear assumption is that there is some kind of rules, which are optimal. This mainly produces efficient global outcome regarding actions of the parts, or units of the organization. Something like Kant's self-governing individual and the supporting rationalist causality is imported into theories of scientific management but with some important distinction. Initially, it is simply the manager to whom rational causality implements. It is the organization individual who exercises the liberty of autonomous choice in the act of selecting the goals and designing the tenets that the individuals of organization have to follow to achieve the goals. Secondly, Kant's pairing of autonomous individual actions with universal moral and ethical principles supposed to be absent

within the logical causality of management science, which deals with human actions as the reflex-like reaction or response to stimuli in line with behaviorist psychology of its time.

The moral aspect emerges to somewhat extent in there action against the human relation school to the scientific management. Till 1930s, the perspective that Taylor and Fayol assumed of human behavior was keenly contested by people like Elton Mayo (1945), who was a social psychologist. He carried out trials to identify what it was that motivated employees and what influenced motivational factors had caused on their work (Fischer, 1994). He figured out how they structured themselves into the shape of groups that quickly developed customs, routines, duties and rituals. He further argued that managers would only be successful if these groups admitted their leadership and authority. He deduced that manager's role in organizing teamwork was a key to sustain cooperation. Mayo actually didn't discard the scientific method but rather sought to apply scientific approach to the study and application of motivation in groups.

From 1940's to 1960's, behavioral researchers, extended this work and inferred that efficient groups had been those in which the goals and values of the group were in line with those of the individual workers, those workers were committed to the group as well as to its leader (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). The efficiency of group was supposed to depend on personal following group goals and values carrying high level of confidence and trust among each other in a harmonious supportive atmosphere. For creating a freedom oriented environment within an organization and focusing attention to motivational factors, the school of human relations took a complete notion of causality.

Taking both human relations and scientific management together we find a theory carrying stability that is preserved by motivational rules which administer the behavior of an organizational member. The transformation is brought about through managers while they decide to alter the rules which they must do in a way that motivates and respects others so that the planned set of rules will yield favorable outcomes (Eastman & Bailey, 1994).

The organizations are considered to work like machines attaining intentionally selected by their managers. Within this framework, radical kind of transformation cannot be explicated. Such a transformation is simply due to rational decision making of managers and just how these decisions are not a part of these theories dares to explain. The outcome is a powerful way of planning and managing when the goals, objectives and tasks are clear, there is not enough uncertainty and the individuals are plausibly passive although inadequate in some other situations (Stacey, 2007). Truly new change and dealing with situations of great uncertainty and complexity were primarily not part of what human relations and scientific management intend to account for or accomplish.

Maturana and Varela (1987) describe a constructivist perspective of human's psychology. According to them, individuals not simply react to stimuli demonstrated by environment; however choose aspects of their surrounding relevant to their own identities (Botella, 1995). In other words, they say and bring forth, the environment that is significant to them. The individual's world is an active composition by that individual of his or her own world that is not a passive representation of a pre-given world everything included, in a sense creates his/her own world.

One influential writer on organizations who adopts a constructivist approach is Karle Weick. He emphasizes enactment and also the role of storytelling in communities of practice as processes of sense making. Weick describes the particular importance to novel moments within the process of sense making. He discovers the origins of novelty

in differences, surprise, dissonance, gaps, uncertainty and unexpected failure. For him it is events of this kind that trigger sense making, which could produce novel explanations. He describes the process as one that involves emotions and is necessarily confusing (Weick, 1995). What he does not question is the split between individual and social and the dual causality that goes with it.

4. Chaos and Complexity

Chaos theory is related with the properties of deterministic, iterative, nonlinear mathematical relationships, that is, an algorithm in which the outcome of iteration becomes the input of the next. In other words, the current state is determined by referring, through a deterministic nonlinear algorithm, to its own previous state (Farmer & Sidorowich, 1988). At some values of a control parameter, these models display a strange attractor called chaos, a contradiction of stability and the instability, the predictability and unpredictability at a few times. Even so the pattern of movement takes one, and only one, form, namely that of the particular strange attracter generated by the particular algorithmic relationship specified.

The theory of complex adaptive systems differs from Chaos which exposes characteristics of iterating linkage among the detached algorithms standing for organizations constituting a system, instead of other iterating algorithms shaping the whole system. The former focuses on the micro level whereas the latter focuses on the macro level. There are two different types of complicated adaptive system simulations. The first one, is where the algorithms or agents consisting of the system are all the same as each other, i.e. in the Boids simulation (Reynolds, 1987), in which he calls everyone's algorithm a 'Boid', and he screams the population-wide pattern they produce 'flocking' (Bayazit et al., 2003). Few of the organizational theorists explain simulations as the Boids, that when a manager desires that his or her organization has to produce strategy or over all pattern of highly complex nature,

it is not sufficient to create and impose that strategy. Alternatively, the manager must establish some basic rules and regulations which definitely help the supremacy of self-organization thereby allowing emergence to take place.

According to Mead (1961) and Stacey (2003):

- The significant human characteristics of consciousness arise in public social interactions

- He made an argument that these fundamental interactions may occur in the form of discussion of gestures

- Very selves of interdependent people are constituted.

- These ordinary conversations become responsible for the emergence of meaningful themes.

- These emerging themes then become responsible for organizational strategies.

- So the emergence of novel strategies depends upon the practice of fluid, spontaneous shapes of conversation. The expectation of such communicative dynamics occurring depends up the communicative practices that are advanced in an organization, in the way in which concern is tackled with and on the type of power relations among people.

In the aforementioned sections, initially the discussion has been commenced by describing different concepts of individualism vs. collectivism taking help from literature of organization theory (OT). Then, moving further, the systemic and responsive process thinking along with some core issues form OT literature are discussed.

5. Methodology

In the methodology section it is time to discuss some visionary and managerial leadership styles for the purpose of correlating the responsive process thinking proactive in case of Apple computers and the responsive

process thinking reactive in case of Microsoft computers.

5.1. Leadership Styles (Visionary Vs Managerial)

5.1.1. Visionary leader. Some of the characteristics of visionary leaders are as follows:

- Proactive, form ideas and can change the way people think about which is suitable and necessary to them.

- Work in order to develop choices, alternative fresh approaches for long-standing issues and problems and perform from high risk positions.

- Influence thoughts and opinions of other people in the organization.

- Concerned to make sure better organization's future particularly through management and development of people.

- Greater embedded in complexity, uncertainty and information load; participate in cross-functional integrative tasks.

- Knowing not less than all functional area experts.

- Eager to invest further in creating and managing the effective human capital and continuing the effective culture for ensuring prolonged viability.

- Focus the attention on making strategies to develop and manage tacit knowledge for promoting enactment of a vision.

- Consider strategic choice more important, which can make a difference in the organization and the environment in which it is being operated.

5.1.2. Managerial leader. Now some characteristics of managerial leader are:

- Responsive, adopt passive stance towards goals, emerge from necessities, do not desire and dreams goals and targets based on past.

- See work as an enabling process that involves some blend of ideas and individuals interacting for establishing strategies.

- Communicate to individuals as per their roles in the process of decision making.

- View themselves like conservators and controllers of existent arrangement.

- Influence decisions and actions of those with whom they perform tasks.

- Show concern to the conditions and contextualize characteristics of daily and routine activities.

- Apprehensive with and feel comfortable in functional domains of duties and responsibilities.

- Proficient in their operational domain of working.

- Participate and support cost effective behavior to enhance figures of the financial performance.

- Concentrate on managing and administering the exchange and grouping of explicit knowledge and making certain the compliance to SOPs.

- Consider determinism important, means, the choices they formulate are determined their internal and external environment.

After discussing these two popular leadership styles, the author is going to discuss and analyze two different individuals as leaders in terms of responsive process thinking playing different roles in their respective organizations. The role of Steve Jobs, as pro-active leader, in case of Apple computers and the role of Bill Gates, as reactive leader, in case of Microsoft computers. There are a few successful leaders in this business world who have transformed their organizations and the industries in which they function and operate. The most popular of them are Steve Jobs and Bill Gates.

5.2. A Responsive Process has been a Proactive Leadership in Apple Computer

Steven Jobs was born on 24th February, 1955. He was one of the founders of Apple Incorporation and an American business man. Earlier, he was CEO of Studio of Pixar Animation and participant of Walt Disney board. He worked on introducing Apple II series and later on Macintosh, along with Steve Wozniak, the co-founder of Apple in 1970.

In next decade, he anticipated the power and marketing strength of graphical user interface (GUI). During the same time period, due to the differences with board of directors, he left Apple and joined NeXT that had speciality in business markets and higher education as a computer technology firm. In 1997, the NeXT was sold out to Apple and thus Steve Jobs became once again the employee of once his own company. Afterwards, he became CEO of NeXT.

Jobs purchased the graphical section of Lucas film, in 1986 it turned into Pixar Animation Studios. Steve was CEO, also having its shares till 2006 when Walt Disney took it over. He became a trustee of board of directors of Walt Disney. Steve Jobs business history, to a larger extent, contributed as symbolic image of the distinguishing unique Silicon Valley entrepreneur, stressing the significance of design and recognizing the essential role, aesthetics performed in public appeal (Cuban & Tzu, 2011). His efforts drove forward product development which was both functional and elegant. This earned him loyal and devoted following.

It was beginning of January 2009 when Steve Jobs took a leave for five months from Apple for liver transplantation. After his surgery, he again continued his work with Apple and appointed again as CEO in June, 29, 2009.

Steve Jobs was a charismatic and persuasive director of Apple, employees of that time described him as unpredictable and explosive manager. It was due to his explosive personality and partly low sales because of industry sales crisis that his working relations suffered with Scullery in 1984. This continued in 1985, when decision about employees' layoffs and internal power problem occurred. Scullery removed Jobs from the Macintosh division as its head. Meanwhile, Jobs was considering NeXT because like Apple its working stations were advanced. At about the same time Jobs established another computer named NeXT. NeXT computer proved to be technologically advanced but was mostly dismissed by industry due to being cost inefficient. Jobs illustrated NeXT cube as interpersonal computer and considered it next step following the personal computing. NeXT mail was believed to be the earliest that supported clickable embedded, universally visible graphics email audio (Costea et al., 1998). Jobs led NeXT with a passion and aesthetic perfection as manifested by such things like magnesium case of NeXT cube.

Jobs purchased from Lucas film's computer, the graphics group named Pixar in 1986 for $10 million price. Out of this $10 million, $5 million were from the company's capital (Catmull, 2008). Newly formed company was based in San Rafael California, later shifted its base to Emeryville, California and was initially planned as high end hardware graphics developer. Continuingly growing as unprofitable firm, sold Pixar image computer, and contracted to Disney for producing computer animated films. Disney took responsibility of co-financing and distribution. The partnership between Pixar and Disney ended in 2004. With Bob Iger replaced Eisner as Disney's new chief, Disney agreed to buy the whole stock transaction for $7.4 billion on January 24, 2006. Jobs became the largest shareholder of Disney Company having approximately 7% of shares (Alef, 2010). Jobs took the lead among directors of the company. He supervised both companies' joint animation works by formulating a guidance committee consisting of six members.

Steve Jobs reacted to strong views on Apple's inefficiency of programs of electronic waste in America and retorted in defense at environmental advocating agencies in annual meeting of Apple in Cupertino. Meanwhile, Apple announced few weeks later that it was going to take back all iPods from its retail stores. The take back campaign of iPods was responded through a plane carrying a banner at the top of graduation center of Stanford University where he was the inauguration guest of honor (Coalition, 2003). The statement written on a banner was "Steve — don't be a mini-player, recycle all e-waste." Apple's recycling program was further expanded in 2006, by Jobs to any US customer who intended to buy a new Mac. The program included shipping and "environment friendly disposals, company's older systems.

5.2.1. Management style. A lot has been said and written of Jobs' demanding and aggressive front. Fortunes wrote"he is considered as one of leading egomaniacs of Silicon Valley". In Mike Moritz's "The Little Kingdom" an authenticated biography of Jobs, comments about temperamental style of management can be found. A former colleague, Jeff Raskin, once said about Job that "he might have been qualified for an admirable king of France", thus alluding to persuasive persona of Jobs.

Positioning Apple and its products as market leader in information technology industry had always been Steve jobs' great aspiration. He did this at least in offering unique style and innovation through his foresightedness and trend setting abilities (Tappin & Cave, 2010). Jobs delivered many famous speeches and in one of his keynote speeches in January 2007 at the Conference of Macworld and Expo, quoting Wayne Gretzky-an ice hockey legend "I adore 'I skate to where the puck is ought to be', and at Apple we always tried to do in the same way from the very beginning and we would always dare to do like this".

Steve Jobs was a vegetarian. He usually used to wear St. Croix and Levi's branded long-sleeved black turtleneck shirt sneakers and blue jeans. He held an open speech with CEO of Dell Computers by criticizing Dell for producing uninnovative beige boxes. In 1997, in Gartner Symposium, when inquired about his reaction on similar situation, Mr. Dell immediately responded that he would like to shut it down and distribute the money among its shareholders. Steve Jobs in 2006 sent an email to all its shareholders and employees when market capitalization of Apple exceeded Dell. Its content was:

"Team, it seemed that Michael Dell was unable to predict future. Today based on market closed stock, Apple is worth above Dell. Stock may rise and fall, and tomorrow situations may be different, but today let me take this opportunity to share that it was worth a moment of reflection".

He cancelled book selling through Apple stores published by John Wiley and Sons in 2005. He took this decision in reaction to publishing an unauthorized biography, iCon: Steve Jobs.

5.2.2. Achievements. Steve Jobs was given National Medal of Technology along with Steve Wozniak in 1985 and thus being the first one among people to receive the honor.

- Steve Jobs was given another award especially for Public Service in 1987. The category was "an individual thirty five (35) years or under".

- He was declared to be the most powerful business man according to Fortune magazine in 2007.

- He was included in the Hall of Fame by the Governor of California Arnold Schwarzenegger in 2007.

- According to a survey, he was considered as the most acclaimed business man between teenagers in 2009.

- He was selected as the CEO of decade according to Fortune in 2009.

- He was ranked 57 amongst most powerful people of the world, a position rewarded by Forbes.

5.3. A Responsive Process has been a Reactive Leadership in Microsoft Computers

William Henry Bill Gates was an American business man, a philanthropist and born on October 28, 1955. He along with Paul Allen founded a software company named "Microsoft" and later on became the chairman of Microsoft. He has been consistently placed among the wealthiest people of the world from 1995 to 2010 except 2007.

Bill Gates was the chief software architect and then CEO of Microsoft, he remained the biggest single shareholder carrying more than 8% of the company's stock (Cusumano, 1998) and has written many books. World recognized him as one of the most well-known entrepreneurs with regards to the personal computer revolution. Though he is cherished by several, his business tactics came under criticism from a number of industry insiders which they felt anticompetitive, a view that has been upheld in some cases by the courts (Dearlove, 2009). Gates has been engaged in a number of philanthropic endeavors in the later halves of his career. In 2000, at Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, he donated a big amount of his programs and different charitable organizations.

In 2000, Gates left Microsoft as CEO, but remained chairman of the company by creating a new rank of chief software architect. In 2006, Bill Gates declared that he is going to quit from Microsoft as full-time employee and instead will continue as part-time worker. He decided to perform full-time duty at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (Freedman, 2006). In 2008, on 27th June, Gates, by gradually transferring his responsibilities to chief software architect Ozzie, and chief research and strategy officer Mundie, spent his last day at Microsoft office and held the position of non-executive chairman at Microsoft.

With regards to his education, in 1973 Gates received his graduation degree from Lakeside School. His score on the SAT was 1590 from 1600 and got enrolled at Harvard College. He had a chance to meet Steve Ballmer while at Harvard, who later became CEO of Microsoft after Gates and Christos Papadimitriou, a computer scientist and later he wrote a paper with him about pancake sorting. During his time as a student at Harvard, he did not have any definite study plan and used to spend a lot of his time playing with the school's computers (Strother, 2010). He joined the Honeywell in the 1974 summer where he happened to contact Paul Allen. Next year witnessed the release of the Micro Instrumentation and Telemetry Systems (MITS) Altair 8800, dependent on the Intel 8080 CPU. They found it as a prospect and decided to initiate similar organization based on computer software.

In 1975, after Popular Electronics' problem of which demonstrated the Altair 8800, Gates decided to contact the inventors of microcomputer MITS, to communicate them that they were aiming at BASIC interpreter. As a matter of fact, Gates and Allen didn't devise any password for it; rather they desired to judge MITS's attention. Roberts as MITS president demonstrated keen interest in this project and met them and in a few weeks' time they developed Altair emulator. They tried in minicomputer and in BASIC interpreter. Whole manifestation took place at Albuquerque offices of MITS where it proved to be quite successful and as a result of that a deal was signed with MITS for distribution of the interpreter as Altair BASIC (Mobile Reference 2007). MITS hired Paul Allen, and Gates took off from Harvard to collaborate with Allen at MITS in Albuquerque. The partnership was named as "Micro-Soft" and set up their inaugural office in the location of Albuquerque. Later on within a year they dropped the hyphen, and the trade name "Microsoft" was registered on November 26, 1976. Gates then never went back to resume education.

Microsoft's BASIC was liked by computer hobbyists and became popular, however Gates found out its preliminary source got leaked and thus further reproduced and distributed (Vadera & Gandhi, 2009). In mid 1970s, Gates published a letter in the MITS newsletter addressing Hobbyists that MITS will stop developing new software. It was not welcomed by various computer hobbyists, nevertheless Gates persisted that software developers must reserve the right to demand payment. In late 70s Microsoft parted ways from MITS and became independent. Company continued to develop programming language based software for different systems. On January 1, 1979, Microsoft shifted its office to a new location. Bellevue, Washington from its earlier office in Albuquerque.

In the early years of Microsoft, all employees used to own broader level responsibility regarding the company's business. The business details were overseen by Gates, but he continued to engage in writing codes. He personally made sure to review every line of code that the company shipped during first five years. In 1980, Microsoft was approached by IBM to make BASIC interpreter in lieu of upcoming IBM personal computer. In a meeting with Bill Gates an IBM's representative, Jack Sams mentioned IBM needed an operating system that should be produced by Microsoft. After a time lapse, Bill Gates put forward a working system same as CP/M using 86-DOS (QDOS). Along with SCP, an agreement was signed by Microsoft as restricted licensing agent and sole proprietor of 86-DOS (Redgrave, 2010). Bill Gates delivered the operating system to IBM and Microsoft charged $50,000 for this new operating system named PC-DOS. Using his past experience and fearing that IBM's system might get copied by other hardware retailer; Gates had not offered the copyright transfer on the operating system. Microsoft was made a success by the sale of MS-DOS. On June 25, 1981, Gates did restructuring of the company and re-incorporated Microsoft

in Washington. He became President of the company and the Board Chairman. Microsoft Windows opening retail version was launched on November 20, 1985. The company signed a deal with IBM for the purpose to develop a separate operating system OS/2 (Cusumano, 1998). Although two new firms had been devised and first version of nascent system was released, escalating artistic dissimilarity destabilized the joint venture. An internal memo was distributed by Gates, containing the announcement of OS/2 partnership ending. Microsoft shifted its efforts to develop the Windows NTkernel.

5.3.1. Management style. During the Microsoft's journey from 1975 to 2006, Bill Gates demonstrated his capabilities with different product strategies and widened product lines and this was the main reason that Microsoft achieved a higher position among whole industry (Ghoshal & Bartlett, 1999). As CEO of the company, Bill Gates used to meet Microsoft's program managers and senior managers regularly. The immediate accounts of these meetings described him as vocally belligerent, scold-ing managers for business's apparent flaws proposals or strategies which could put company at risk in the long run. He used to interrupt presentations a lot with remarks as, "That's the funniest thing I've ever heard!" and, "Why don't you just quit your actions and join the Peace Corps? The target of his eruption then had to defend the strategy or proposal in detail till the time, hopefully, Gates was completely swayed. In such case subordinates seemed to be delaying, he was notorious to remark ironically, "I'm going to do it over the weekend."

Most of the time, Gates at the Microsoft company had been in a role of manager or executive. But, he was an intelligent and dynamic software developer in his early years, especially when it came to talk about programming language products of the company. Gates announced on June 15, 2006, that he planned to switch out from his routine role during the next two years to give more time to philanthropy (Lockwood,

2008). He decided to divide his everyday tasks between two successors, assigning charge of daily management to Ray Ozzie and making Craig Mundie responsible for long-term product strategy.

In 2000, Bill Gates and his wife Melinda pooled three family foundations into one and created the Bill & Melinda Gates charitable-Foundation. It was the largest charitable foundation transparently operated in the world (List & Bollinger, 2010). The foundation was established to allow sponsors access to see how his/her money was being spent. The kindness and large philanthropy of David Rockefeller had been attributed as a major influence. Gates and his father used to meet Rockefeller many times and had modeled their benevolent in part on the philanthropic focus of Rockefeller family, specifically those global troubles that were overlooked by governments and other agencies. Till 2007, Bill and Melinda Gates in America were turned out to be the second most generous philanthropists, with over $28 billion donated in charity.

The foundation was also criticized because it invested the assets which it had not yet dispersed with the sole objective of increasing the return on investment (Bisesi, 2010). As a result of this, its investments allowed companies that had been denounced for aggravating poverty in the same developing countries in which the Foundation was trying to alleviate poverty. These included companies that got spoiled heavily and pharmaceutical companies which did not trade into the developing world. In response to media criticism in 2007, the foundation declared a review of its investments to evaluate social responsibility. It then cancelled the evaluation and adhered to its policy of investing and spending for maximum return, by means of voting rights to sway company practices.

5.3.2. Achievements. According to Time Magazine, Gates is amongst one hundred persons who mainly influenced the 20th century. He was also named among 2004,

2005, and 2006's 100 most influential persons by the magazine.

- Time Magazine also jointly named Gates, Melinda and Bonorock ban US's lead singer as the Persons of the year 2005 in recognition to their humanitarian efforts.

- In 2006, Gates was voted number eighth in the list of "Heroes of our time". In 1994, Chief Executive Magazine named him CEO of the year.

- In recognition of their philanthropic work in the areas of health and education Gates and Malinda were awarded the Order of the Aztec Eagle in November 2006.

- Gates was given Bower Award for Business Leadership in 2010 by the Franklin Institute because of his contributions in business and philanthropic works.

6. Conclusion & Discussion

The role of individual leadership as Steve Jobs in Apple computers has been proactive. A quick look at Jobs' profile leads one to envisage that his charisma, his personality, and his presentation skills drove Apple to its recent success. If we suppose to put his real world achievements on one side and his astounded audiences on another one thing that becomes quite evident is that Jobs had the ability to get the things done and which was his best leadership skill. He had the mastery to mobilize people around his agenda and the skill to convert idealism into reality. Jobs' presence on the stage could teach public speakers more about the complex dexterity. Learning from his passion young entrepreneurs could gain that vigor and dedication was essential to business. His daily routines included leadership skills and passion that gave momentum to achieve modifications. As it has already been discussed, while reviewing the literature regarding responsive process thinking, that development of ideas and thoughts takes place through conflict among individuals. The world of our experience is the world that we are cre-

ating in our thoughts (Stacey, 2007). Hegel argued that people are fundamentally social practitioners and what they think, say or do takes form in the background and context of social practices, while these practices provide the required resources, object of desire, skills and procedures, so it is very important for the managers (leaders) to interact with the individuals, listen to them on regular basis so that leader may be able to get the firsthand knowledge about the functioning of day to day tasks, about their problems and their accomplishments. This is going to be significant because whatever the technology, methods or procedures adopted by the organization, ultimately it has to be done by the humans working in that organization. No strategy can be implemented and ultimately successful without the involvement of people if it has to achieve certain objectives, and where there are humans, there are contradictions, conflicts, and chaos and that has to be taken care of by the managers and leaders if they really want to be successful.

From history when we discuss about leadership we come to know that Martin Luther King Jr. never made stirring speeches. But he made good relation with people, making alliances and systemizing community. He then transferred his potent scheme. Leaders are not always supposed to enchant public speakers; neither have they al-ways appointed gigantic traits. It reveals that they are simple people with great ideas and their motivation made it done.

So the criticism which author has about Steve Jobs's leadership style is that he did not spend much of his time talking to the-people in order to bring people together to achieve all of his desired objectives.

Now the role of Bill Gates as team work leader in Microsoft computers has been re-active. Bill Gates has always been engaged in interacting with people (software engineers) building product strategy for Microsoft from the day one. As a manger as well as an executive he engaged himself with the program managers, software engi-

neers, and senior managers of the Microsoft Corporation in order to discuss with them his future plans, targets, and objectives and took their feedbacks. Coming back to responsive process thinking, as Elias and others argue that individuals do not exist but are, rather, themselves the results of social evolution. Social changes produce rational, planning kinds of individuals, not the other way around. Elias talks about a trend or direction in the evolution of the consequences of the interweaving of individual plans and intentions. In other words, he is talking about self-organization and emergence. So in case of Bill Gates we see very much the same. That is why he has been so successful as compared to his counterparts.

Another important aspect of Bill gates personality so far revealed is of believer of emergent strategies and that is only possible when you interact with people working in your organization on regular basis and involve them in your day to day activities, as Mead and others have already described that a successful organizational strategy emerges only in local communicative interactions. Mead says that the vital human characteristics come out only in local social interactions. He also argues that such connections develop only in meetings where people truly self-appear and become responsible for valuable contributions. These regular interactions among people form organizational strategies. Since different kind of tension and anxiety are dealt with in these interactions, so targets, goals, and objectives are successfully achieved through these organizational strategies. Since Bill Gates was intentionally or unintentionally following all those aforementioned characteristics and strategies, thus in authors point of view, these things become responsible for Bill Gates' success.

7. Future Research

In future, different other personalities in the form of various leadership roles in their respective organizations can also be studied. Further in addition to responsive process

thinking, there is a need to identify such organizations where systemic process thinking is involved and successfully being implemented. There is also a need to verify whether responsive process thinking is suitable for organic type of organizations and systemic process thinking is a better choice for a mechanistic type of organizations.

References

Alef, D. (2010). *Sold! How America's greatest sales and marketing titans pulled it off.* Santa Barbara, CA: Titans of Fortune Publishing.

Bayazit, O. B., Lien, J.-M. Amato, N. M. (2003). Better group behaviors in complex environments using global. *Artificial Life, 88,* 362.

Bisesi, M. (2010). *Bill and Melinda gates foundation. International Encyclopedia of civil society*. USA: Springer, 64-65.

Botella, L. (1995). Personal construct psychology, constructivism, and postmodern thought. *Advances in Personal Construct Psychology, 3*, 3-36.

Burkitt, I. (2008). *Social selves: Theories of self and society.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Catmull, E. (2008). *How pixar fosters collective creativity.* Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Chen, C. C., Chen, X.-P., Menidl, J. R. (1998). "How can cooperation be fostered? The cultural effects of individualism-collectivism." *Academy of Management Review 23*(2), 285-304.

Chen, C. C., Peng, M. W. Saparito, P. A. (2002). Individualism, collectivism, and opportunism: A cultural perspective on transaction cost economics. *Journal of Management*, 28(4), 567-583.

Coalition, S. E. (2003). *There's more to business than you think: A guide to social enterprise.* London: Social Enterprise Coalition.

Costea, I., Guenther, U., & Nicolescu, R. (1998). Coping with file formats on the Internet. *Computer Communications, 20*(16), 1437-1447.

Cuban, M., & Tzu, S. (n.d.). "Steve Jobs By think and grow On July 18, 2011. Leave a Comment. In action & decision, art, biographies, business change, creativity, dreams & dreamlining, entrepreneurship, fear of failure, focus, follow your dreams, health & wellness, hustle, imagination, innovation, law of attraction, leadership, life, lifestyle design, personal growth, positivity, possibilities, power, rebel, revolution, steve jobs, success, technology, the future, war, wisdom."

Cusumano, M. A. (1998). *Microsoft secrets: How the world's most powerful software company creates technology, shapes markets, and manages people.* NewYork: Touchstone.

Dearlove, D. (2009). *The Unauthorized guide to doing business the Richard Branson way: 10 Secrets of the World's greatest brand builder, Capstone.* West Sussex, UK: Capstone

Eastman, W. N., & Bailey, J. R. (1994). Examining the origins of management theory: Value divisions in the positivist program. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 30*(3), 313-328.

Farmer, J. D., & Sidorowich, J. J. (1988). Exploiting chaos to predict the future and reduce noise. In Lee, Y. C. (Ed.). *Evolution, learning, and cognition* (pp.277-330). Singapore: World Scientific Publishing. 277.

Fischer, F. (1994). Organizational expertise and bureaucratic control: Behavioral science as managerial ideology. In Fischer, F., & Sirianni, C. (Eds). *Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy* (pp. 174-195). Philladelphia: Temple University Press.

Freedman, M. (2006). The social-purpose encore career: baby boomers, civic engagement, and the next stage of work. *Generations, 30*(4), 43-46.

Ghoshal, S., & Bartlett, C. A. (1999). *The individualized corporation: A fundamentally new approach to management*. New York: Random House Publishing.

Hollis, M. (1996). *Reason in action: Essaysin the philosophy of social science.* Cambridge University Press.

Jeannerod, M., & Pacherie, E. (2004). Agency, simulation and self - identification. *Mind & Language, 19*(2), 113-146.

Johannessen, S., & Stacey, R. (2005). Technology as social object: A complex responsive processes perspective. In Ralph Stacey (Ed.). *Experiencing emergence in organizations: Local interaction and the emergence of global pattern* (pp. 142-163). London: Routledge.

Kant, I. (1998). *Critique of pure reason* (Paul Guyer & Allen W. Wood, Ed. & Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuiper, K. (2009). *The Britannica guide to theories and ideas that changed the modern world.* New York: The Rosen Publishing Group.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch J. W. (1967). Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 12*(1), 1-47.

List, R., & Bollinger, J. O. (2010). Gates, William H. III. In Helmut K. Anheier, Stefan Toepler (Eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society.* London: Springer: 750-751.

Lockwood, B. (2008). *Bill Gates: Profile of a digital entrepreneur: Easy read super large* 24 pt edition. USA: Read How You Want.

Maturana, H. R., & Varela, F. J. (1987). *The tree of knowledge: The biological roots of human understanding*. New Science Library/Shambhala Publications.

Mead, J. (1961). Mechanical properties of lungs. *Physiological Reviews, 41*(2), 281-330.

McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(1), 24-59.

Mobile Reference (2007). *100 Richest people in the World for smartphones and mobile devices illustrated history of their life and wealth*. (n.d.): Author.

Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *16*(2), 127-142.

Note, N., Pinxten, H., & Aerts, D. (2005). *Towards a re-delineation of the human self-understanding within the western worldview: Its social and ethical implications.* In Diederik Aerts, Bart D'Hooghe, & Nicole Note (Eds.).

Paletz, S. B., & Peng, K. (2009). Problem finding and contradiction: Examining the relationship between naive dialectical thinking, ethnicity, and creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, *21*(2-3), 139-151.

Realo, A., Koido, K., Ceulemans, E., & Allik, J. (2002). Three components of individualism. *European Journal of Personality*, *16*(3), 163-184.

Redgrave, S. (2010). Enduring Success: Lessons from business on long term results and how to achieve them. New York: Business Plus.

Reynolds, C. W. (1987). Flocks, herds and schools: A distributed behavioral model. *ACM SIGGRAPH Computer Graphics, 21*(4), 25-34.

Stacey, R. D. (1992). *Managing the unknowable: Strategic boundaries between order and chaos in organizations*. San-Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Stacey, R. D. (2003). *Complexity and group processes: A radically social understanding of individuals*. New York: Routledge.

Stacey, R. D. (2007). S*trategic management and organisational dynamics: The challenge of complexity to ways of thinking about organisations*. New York: Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Strother, R. (2010). *Bill Gates: Microsoft founder*. Edina, Minnesota: ABDO Publishing.

Tappin, S., & Cave A. (2010). *The New Secrets of CEOs: 200 Global Chief Executives on Leading*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Vadera, K., & Gandhi, B. (2009). *Open Source Technology*. New Delhi: Laxmi Publications.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sense making in organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Worley, L. (2011). *The poises of' human nature': An exploration of the concept of an ethical self.* Victoria, Australia: Victoria University.