LARRY PAGE: FROM X TO Y

Medina Braha
International Business College Mitrovica (IBCM), Kosova

Abstract

Theory X and Theory Y represent assumptions on manager's attitude towards human nature and behavior. Theory X assumes a negative manager attitude, while Theory Y assumes the opposite. Accordingly, Douglas McGregor, founder of this theory, believed X-type leaders should convert to Y-types if they are to motivate and perform successfully. This work aims to provide real-life support of McGregor's assumption through a case study on the leadership profile of Larry Page, co-founder and twice CEO of Google and current CEO of Alphabet. Page's leadership profile drawn from this analysis acts in favor of Theory Y's assumptions, howev-er, transfer from X appears to have taken place beforehand. The conversion appears to be associated with the benefits anticipated by McGregor.

Keywords: *Theory X and Theory Y, leadership style, human nature and behavior, organizational culture, leader attitude, leadership effectiveness*

1. Introduction

This paper intends to analyze the leadership profile of Google's co-founder Larry Page looking from a Theory X and Theory Y perspective. Albeit Google has two co-founders, Page is regarded as its locomotive, hence, the reason it is considered appropriate to take him as subject of case study. The article consists of an analysis of two main research questions, namely:

1. Are there typical real-life examples of X-to-Y conversions as suggested in McGregor's theory X and Theory Y?
2. In situations where we see an X-leader becoming a Y-leader, does that correspond with the benefits of Y style leadership as suggested by McGregor?

In order to answer the above research questions, the first section of this article briefly introduces the theory and the main ideas behind it. The following sections portray Larry Page's biography, vision, leadership atti-tude and style, and its company's organizational culture. Finally, the paper provides a conclusion by answer-ing the research questions as well as associated limitations and recommendations.

2. Theories X and Y

Theory X and Theory Y were established by Douglas McGregor in his book The human side of enterprise (1960), even though firstly introduced during his speech held at Sloan School of Management (MIT) in 1957 (Kopelman, et al., 2010; Hindle, 2012; Koontz & Weihrich, 2015). The basic idea behind these two theories is relatively straightforward. McGregor believed that assumptions on human nature or behaviour are to be found behind every managerial decision or action. Accordingly, Theory X and Theory Y represent management approaches based on the respective sets of assumptions managers make on their subordinates, and consequently, build their managing style.

Theory X reflects negative assumptions on human nature and behaviour. X-style managers assume the average person: intrinsically dislikes work and avoids it whenever possible; needs to be coerced, controlled, directed, punished and threatened in order to urge him to deliver his required performance; and he prefers to be directed and controlled due to his lack of responsibility-taking and ambition (McGregor, 2006). X-types represent the conventional scientific management approach which dominated in early 20th century organizations (McGregor,

2006; Wagne & Hollenbeck, 2015). Fundamentally, Theory X considers only punishment and reward as appropriate managing methods (Hofstede, 1987; Carson, 2005; Hersey, et al., 2008; Kopelman, et al., 2010; Russ, 2011) what corresponds to an autocratic/transactional leadership style. McGregor argued both approaches – reward and punishment, which he referred to as soft and hard approaches – have been explored in their entireness and difficulties are to be found in each of them; the hard approach usually provokes counter forces while the soft one commonly leads to abdication of management and indifferent performance.

Alternatively, Theory Y reflects positive assumptions on human nature and behaviour. Y-style managers assume the average person: delivers naturally and willingly his mental and physical contribution at the work-place; can self-control and self-direct himself towards achieving committed goals; regards goal commitment as associated to his achievement rewards; at optimal conditions, not only takes but also pursues responsibility; possess relatively high degree of creativity and originality in solving organizational problems; and is marginally utilized, in terms of intellectual capacities, in the organizational life (McGregor, 2006). Essentially, Theory Y assumes people are willing to offer their maximum effort provided they are devoted to the general organizational goals, hence, management is responsible to maximize that commitment (Schein, 1974; McCauley & Kuhnert, 1992; Truss, et al., 1997; Şahin, 2013; Lawter, et al., 2015). As such, Theory Y resembles the democratic/participative/transformational leadership style. Although McGregor appreciated human behavior in industrial organizations (of that time) is in line with X-assumptions, he suggested such behaviour is initiated by overall management approach rather than by inherent nature of people (Theory X confounded cause and effect). Finally, since Theory X appears ineffective in motivating employees, he concluded Theory Y is more realistic and advocated its application.

McGregor's approach could be considered an influence of Maslow's (1943) work and a reaction to scientific management and human relations approach, both being then dominant schools of management. In fact, he seems to correspond Theory X to the suggestions of scientific management and argued that it may be applica-ble as long as low-level needs are to be fulfilled. Once that happens, people will become indifferent on the incentives provided by this approach what will make it practically become ineffective. In addition, he claimed that the, then, current needs of employees fall under the high-level category, hence, he advocated Theory Y as solution. Theory Y is among most supported (Maslow, 1964; Fiman, 1973; Schein, 1974; Jacoby & J.R.Terborg, 1975; Larsson, et al., 2007; Gürbüz, et al., 2014) and most influential in its field (Bennis, 1972; Bolden, et al., 2003; Carson, 2005). Main objections on Theory Y suggest incompleteness, no significant superiority in effectiveness, and situation-dependency (Bobic & Davis, 2003).

3. Larry Page Biography and Google History

Lawrence Edward Page was born in East Lansing, Michigan on 26 March 1973 (Academy of Achievement, 2015). His family comes from the IT world; his father (Carl) was a computer sciences professor and his mother (Gloria) a computer programming instructor both at Michigan State University, while his brother became a successful internet entrepreneur (McClafferty, 2013). His family background undoubtedly had an impact on Page who became truly passionate about computers, something uncommon at the time of his childhood (Smale, 2004; Vise & Malseed, 2006). Page graduated from Michigan University in Computer Engineering, finished his masters in Computer Sciences at Stanford University where he also enrolled in his Computer Engineering PhD (McClafferty, 2013). This last academic step made him revolutionize online searching and build a multi-billion company.

In search for a PhD dissertation topic Page got interested in flourishing World Wide Web by finding the way through which back pages were linked to a particular page which, if discovered, he thought the "Web would become a more valuable place" (Batelle, 2005). Together with a fellow PhD student, Sergey Brin, Page solved this puzzle and so they created their innovation initially entitled Backrub (Batelle, 2005). Soon after, they looked for a more client-acceptable name and got inspired by googol (number with 100 zeros) which slightly changed to Google (Kettler, 2014). This way, they founded Google Inc. in 1998 (McClafferty, 2013) with its famous mission "to organize the world's information and make it universally accessible and useful" (L. Page, personal communication, May 2, 2009). What made Google's contribution to the Web so special, although there were five other search engines in the market, was the accuracy in finding the relevant information for the word(s) typed in its search bar (Vise & Malseed,

2006). They became so emotionally linked to their creation that they did not sell it even for $1 million received while still being graduate students (L. Page & S. Brin, personal communication, July 3, 2014).

Since 1999 Google's headquarter (Googleplex) has been in Mountain View, California (Pictopad, 2012). Page served as CEO until 2001 when he was replaced by Eric Schmidt – Page opposed this heavily first and did truly never completely agree with his replacement – since it was perceived necessary to have a more experienced CEO (Carlson, 2014). In 2011, Page decided to retake Google's direction and returned as its CEO; the company's structure was reformed in October 2015 with the new-created Alphabet Inc. (Mother Company of Google) and Page Alphabet's CEO (Google Company, 2016a). Google currently possesses more than 70 offices in more than 40 countries, employs more than 55 thousand people (Google Company, 2016a), its product range has continuously expanded and it competes with a variety of successful market players such as Apple, Microsoft, Facebook and Amazon. Being co-founders of Google, the initiating design of this project is usually regarded as a mutual idea of Page and Brin. In reality, Page hired Brin to cooperate on his project and to con-tribute with his data mining expertise (Carlson, 2014; Academy of Achievement, 2015).

4. Larry Page's Leadership Attitude and Google's Organizational Culture

Analysing Page's attitude from a Theory X and Theory Y perspective, real data exists of his opinion on how people regard work. Page (L. Page & S. Brin, personal communication, July 7, 2014) appears personally interested in harmonizing people's work-life balance as to increase their satisfaction, while assuming most people have a positive outlook on work. His attitude towards people's behaviour – clearly stating people love work and do not feel happy if they do nothing – corresponds solidly with Theory Y's descriptions.

"I totally believe we should be living in a time of abundance, like Peter Diamandis' book. If you really think about the things that you need to make yourself happy – housing, security, opportunities for your kids – anthropologists have been identify-ing these things. It's not that hard for us to provide those things. The amount of re-sources we need to do that, the amount of work that actually needs to go into that is pretty small. I'm guessing less than 1-percent at the moment. So the idea that every-one needs to work frantically to meet people's needs is just not true. I do think there's a problem that we don't recognize that. I think there's also a social problem that a lot of people aren't happy if they don't have anything to do. So we need to give people things to do. We need to feel like you're needed, wanted and have something productive to do. But I think the mix with that and the industries we actually need and so on are– there's not a good correspondence. That's why we're busy destroying the environment and other things, maybe we don't need to be doing. So I'm pretty worried. Until we figure that out, we're not going to have a good out-come."

"…Most people like working, but they'd also like to have more time with their family or to pursue their own interests. So that would be one way to deal with the problem, is if you had a coordinated way to just reduce the workweek. And then, if you add slightly less employment, you can adjust and people will still have jobs.
(L. Page & S. Brin, personal communication, July 7, 2014)

However, Page's leadership style has not always been so much in line with Theory Y. In fact, Page was per-ceived regarding people untrustworthy to the degree that he was even considered being control-freak (Nisen, 2014). For instance, the year 2001 is famous at Google for the immediate, unnoticed and unexplained dismissal of dozens of project managers Page made because he believed engineers cannot be led by non-engineers and was simply not satisfied with their performance (Edwards, 2011). As Edwards (2011) continues, many Googlers (Google employees) reported Page also unhesitatingly rejected ideas he considered not worthy for further development, without thinking even for a moment on the body language he used and the way it affected employee motivation. Moreover, Page was very into detail, ready to get personally involved in almost every single task (Vise & Malseed, 2006). More

dramatically, he encouraged an aggressive culture within the company, probably the most aggressive Googler turning out to be himself (Edwards, 2011).

Eventually, after many attempts, investors convinced Page to step aside and make room for Eric Schmidt's 'adult supervision' in 2001 (Carlson, 2014). Schmidt dealt with company's daily direction, appointed its exec-utive staff and was on charge during Google's most significant developments such as going public (Pictopad, 2012). Nonetheless, leaving CEO's seat did not imply Page ceded to practically decide on Google's strategic issues. Indeed, he has always remained the actual leader of Google; Schmidt did not act without consultation with the co-founders, particularly with Page, and after all, it was Page's signature on Google's public offering (Edwards, 2011). According to Carlson (2014), Page has continuously stayed the visionary, ultimate decision maker and factual driving force of Google. He ultimately retook Google's CEO position in 2011, but now with a more mature attitude to his leadership role.
The above illustrated examples show a typical X-type leadership followed by Page in Google's early years of existence. Based on McGregor's suggestions, one could assume that Google would not have experienced its success if Page's initial attitude had dominant in subsequent years. Really, this paper argues it was exactly his resign as CEO that made Page a better leader. The argument supporting this idea rests in that the outsider's point of view enabled Page to see the big picture and think outside of the box in terms of his management approach. In addition, this paper also suggests that there are exactly the Theory Y's elements, illustrated further, which have most significantly contributed to the overall achievement of Google up to date.

Page's vision on Google has always been to create and maintain an unconventional company (L. Page, personal communication, November 3, 2015). Its unconventional working environment has become a widely known and wished reality. Vast variety of free food, gyms, bowling, climbing, parties, on-site oil changes, jungle-style lobby, pub-style lounge, trips, inside green spaces, afternoon volleyball breaks, on-wheels barber shop, free laundry, nap pods, swimming pools and massages are just some among many other recreational motivating work conditions provided by Google, originating from the unconventional company idea (Inside Google, 2010; Google Company, 2016b; Forbes, 2015). Perhaps not surprisingly, Fortune Magazine ranked Google repeatedly the best company to work for in 2007, 2008, 2012, 2013, 2014 as well as Alphabet in 2015 (Fortune, 2007; 2008; 2012; 2013; 2014; 2016). Furthermore, Google was chosen America's best employer by Forbes too (Forbes, 2015). Recognizing cultural and product usage patterns differences, Google tends not building exactly same organizational culture in all branches, however, it presses on maximally having as much as possible similar collaborative and informal atmosphere across all of them (Inside Google, 2010). As a result, despite it currently employs ten thousands of employees all over the world, Google continues to maintain alive Page's dream of an unconventional company and functions with a very informal, unique in its nature, organizational culture.

Another vital strength of Google's motivation policy is the manner employees are generally treated and incen-tivized to explore and develop their innovative and creative skills. Examples include the in-house food with large tables aiming to encourage employees to sit next to colleagues they do not know so they can receive new ideas and get challenged on their thoughts, white boards hanging on many locations inside Google premises to be jointly used anytime, and paper-less operation to encouraged electronic notes sharing among colleagues (Inside Google, 2010). Additionally, Google employs a Chief Culture Officer to enrich creativeness and the collaboration environment (Kuntze & Matulich, 2010). Finally, Google possesses a distinct segment hunting for creative and potentially prospect technologies developed at start-ups. In case these products are considered worth covering under Google's umbrella and if their creators feel they can develop their ideas better at Google, they get acquired. Among most successful deals are YouTube and Google Earth (Inside Google, 2010).

Team spirit is considered very important currently, leaving behind the days of aggressive fighting. According to Carlson (2005), a request Page highlighted in his speech given during a retreat of Google's top-executives was to stop destructive competing if they were to accomplish Google's mission. Such approach is completely the opposite of what he used to have initially. Actually, team spirit of the co-founders appears among crucial engines driving Google on top. Vise and Malseed (2006) think Birn's extroversion was a good combination to Page's introvert character. Moreover, Birn's presence in Google's life is much more evident than of main-stream co-founders of other companies, both in terms of his physical appearance as well as in Page's pronouncements. Accordingly, this paper

advocates the ability to supplement personal weaknesses by cohering co-workers who possess abilities one does not, represents one of the most important leadership skills.

Despite being a poor public speaker, not being able to always clearly express himself, being an introvert with-out whatsoever leader-stylish (let alone charismatic) body language, Page's vision has always been the steering wheel of Googlers. More importantly, the latter have always regarded him as their real boss even during his non-CEO period. Additionally, Page has over time improved his attitude towards delegating which used to be one of his critical leadership weaknesses at the early days of Google. Particularly, his well-played supervisory role with Android's creator, Andy Rubin, is considered a turning point in changing his approach towards delegation (Nisen, 2014). Besides delegating and goal setting, with his return, Page appears much better prepared in terms of his management strategy. In contrast to his rather stubborn leadership attitude in the early days, he seems much more open now to embrace successful ideas, practices and suggestions. For instance, in support of his goal for accelerating decision-making within Google, Page has made use of New York City Mayor's idea which the latter has been using in his administration (Stone, 2012). Currently, Googlers are pushed to feel they are the best and the smartest and, although most of them pretty young, significant authority and responsibilities are delegated to them (L. Page, personal communication, November 3, 2015). They report the importance highlighted on developing and working towards shared goals, backed up by huge transparency to the degree that, through intranet, they have access to the details of every active project (Inside Google, 2010). Page is very aware of creating a non-monotonous work environment if he wants to continue attracting world's best talents and achieve his powerful ambition of remaining one of the market leaders, not only for some years, but for generations (Helft, 2014).

"It's really the people that make Google the kind of company it is. We hire people who are smart and determined, and we favor ability over experience. Although Googlers share common goals and visions for the company, we hail from all walks of life and speak dozens of languages, reflecting the global audience that we serve. And when not at work, Googlers pursue interests ranging from cycling to beekeep-ing, from frisbee to foxtrot.
We strive to maintain the open culture often associated with startups, in which eve-ryone is a hands-on contributor and feels comfortable sharing ideas and opinions. In our weekly all-hands ("TGIF") meetings—not to mention over email or in the cafe—Googlers ask questions directly to Larry, Sergey and other execs about any number of company issues. Our offices and cafes are designed to encourage interac-tions between Googlers within and across teams, and to spark conversation about work as well as play."
(Google Company, 2016b)

Page's passion on cutting-edge technology is reflected by his direct impact in many revolutionizing projects. A typical case is Google's self-driving car derived from a similar idea he had while still at university (L. Page, personal communication, January 17, 2013). His motto is setting very high goals, even if knowing they are unachievable, so as to be encouraged to provide the maximum and achieve much more than when moderate goals are set (L. Page, personal communication, November 3, 2015). His thoughts could be objected, though, as being unenthusiastic since employees may become discouraged if they already know they are not going to reach what they seek. Hitherto, however, Page's motto seems to have the desired effect and Google has be-come among most ambitious and innovative companies. A Googler reported that he easily, without smallest doubt, started setting and pursuing goals he previously did not even dare to think about only one month after he had been working for Google (Inside Google, 2010). Unlike Apple which is very good at being involved only at a narrow range of projects, Page intends to increase Google's influence in the world by "doing more things" (Helft, 2014) and by doing them "ten times better than competitors" (CNBC, 2014). Google's large range of products seems logical also from a portfolio perspective, i.e. securing revenues from a variety of products maintains the company more prepared for future market trends.

Finally, Page's vision extends much beyond Googleplex's walls. In terms of impact on public, Google has revolutionized the Web. According to CNBC (2014), "websites live or die by their Google page rank". Likewise, Google has become a verb – to google – included in English dictionaries. However, these impacts are only a small

piece of Page's visionary aims which, originating already from the first days of his great idea, consist of changing the world for the good and his interests spread out from health to socio-economic issues (Helft, 2014; L. Page, personal communication, Alphabet Inc. homepage, 2015). In addition, Google claims to maintain a commitment to environmentally sustainable technology (Google Company, 2016a).

"As Sergey and I wrote in the original founders letter 11 years ago, "Google is not a conventional company. We do not intend to become one." As part of that, we also said that you could expect us to make "smaller bets in areas that might seem very speculative or even strange when compared to our current businesses." From the start, we've always strived to do more, and to do important and meaningful things with the resources we have.
We did a lot of things that seemed crazy at the time. Many of those crazy things now have over a billion users, like Google Maps, YouTube, Chrome, and Android. And we haven't stopped there. We are still trying to do things other people think are crazy but we are super excited about. We've long believed that over time companies tend to get comfortable doing the same thing, just making incremental changes. But in the technology industry, where revolutionary ideas drive the next big growth areas, you need to be a bit uncomfortable to stay relevant.

Our company is operating well today, but we think we can make it cleaner and more ac-countable. So we are creating a new company, called Alphabet. I am really excited to be running Alphabet as CEO with help from my capable partner, Sergey, as President. What is Alphabet? Alphabet is mostly a collection of companies. The largest of which, of course, is Google. This newer Google is a bit slimmed down, with the companies that are pretty far afield of our main internet products contained in Alphabet instead. What do we mean by far afield? Good examples are our health efforts: Life Sciences (that works on the glucose-sensing contact lens), andCalico (focused on longevity). Fundamentally, we believe this allows us more management scale, as we can run things independently that aren't very related.

Alphabet is about businesses prospering through strong leaders and independence. In general, our model is to have a strong CEO who runs each business, with Sergey and me in service to them as needed. We will rigorously handle capital allocation and work to make sure each business is executing well. We'll also make sure we have a great CEO for each business, and we'll determine their compensation. In addition, with this new structure we plan to implement segment reporting for our Q4 results, where Google financials will be provided separately than those for the rest of Alphabet businesses as a whole. This new structure will allow us to keep tremendous focus on the extraordinary opportunities we have inside of Google. A key part of this is Sundar Pichai. Sundar has been saying the things I would have said (and sometimes better!) for quite some time now, and I've been tremendously enjoying our work together. He has really stepped up since October of last year, when he took on product and engineering responsibility for our inter-net businesses. Sergey and I have been super excited about his progress and dedication to the company. And it is clear to us and our board that it is time for Sundar to be CEO of Google. I feel very fortunate to have someone as talented as he is to run the slightly slimmed down Google and this frees up time for me to continue to scale our aspirations. I have been spending quite a bit of time with Sundar, helping him and the company in any way I can, and I will of course continue to do that. Google itself is also making all sorts of new products, and I know Sundar will always be focused on innovation—continuing to stretch boundaries. I know he deeply cares that we can continue to make big strides on our core mission to organize the world's information. Recent launches like Google Photos and Google Now using machine learning are amazing progress. Google also has some services that are run with their own identity, like YouTube. Susan is doing a great job as CEO, running a strong brand and driving incredible growth.

Sergey and I are seriously in the business of starting new things. Alphabet will also in-clude our X lab, which incubates new efforts like Wing, our drone delivery effort. We are also stoked about growing our investment arms, Ventures and Capital, as part of this new structure. Alphabet Inc. will replace Google Inc. as the publicly-traded entity and all shares of Google will automatically convert into the same number of shares of Alphabet, with all of the same rights. Google will become a wholly-owned subsidiary of Alphabet. Our two classes of shares will continue to trade on Nasdaq as GOOGL and GOOG. For Sergey and me this is a very exciting new chapter in the life of Google—the birth of Alphabet. We liked the name Alphabet because it means a collection of letters that repre-sent language, one of humanity's most important innovations, and is the core of how we index with Google search! We

also like that it means alphabet (Alpha is investment return above benchmark), which we strive for! I should add that we are not intending for this to be a big consumer brand with related products—the whole point is that Alphabet companies should have independence and develop their own brands.

We are excited about…

- Getting more ambitious things done.
- Taking the long-term view.
- Empowering great entrepreneurs and companies to flourish.
- Investing at the scale of the opportunities and resources we see.
- Improving the transparency and oversight of what we're doing.
- Making Google even better through greater focus.
- And hopefully… as a result of all this, improving the lives of as many people as we can.

What could be better? No wonder we are excited to get to work with everyone in the Alphabet family. Don't worry, we're still getting used to the name too!" (L. Page, personal communication, Alphabet Inc. homepage, 2015)

As a result, his ambitions have also raised the desire of many Googlers to bring positive changes to the world. Perhaps not surprisingly, in 2014, Page was chosen the most ambitious CEO in universe (Helft, 2014). Moreover, Page resulted also the most popular CEO in 2015 based on employees' rankings (McCarthy, 2015).

5. Conclusive Summary

Are there typical real-life examples of X-to-Y conversions as suggested in McGregor's theory X and Theory Y?

The analysis made in this paper on Larry Page's leadership profile reveals a specific approach characteristic to Page. During his first time as Google's CEO in the early years of its foundation, Page applied more authoritative leadership what may be considered more corresponding to Theory X's assumptions. Having been not formally in charge with everyday management for a decade, this work argues it was an excellent opportunity for Page to look his company with a more outsider's eye not ignoring the fact he is considered to always have had the last word despite not managing closely – and, consequently, he was able to see the whole picture what affected him to change his attitude later. Based on that, it seems reasonable to conclude that the first research question has a positive answer.

In situations where we see an X-leader becoming a Y-leader, does that correspond with the benefits of Y style leadership as suggested by McGregor? Notwithstanding Page's introversion, lack of oratory, atypical leader body language, and to some degree continuing technical involvement, his return as CEO seems stronger, more qualitative and, presumably, more sustainable. Based on all the above said, without claiming that every single project at Google is a personal contribution of Page, it is concluded here that his ambitions supported by a visionary, participative, and informal leading style are fuelling the creativity and ambitions of Googlers what, in turn, strongly motivates them to-wards company's general aspirations. This reality appears pretty much in line with Theory Y's assumption of drawing overall goals and then leaving subordinates free to set their objectives as to progress towards the collective mission. In other words, this article argues that we can positively answer the second research question as well.

6. Limitations and Recommendations

Being focused on one single leader and company, generalizations on the appropriate leadership style may become difficult to draw. In addition, Page's return may still be considered relatively recent as to enable any conclusions on his come-back's quality. Moreover, in line with previous works mentioned earlier, it is accept-ed that it is almost impossible to have a pure X-style or Y-style leader in practice. However, the above analysis indicates Y-leadership as more effective in Google's case. Future research could broaden by taking into account three main aspects. Firstly, more situations of X-to-Y converting could be approached as to observe the effects following the altering. Secondly, when possible, cases where the transfer to Y-leader has occurred a longer time ago should be aimed as to have a

more reliable image on the leader's success level. Finally, opposite examples (Y to X) may also be of significant value to research for comparative assessment.

7. Implications

The case of Larry Page appears a typical, at the same time rare, case of a practical example of transformation from X to Y leadership style. As such, this research is also very specific in its nature, approach and, potentially, its research and practical implications as well. Considering Google's success, many leaders may want to learn from Page's leadership style to apply in their every-day management of their organization. A temporary setback from the leader's formal position may be a clever strategy for personal leadership development as well as a more effective organizational identity building. Google has revolutionized the information finding and spreading. It has brought a fundamental change to the lives of the majority of people with access to and basic use of internet. Page's leadership style, particularly his leader skills development through the conversion analysed and portrayed in this paper, may serve as a role-model for many others who want to embrace one of Page's critical success determinants.

References

Academy of Achievement (2015), Larry Page biography. [Online]

Available at: http://www.achievement.org/autodoc/page/pag0bio-1

[Accessed 26 March 2016].

Batelle, J. (2005), The birth of Google. [Online]

Available at: http://www.wired.com/2005/08/battelle/

[Accessed 26 March 2016].

Bennis, W. G. (1972), Chairman Mac in perspective, s.l.: Harvard Business Review Special Report.

Bobic, M. P. & Davis, W. E. (2003), A kind word for theory X: Or why so many newfangled management techniques quickly fail. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 13(3), pp. 239-264.

Bolden, R., Gosling, J., Marturano, A. & P.Dennison (2003), A review of leadership theory and competency frameworks, Exeter: University of Exeter Centre for Leadership Studies.

Carlson, N. (2014), The untold story Of Larry Page's incredible comeback. [Online]

Available at: http://www.businessinsider.com/larry-page-the-untold-story-2014-4

[Accessed 3 March 2016].

Carson, C. M. (2005), A historical view of Douglas McGregor's theory Y. Management Decision, 43(3), pp. 450-460.

CNBC (2014), The list: CNBC first 25. [Online]

Available at: http://www.cnbc.com/2014/04/29/25-google-team--sergey-brin-larry-page-eric-schmidt.html

[Accessed 28 March 2016].

Economist, T. (2009), The world of business: From valuable brands and games directors play to bail-outs and bad boys. London: Profile Books Ltd.

Edwards, D. (2011), I'm feeling lucky: The confessions of Google employee number 59. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Fiman, B. G. (1973), An investigation of the relationships among supervisory attitudes, behaviors, and outputs: An examination of McGregors's theory Y. Personnel Psychology, 26(1), pp. 95-105.

Forbes (2015), America's best employers 2015. [Online]

Available at: http://www.forbes.com/sites/clareoconnor/2015/03/25/americas-best-employers-2015/#5ac9b4d96ceb

[Accessed 30 March 2016].

Fortune (2007), 100 best comapnies to work for 2007. [Online]

Available at: http://archive.fortune.com/magazines/fortune/bestcompanies/2007/full_list/

[Accessed 30 March 2016].

Fortune (2008), 100 best companies to work for 2008. [Online]

Available at: http://archive.fortune.com/magazines/fortune/bestcompanies/2008/full_list/index.html

[Accessed 30 March 2016].

Fortune (2012), 100 best companies to work forr 2012. [Online]

Available at: http://archive.fortune.com/magazines/fortune/best-companies/2012/full_list/

[Accessed 30 March 2016].

Fortune (2013), 100 best companies to work for 2013. [Online]

Available at: http://archive.fortune.com/magazines/fortune/best-companies/2013/list/

[Accessed 30 March 2016].

Fortune (2014), 100 best companies to work for 2014. [Online]

Available at: http://archive.fortune.com/magazines/fortune/best-companies/2014/list/

[Accessed 30 March 2016].

Fortune (2016), 100 best companies to work for 2015. [Online]

Available at: http://fortune.com/best-companies/google-alphabet-1/

[Accessed 30 March 2016].

Google Company (2016a), [Online]

Available at: https://www.google.com/about/company/

[Accessed 19 January 2016].

Google Company (2016b), Our culturre. [Online]

Available at: https://www.google.com/about/company/facts/culture/

[Accessed 28 March 2016].

Gürbüz, S., Şahin, F. & Köksal, O. (2014), Revisiting of theory X and Y. Management Decision, 52(10), pp. 1888 - 1906.

Helft, M. (2014), Google's Larry Page: The most ambitious CEO in the universe. [Online]

Available at: http://fortune.com/2014/11/13/googles-larry-page-the-most-ambitious-ceo-in-the-universe/

[Accessed 27 March 2016].

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H. & Johnson, D. E. (2008), Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources. Ninth ed. s.l.:Pearson International Edition.

Hindle, T. (2012), Guide to management ideas and gurus. London: Profile Books Ltd.

Hofstede, G. (1987), The applicability of McGregor's theories in South East Asia. Journal of Management Development, 6(3), pp. 9-18.

Inside Google (2010), [Film] Canada: CBC.

Jacoby, J. & J.R.Terborg (1975), Development and validation of theory X and theory Y scales for assessing McGregor's managerial philosophies. Teleometrics International.

Kettler, S. (2014), The Google chronicles: 7 facts on founders Larry Page & Sergey Brin. [Online]

Available at: http://www.biography.com/news/google-founders-history-facts

[Accessed 12 March 2016].

Koontz, H. & Weihrich, H. (2015), Essentials of management: An international, innovation and leadership perspective. Tenth ed. New Delhi: McGraw-Hill Education.

Kopelman, R. E., Prottas, D. J. & Falk, D. W. (2010), Construct validation of a theory. Leadership & Organization, 31(2), pp. 120-135.

Kuntze, R. & Matulich, E. (2010), Google: searching for value. Journal of Case Research in Business and Economics, pp. 1-10.

Larsson, L., Vinberg, J. & Wiklund, S. (2007), Leadership, quality and health: Using McGregor's X and Y theory for analyzing values in relation to methodologies and outcomes. Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 18(10), pp. 1147-1168.

Lawter, L., Kopelman, R. E. & Prottas, D. J. (2015), McGregor's theory X/Y and job performance: A multilevel, multi-source analysis. Journal of Managerial Issues, 27(1-4), pp. 84-101.

Maslow, A. H. (1943), A theory of human motivation. Psychological Review, 50(4), pp. 370-396.

Maslow, A. H. (1964), Synergy in the society and in the individual. Journal of Individual Psychology, 20(2), pp. 153-185.

McCarthy, N. (2015), America's most popular chief executives [Infographic]. [Online]

Available at: http://www.forbes.com/sites/niallmccarthy/2015/10/22/americas-most-popular-chief-executives-infographic/#60113d1758d6

[Accessed 2 April 2016].

McCauley, D. P. & Kuhnert, K. W. (1992), A theoretical review and empirical investigation of employee trust in management. Public Administration Quarterly, 16(2), p. 265–284.

McClafferty, C. K. (2013), Profiles #3: Tech titans. s.l.:Scholastic Inc..

McGregor, D. (1960), The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McGregor, D. (2006), The human side of enterprise. Annotated Editon Joel Cutcher-Gershenfeld ed. s.l.:McGraw-Hill.

Nisen, M. (2014), Larry Page's lost decade was the best thing to ever happen to Google. [Online]

Available at: http://qz.com/202710/larry-pages-lost-decade-was-the-best-thing-to-ever-happen-to-google/

[Accessed 27 March 2016].

Page, L. (2009), Larry Page's University of Michigan commencement address, Michigan: Googlepress.

Page, L. (2013), Google's Larry Page on why moon shots matter [Interview] (17 January 2013).

Page, L. (2015), Alphabet Inc. homepage, s.l.: s.n.

Page, L. (2015), Larry Page talks Alphabet, Warren Buffett and project loon at Fortune Global Forum 2015 [Interview] (3 November 2015).

Page, L. & Brin, S. (2014), Fireside chat with Google co-founders, Larry Page and Sergey Brin [Interview] (3 July 2014).

Page, L. & Brin, S. (2014), Larry Page's plan for people whose jobs are replaced by tech: Work less [Interview] (7 July 2014).

Pictopad (2012), Bloomberg game changers - Sergey Brin & Larry Page Google full story, s.l.: YouTube.

Russ, T. L. (2011), Theory X/Y assumptions as predictors of managers' propensity for participative decision making. Decision Making, 49(5), pp. 823 - 836.

Şahin, F. (2013), The mediating effect of leader–member exchange on the relationship between theory X and Y management styles and affective commitment: A multilevel analysis. Journal of Management & Organization, 18(2), pp. 159-174.

Schein, E. H. (1974), In defense of theory Y. Organizational Dynamics, 4(1), pp. 17-30.

Smale, W. (2004), Profile: The Google founders. [Online]

Available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/3666241.stm

[Accessed 25 March 2016].

Stone, B. (2012), The education of Google's Larry Page. [Online]

Available at: http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2012-04-04/the-education-of-googles-larry-page

[Accessed 29 March 2016].

Truss, C. et al. (1997), Soft and hard models of human resource management: A reappraisal. Journal of Management Studies, 34(1), pp. 53-73.

Vise, D. A. & Malseed, M. (2006), The Google story - Inside the hottest business, media and technology success of our times. London: PanMacmillan.

Wagne, J. A. I. & Hollenbeck, J. R. (2015), Organizational behavior: Securing competitive advantage. Second ed. Abingdon: Routledge.