

# Ultimate leadership styles that the managerial grid deems to be ideal

[Profession](#), [Manager](#)



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

This is the ultimate leadership styles that the managerial grid deems to be ideal. This leader encourages teamwork while focuses on result and output simultaneously without compromising either. The leader is dominant enough to make the followers feel that they are constructive parts of the company and so make the most out of their capabilities. Research has helped us identify this leadership styles as Charismatic leadership or transformational leadership. Charismatic leadership is defined as a social influence process that involves the formulation and articulation of an evocative vision, provides inspiration to motivate collective action, demonstrates sensitivity to environmental trends, and displays unconventional and personal risk-taking behavior. These behaviors result in leaders being role models for followers who become committed to the leader and the vision, experience task meaningfulness, and make sacrifices for the collective cause (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Shamir et al., 1993). Shamir, House, & Arthur's (1993) self-concept based theory presents two core dimensions of charismatic leadership. These dimensions are inspirational motivation and idealized influence. Inspirational motivation involves communicating high performance expectations through the projection of a powerful, confident and dynamic presence. Such behaviors evoke powerful emotional responses from followers that energize them to exert extra effort. (Sosik & Dinger, 2007) Idealized influence involves the display and attribution of role modeling for followers through exemplary personal achievements, character strengths and/or behavior. (Sosik & Dinger, 2007) According to Bass & Avolio, (1997) both these core behaviors help create a strong emotional bond between the follower and the leader. Inspirational motivation and idealized influence are

also considered as charismatic components of transformational leadership. . (Sosik & Dinger, 2007) Previous research suggests that transformational leadership contributes to the success of an organization by motivating employees to go beyond self interest and be passionate to achieve given targets and goals. Ross & Gray (2006) chose transformational leadership when researching on teacher leadership and student achievement because according to them, “ it is compatible with broadly based trends of teacher empowerment, multiple stakeholder participation in school decisions, and reduced support for top down change theories.” In addition, substantial evidence exists that transformational leadership is a stronger predictor of teacher beliefs and practices than transactional leadership (e. g., Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995). Transformational leadership is said to contribute to collective teacher efficacy (Bandura,(1986). Collective teacher efficacy regards to the perceptions of the teachers in a school that the collective efforts of the teachers will positively contribute to student achievement. (Goddard, Hoy, &Hoy, 2000)

#### Produce, Dictatorial or Perish Style

This is a very task oriented leader who has high concern for the fulfillment of goals and responsibilities and minimum or low concern for the welfare, comfort or interaction of the employees. His solution to a non productive worker is simply to punish him or replace him. This leader has a dictatorial style and his focus is on planning, coordinating work, scheduling and providing the necessary resources for task accomplishment (e. g., Likert,

1967). People who tend to act on extremes of this leadership style tend to become “petty tyrants” or “abusive leaders”

Hornstein (1996) describes an abusive leader as “one whose primary objective is the control of others, and such control is achieved through methods that create fear and intimidation” (Hornstein, 1996). Ashforth (1994) describes a petty tyrant as “someone who uses their power and authority oppressively, capriciously, and perhaps vindictively”

Tyrannical leadership falls in the domain of this leadership style. This leadership style hampers motivation, job contentment or welfare of the followers. Tyrannical leaders may behave in accordance with the goals, tasks, missions and strategies of the organization, but they typically obtain results not through, but at the cost of subordinates (Ashforth, 1994; Tepper, 2000). While dictatorial leaders are least concerned about their followers and keep minimum interaction with them, tyrannical leaders act aggressively towards their subordinates and believe that doing so will increase work effort. Most of the literature on tyrannical leadership considers it harmful for organizations especially in the long run. (Bies & Tripp, 1998; Tepper, 2000; Lombardo & McCall, 1984) Nevertheless Brodsky (1976), argues that tyrannical leaders, despite of harassing followers, may perform well on other work related duties. They may also have strong technical skills that somewhere down the line are contributing to the overall success of the organization. Ma et al. (2004) call this, “the paradox of managerial tyranny,” arguing that tyrannical leadership may lead to extraordinary performance, even when subordinates suffer. So we can argue that the behavior of this

leader can be evaluated differently by upper management as compared to the subordinates. Another style that can be discussed here is the instructional leadership style. Research on teacher leadership argues that supervisory leadership is a characteristic of instructional leadership (Hulpia & Devos, 2010). Previously it has been discussed that the instructional leader plays a key role in controlling, monitoring and directing in schools (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Hallinger Mrphy, 1985). However, it empirical research shows that autocratic leaders reduce the stability, satisfaction and feelings of motivation within a group of followers. (Van Vugt, Jepson, Hart, & De Cremer, 2004). As discussed above, these leaders fall low on the axis of the grid that presents concern for people. So their priority for satisfaction, motivation and comfort of the followers is minimum reducing effectiveness in performance. (Judge et al., 2004). In a study where followers motivation and satisfaction were two dependent variables checked against autocratic leadership, it was found that people do not favor autocratic leaders(Cremer, 2006). According to the study this was so because autocratic leaders donot give sufficient attention to followers and so fail to motivate them to participate, exhibit loyalty, or contribute positively towards the group.

#### The Impoverished or the Indifferent Style.

Leaders who fall in this category have low concerns for both people and production. They either adopt a very lazy approach or simply try to avoid getting into any trouble. The main concern of this leader is not to be held responsible for any mistakes and in that course he/she tends to be unproductive, disorganized and they lack effective leadership qualities.

Up to date, there has been little effort to research or study this leadership style, instead literature on leadership is concentrated of effective and ideal leadership styles. (Kelloway, Mullen, & Francis, 2006). Although destructive leadership is not a synonym for the impoverished leader but it can fall within the domain of this leadership style. Destructive leadership behavior

is defined as “ the systematic and repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor or manager that violates the legitimate interest of the organization by undermining and/or sabotaging the organization’s goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of his/her subordinates.” (Einarsen, Aasland, Skogstad, 2007) According to this definition the leader does not deliberately harm the subordinates or doesn’t intend to do so rather he is thoughtless, incompetent as well as ignorant. ( Einarsen, et al. 2007). According to the presented definition a leader will be practicing a destructive style if he is violating the legitimate laws of an organization. Any behavior that opposes a legitimate decision, goal or strategy of

the firm, is to be regarded as destructive from the moment these decisions, goals or strategies are enforced. . ( Einarsen, et al. 2007) For example, if a school decides to give extra attention to weaker students and instructs all teachers to do so, and some teachers fail to abide by this decision, this behavior can be characterized as destructive teacher leadership.

Country Club Style

These leaders are extra cautious about the welfare and comfort of the followers. They take care of their followers at the expense of the welfare of the organization often by interacting with them on a personal level, or by giving them favors and rewards that are not part of the organization's judgment. The main goal of task or goal attainment is undermined while violating the legitimate interest of the organization. (Einarsen, et al. 2007) these leaders may be giving more benefits to the subordinates than they are obliged to and this is done at the cost of the company. They may be stealing resources in form of time or finance from the work place. (Altheide et al., 1978; Ditton, 1977). They are of the opinion that if the employees are happy, they tend to be more motivated to work hard and achieve organizational efficiency.

The research work of Einarsen, et al. 2007, shows that a category of leaders called supportive disloyal leaders is very similar to Blake and Mouton's country club style. It is argued in their article that both the styles show overriding concern to establish good relations with the subordinate. These leaders lack strategic competence and so support values and beliefs that are not consistent with those focused by the organization. Irrespective of that, they may be able to maintain a good relationship with the followers. Such leaders easily gain popularity amongst their followers and are often considered them by as good leaders. It is also argued in previous studies that the intention of supportive disloyal leaders is not to harm the organization; they just believe acting in the particular way discussed above will bring benefit to it. (Mars, 1994)

Another concept that falls in the same domain is that of Laissez faire leadership. This leader avoids getting into trouble, make any decision or try solving a problem. (Bass & Avolio, 1997),

Middle of the road or the status-quo style

This leadership style lies in the middle of Blake & Mouton's grid. His focus is equally divided between concern for production and concern for people. It is argued that he tries to keep a balance between the two.(Bartol, Tein, Mathews, 1994. p405)

These leaders are regarded to be average or mediocre leaders. They are not pioneers nor are failures. Also, this approach puts considerable emphasis on the leader, his characteristics and attributes. However, not much attention is paid on the attributes of the subordinates, or the circumstances within which the leader and followers are interacting.( Hitt, Black, Porter, 2006. P 418)

The above discussion was aimed to present multiple leadership styles considered effective or otherwise so previous research may be highlighted. I find it important to point out here that there is no ideal leadership style, rather the effectiveness of a leadership style is dependent upon the choice of leadership style adopted in a particular situation. According to the contingent approach to leadership, leader effectiveness doesn't only depend on a leader but also on situational characteristics. So a leader will only be effective if he adopts his leadership style according to the situation.(liu, et all, 2003) The contingency approaches to leadership dominated by the path goal theory: House, 1971 all argue that situational characteristics influence the



effectiveness of a leader. Also, it is argued culture is an important situational factor that influences leadership style. (Hofstede, 2001)

According to Hofstede (2001) leaders in collectivistic cultures aspire more for traditional values and they follow standard methods, and do not support follower's initiative. People treat their leaders with respect and are obedient towards them in many collectivistic cultures, where paternalistic leadership is traditionally seen (Dickson, et al., 2003; Dorfman et al., 1997). The directive and supportive leadership styles collectively make up this paternalistic style. So in this leadership style close supervision of employees is combined with high concern for the well being of the follower. Paternalistic Leadership is widespread in non-western cultures (Dickson et al., 2003). Directive leadership in general, is a less common practice and is not much of a consideration when an appropriate leader behavior is considered in individualistic (Western) countries, as it is in the case of collectivist societies (Hofstede, 2001; Dickson et al., 2003). Similarly, supportive leadership is more common in collectivistic cultures as compared to individualistic cultures. (Wendt, 2004)