
Leadership Styles and Their Consequences

D. D. Warrick

University of Colorado

This article discusses leadership style theories and offers an integration of the theories by describing the typical characteristics, philosophy, skills, and consequences associated with each major style. Then an experimental exercise is offered that portrays the major styles and the productivity and satisfaction each is likely to produce. Finally, a debriefing is presented that helps interpret the exercise and integrate the style theories with contingency theory.

Importance of Leadership Style

Few leaders understand the full significance of how influential their leadership style is on the performance and satisfaction of their employees. Leaders control both interpersonal and material rewards and punishments that often shape employee behavior and influence an employee's performance, motivation, and attitude. They can affect an employee's self-image and resulting potential in either a positive or negative way by being supportive, fair, and encouraging, or unsupportive, inconsistent, and critical. In addition, they can even affect an employee's health and energy level by creating a stimulating work climate or one filled with tension and fear. The influence of a leader's style reaches greater proportions as the effects on individuals begin to have a cumulative effect on group performance.

There are no doubt variables other than a leader's style that affect employee performance and satisfaction. Certainly, job challenge and interest, organizational working conditions and work climate, opportunities for growth and advancement, and peer relations among other factors should be considered. However, the potential consequences of a leader's style should be understood and not be underestimated.

Address reprint requests to: Dr. Don Warrick, College of Business Administration, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, CO 80908.

D. D. Warrick is an Associate Professor of Management and Organization Behavior at the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs campus. He is the editor of the Academy of Management OD Newsletter and serves on the OD Executive Committees of the Academy of Management and the American Society for Training and Development. His articles have appeared in several leading management journals. He received his D.B.A. from the University of Southern California.

Leadership Theories

Most authorities on organizational leadership agree that the major theories of leadership are the traits, leadership styles, and contingency (sometimes called situational) theories. The leadership styles and contingency theories now dominate the current literature on leadership while the traits theory has generally been dismissed because of the theoretical, methodological, and practical problems involved in trying to identify and support a consistent list of traits.

Major Leadership Styles Theories

Ohio State Leadership Studies

The leadership styles approach emerged from the Ohio State University leadership studies that began in 1945. Some of the chief contributors to the study were Hemphill, Stogdill, Coons, Fleishman, Harris, and Burt [1-3]. While this study was responsible for a variety of significant findings on leadership, perhaps the most important contribution was the isolation of "Consideration" and "Initiating Structure" as the basic dimensions of leadership behavior in formal organizations. These variables were identified as a result of a series of investigations that attempted to determine, through factor-analytic procedures, the smallest number of dimensions that adequately describe leader behavior as perceived by the leader and his subordinates.

Consideration may be defined as behaviors by means of which the leader establishes rapport with his or her employees, two-way communication, mutual respect, and understanding. It includes behavior indicating trust and warmth between the supervisor and his or her group and emphasizes concern for group members' needs.

Initiating Structure may be defined as behaviors by means of which the leader defines or facilitates group interaction toward goal attainment. The leader does this by planning, scheduling, criticizing, initiating ideas, organizing the work, defining member roles, assigning tasks, and pushing for production.

It was during the early Ohio State studies that leadership was first plotted on two separate axes as opposed to being on a single continuum.

University of Michigan Leadership Studies

The University of Michigan followed in 1947 with an extensive study of leadership that resulted in many similar findings to the Ohio State studies. Kahn, Likert, Katz, Maccoby, and Morse [4, 5] were some of the original investigators. They investigated the relationship between supervisory behavior and employee productivity and satisfaction. The earliest study was conducted at the Prudential Life Insurance Company and the strategy was to use company accounting procedures to identify high-

producing and low-producing groups which were evidently equal in ability, background, etc. Then they would investigate the supervisory practices associated with the high and low producing groups. The University of Michigan group identified two styles of leaders—Employee-Centered and Production-Centered.

Employee-Centered supervisors spent more time in actual supervisory activities, less time performing tasks similar to those performed by subordinates, used general rather than close supervision, took a personal interest in employees and their goals, and were less punishing when mistakes were made. Employees of employee-centered supervisors felt that their supervisor took a personal interest in them, let them know how they were doing on the job, and would support them.

Production-Centered supervisors spent less time in actual supervisory practices such as planning, more time performing tasks similar to those subordinates performed, used close supervision, and punished mistakes.

Employees of production-centered supervisors tended to feel as if they were treated only as instruments of production and responded with poor performance.

In the earlier studies, employee-centered and production-centered supervisors were treated as if they represented opposite ends of a single continuum. However, in later studies it was discovered that these two dimensions were independent and could occur simultaneously.

Other Leadership Styles Theories

The Ohio State and University of Michigan studies stimulated considerable interest in leadership theory and many new theories were offered such as those by Keith Davis [6], Hersey and Blanchard [7], and Blake and Mouton [8]. Most of the leadership theories had two things in common. They identified two basic dimensions of leadership and they resulted in four basic leadership styles (see Figure 1) which in effect described an Autocratic Leader (High emphasis on performance and low emphasis on people), Laissez Faire Leader (low emphasis on performance and people), Human Relations Leader (low emphasis on performance and high emphasis on people), and Democratic Leader (high emphasis on performance and people).

The Managerial Grid

A somewhat transitional theory between the leadership styles theories and the contingency theories is the Managerial Grid developed by Blake and Mouton [9]. Blake and Mouton described the two basic dimensions of leadership as concern for production and concern for people. The term concern for, as used in the grid, is a theoretical variable reflecting basic attitudes or styles of control. It does not reflect actual production or effectiveness. The horizontal axis of the management grid represents concern for production and the vertical axis represents concern for mature and healthy relations among those engaged in production. Each axis is on a 1 to 9 point scale, with 1 representing a minimum interest or concern and 9 a maximum concern. The Managerial Grid results in five basic styles of leadership: A Production Pusher (9,1), Do-Nothing Manager (1,1), Organization Man (5,5), Country Club Manager (1,9), and Team Builder (9,9).

assumptions because they tend to be self-fulfilling prophecies. Management Skills include the management skills characteristic of a particular style. It is important to be aware of these skills because any of them could be appropriate to a given situation.

The leadership style characteristics, philosophies, and management skills for each of the four basic leadership styles are shown in Figures 2 and 3.

Figure 2
Descriptions of Autocratic and Laissez Faire Leaders

Leadership Style	Autocratic Leader	Laissez Faire Leader
Leadership Style Characteristics Emphasis on Performance Emphasis on people	High emphasis on performance Low emphasis on people	Low emphasis on performance Low emphasis on people
Leadership Philosophy Assumptions about people	People tend to be lazy, undependable, dislike work, resist responsibility, work primarily for money, and prefer to be led.	People are unpredictable and trying to understand them is a waste of time.
Assumptions about the role of a leader	Run a tight ship by planning, organizing, directing, and controlling the efforts of others.	Keep a low profile, be obedient, and don't make waves.
Management Skills		
Planning and Setting Objectives	It is the leader's job to plan and establish objectives.	Plans and establishes objectives only if required to do so.
Organizing	A formal, centralized structure is used with carefully defined rules and procedures.	Lives with whatever structure he is given.
Controlling	Tight controls are established to assure that employees do their jobs.	Abdicates controlling to employees.
Decision-Making	All but minor decisions must be made or approved by the leader.	Avoids making decisions as much as possible.
Motivating	Uses close supervision and tight controls, simplifies and standardizes work, and offers economic incentives and fringe benefits to motivate people.	Leaves people alone. Nothing seems to work anyway.
Communicating	Communication is primarily one-way, downward, formal, impersonal and in a parent to child manner.	Communication is non-committal, superficial, and avoided.
Developing	Development comes from hard work and experience although some professional development may be considered if it will result in greater efficiency and productivity.	Leaves development up to employees. If people want to develop themselves, that is their business.

Figure 2
(Continued)

Leadership Style	Autocratic Leader	Laissez Faire Leader
Use of rewards and punishment	People are rewarded for being obedient and punished for making mistakes. Punishment may take the form of withholding attention or good assignments or making people feel guilty.	Avoids rewarding or punishing people.
Approach to handling conflicts	Conflicts are either suppressed because they interfere with work or they are resolved in favor of the leader.	Ignores conflicts and hopes they will disappear.
Approach to handling problems and mistakes	Attacks people and not the problem and looks for a scapegoat or someone to blame when mistakes are made.	Ignores problems and mistakes unless forced to deal with them.
Interpersonal relationship with employees	Keeps relationships formal and impersonal so he can remain "objective."	Avoids close relationships and lets employees do pretty much as they please.
Use of power and authority	The use of power and authority are essential to maintaining order and high productivity.	Power and authority are abdicated to whomever wants to assume them.
Delegation practices	Fully delegates only low risk jobs.	Responsibilities are assumed by default rather than through delegation.
Performance Appraisals	Uses performance appraisal to let employees know what they are doing wrong.	Either avoids performance appraisals or gives minimum compliance to required appraisal procedures.

Figure 3
Descriptions of Human Relations and Democratic Leaders

Leadership Style	Human Relations Leader	Democratic Leader
Leadership Style Characteristics Emphasis on Performance Emphasis on people	Low emphasis on performance High emphasis on people	High emphasis on performance High emphasis on people
Leadership Philosophy Assumptions about people	"All" people are honest, trustworthy, self-motivated, want to be involved in all decisions, and will give their best if kept happy.	"Most" people are honest, trustworthy, self-motivated, and like responsibility and challenging work.
Assumptions about the role of a leader	Minister to the needs of employees and keep them happy because happy people are productive people.	Arrange organizational conditions to promote teamwork and high job performance and satisfaction.

Figure 3
(Continued)

<i>Leadership Style</i>	<i>Human Relations Leader</i>	<i>Democratic Leader</i>
Management Skills		
Planning and Setting Objectives	Use group planning and objectives setting almost exclusively.	Planning ahead and establishing clear objectives are essential to effective performance and are best accomplished with heavy employee involvement.
Organizing	A decentralized, informal, and loosely controlled structure is used.	A decentralized and flexible structure is used with clearly defined responsibilities and an open participative work environment.
Controlling	Relies almost entirely on the "self-control" of employees.	Control is distributed among the leader and the employees.
Decision-Making	Uses a participative approach for most decisions and primarily serves as a discussion leader in helping his group arrive at decisions.	The leader is a decisive decision-maker who emphasizes team decision-making but also makes some decisions alone.
Motivating	Involve employees, give continuous positive reinforcement, and provide for good working conditions, social relations, and fellowship.	Provide good working conditions and assure that jobs are challenging and offer opportunities for growth, responsibility, achievement, recognition, and advancement.
Communicating	Communication is open and two-way but is often ungenuine when conflict is involved because of the emphasis on maintaining harmony and good relations.	Communication is open, two-way and genuine. "Leveling" and honesty are encouraged.
Developing	Any development activities even remotely related to the job are encouraged.	Emphasizes personal, employee, and team development.
Use of rewards and punishment	Rewards and recognition are used at every opportunity but punishment is rarely ever used since "everyone makes mistakes."	Good work is recognized and rewarded and punishment is used only as a last resort.
Approach to handling conflicts	Conflict is smoothed over or avoided if it might threaten good relations. Conflicts with the leader, are usually resolved in favor of employees.	Conflicts are openly confronted.
Approach to handling problems and mistakes	Mistakes are ignored and problems are given to employees to resolve.	Attacks problems and not people and emphasizes finding solutions.
Interpersonal relationship with employees	Many internal and external activities are planned to promote close interpersonal relations and group harmony.	Maintains a close but objective relationship with employees.

Figure 3
(Continued)

<i>Leadership Style</i>	<i>Human Relations Leader</i>	<i>Democratic Leader</i>
Use of power and authority	Power and authority are abdicated to employees.	Believes that power and authority are earned, not legislated.
Delegation Practices	Delegates considerable responsibility but does not hold employees accountable for results.	Delegates considerable responsibility and holds employees accountable for results.
Performance Appraisals	Uses performance appraisal to let employees know what they are doing right.	Uses performance appraisal to let employees know what they are doing right and wrong.

The Consequences of Each Style

Few theories have been more heavily researched than the leadership styles theories. The extensive research makes it possible to predict the usual consequences of each style (for example, see [11-15]). The typical consequences are summarized in Figure 4.

Figure 4
Typical Consequences Resulting From Each Leadership Style

LAISSEZ FAIRE LEADER	AUTOCRATIC LEADER	HUMAN RELATIONS LEADER	DEMOCRATIC LEADER
Employees become apathetic, disinterested, and resentful of the organization and their leader. Results in the lowest employee productivity and satisfaction of all the leadership styles.	Although the emphasis is on high productivity, it often breeds counterforces of antagonism and restriction of output. Frequently results in hostile attitudes, a suppression of conflict, distorted and guarded communications, high turnover and absenteeism, low productivity and work quality, and a preoccupation with rules, procedures, red tape, working conditions, status symbols, and trying to cater to the whims of the boss. Tends to develop dependent and uncreative employees who are afraid to seek responsibility.	While this style may keep employees happy, there is little evidence to support the notion that keeping employees happy and treating them well results in high productivity. The preoccupation with keeping people happy and involved often interferes with high achievement, causes employees to lose respect for their leader, results in the emergence of informal leaders, and causes problems to be smoothed over. Such an atmosphere can be frustrating to goal-oriented people.	Results in high employee productivity, satisfaction, cooperation, and commitment. Reduces the need for controls and formal rules and procedures. Results in low employee absenteeism and turnover. Develops competent people who are willing to give their best, think for themselves, communicate openly, and seek responsibility.

Exercise Objective

The objective of the exercise is to demonstrate the effect of a leader's style on the productivity and satisfaction of employees.

Procedures

Volunteers are requested for the roles listed below. Preferably the volunteers should be selected with ample time prior to the exercise to prepare their roles (a day or more would be best although several hours will also work).

- 4 Leaders
- 2 Customers
- 4-8 Observers (optional)
- 4 Scorers (optional)

Role instructions for each role player are contained in Figure 5. The instructor should meet with the role players to explain their role and how the exercise works. Explanations should be given to the customers and observers first so they can be dismissed while explanations are given to the leaders. This is done to prevent bias on the part of the customers and observers. The leaders must be urged to play their roles strictly so the exercise will work.

Figure 5
Leader Instructions and Descriptions
(One copy for each leader)

Your task is to lead your group in making trademarks for the companies listed below. In leading your group, it is extremely important that you do a good job of leading from the leadership style that you have been assigned. The exercise will last 30 minutes and you may make the trademarks in any order that you choose. After completing a trademark, you should call in the customer raters who will evaluate the trademark on a 10 point scale depending on how well it represents the company it is for and how creative it is. After a trademark is rated, you can tear it down and re-use the parts.

Scale

Poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Outstanding

COMPANIES TO BUILD TRADEMARKS FOR

ABC	Disneyland	Jeep	NASA
Adidas	Dr. Pepper	Kentucky Fried Chicken	20th Century Fox
Arrow Shirts	General Motors	Kodak	Rolls Royce
AT&T	Hawaii Hilton Hotel	Las Vegas Sands Hotel	Schwinn Bicycles
Continental Airlines	IBM	McDonalds Hamburgers	Tony Lama Boots

Role Description—Laissez Faire Leader

A Laissez Faire leader places a low emphasis on people and performance. They do just enough to get by by being vague about the task and exercise ground rules and by offering information primarily as a result of being asked. Provide little if any direction and let your employees do whatever they want. Take occasional breaks and upon your return check with the employees to find out what is going on. Try to be as non-committal

as possible and show little concern for your people or their performance. Your main purpose as a leader is to let the organization take care of itself.

Role Description—Autocratic Leader

An Autocratic leader *places a low emphasis on people and a high emphasis on performance*. It should be well understood that you are the boss and make the decisions, that your only purpose is to make as many trademarks as possible as fast as possible, and that you will not tolerate disobedience. In the leadership exercise, you should begin by making clear the above ground rules and be telling people exactly what you want each of them to do. You should closely supervise and control each employee, push them to work harder, and make them redo anything that you don't like. Show little interest in your employees or their feelings and don't hesitate to reprimand anyone who challenges your authority or makes a mistake. Recognition should be minimal and should focus primarily on obedience. Your main purpose as a leader is to push for performance and maintain your authority.

Role Description—Human Relations Leader

A Human Relations leader *places a high emphasis on people and a low emphasis on performance*. They feel that happy people are productive people and that a leader's job is to promote good relations, seek quality rather than quantity, involve people at every opportunity, and allow people as much individual freedom as possible. In the leadership exercise, you should begin by saying that you really care about your people and that you intend to involve them as much as possible so it will be their team, and that you will do everything you can to make their work enjoyable. Then explain the ground rules (task, number of trademarks and time) and explain that your goal is to produce only high quality and creative trademarks. Push for everyone working together on each trademark or for a few small teams but ask the group what they think is best. Stop the group occasionally for a group meeting to make sure everyone is satisfied and likes what they are doing. Continuously compliment people, never chastise or push them, and avoid confrontations or conflicts at all costs. Your main purpose as a leader is to keep people happy and to use a participative style that encourages involvement.

Role Description—Democratic Leader

A Democratic leader *places a high emphasis on both people and performance*. They are genuinely interested in their people but also expect a high level of performance in terms of both quality and quantity. They approach management as a professional and take the time to establish clear objectives, define responsibilities, and provide the necessary leadership, planning, organizing, controlling and communicating, motivating, and developing to reach a high level of both productivity and satisfaction. In the leadership exercise you should begin by describing the task (produce trademarks for 20 companies during a period of 30 minutes with each trademark being rated by customers on a ten point scale based on: (1) how well it represents the company and (2) how creative it is). Then share your objective which is to try to produce all 20 items and yet aim for high quality and creativity on each one. Ask for questions and assure that the group is willing to shoot for the objective. Then suggest that given the limited time period, that the team needs to get organized and that you would suggest that they work in pairs with each pair selecting the projects they want to work on. If there is a person without a partner or a person that prefers to work alone, they could work on their own projects or assist the other pairs when they need help. Once they are organized, the boss' job is to keep them informed about how much time is left, offer encouragement and assistance, find the customers, give feedback on their scores and give recognition when they do a good job, and help resolve any problems that arise. Your main purpose as a leader is to achieve both high productivity and morale.

Randomly select four teams (have the remaining people count off by four with each person being on the team with their number—all the ones are together, etc.) Each team will perform the same task over a 30 minute period with the only difference being that each team will have a different style of leader (Democratic, Autocratic, Human Relations, or Laissez Faire). The task is to build trademarks out of tinkertoys for a common list of companies given to each leader. A trademark could include letters (for example a GM for General Motors) or symbols (for example a car for General Motors) or anything else that would serve as a suitable trademark. The exercise is ideally conducted in an area where the observers can observe behind one-way glass.

The exercise begins by each leader taking a large box of tinkertoys

(each box should have identical contents) and meeting with his or her group to provide instructions and begin building trademarks. The leaders must lead from the leadership style that they have accepted and not revert to other styles. One or more observers can be assigned to each group.

The customers should continuously rotate from group to group and rate each finished trademark on a scale from 1 (Poor) to 10 (Excellent). Ratings are based on: (1) *how well the trademark represents a company or organization* and, (2) *the creativity of the trademark*. Once a trademark is rated, it can be torn down so the parts can be used again. Customers must go together and agree on the ratings before entering scores onto their scoring sheet. Customers are allowed to divulge scores if asked. Figure 6 contains the customer rating sheet.

At the conclusion of the 30 minutes allowed for the exercise, the instructor tells all the groups to stop and then gives the following instructions:

1. All work must stop but finished trademarks will still be rated by the customers.
2. Each group should put their tinkertoys back in the box once all items have been rated.
3. Each group is given a *Satisfaction Questionnaire* (see Figure 7) for the members (excluding the leader) to complete. When the questionnaires are completed, they are collected by the scorers who tabulate the scores for each team to determine: (1) the *Average Satisfaction Score* rounded to the nearest whole number (1 to 10) on each of the ten items in the questionnaire, (2) the *Total Satisfaction Score* (the total of the ten Average Satisfaction Scores) for each team. The scores are then posted on a chalk board using the format used in the *Exercise Analysis Sheet* (see Figure 8). These numbers will provide a *Satisfaction Score* for each team. Team members can be given a 15-minute break while the scores are being tabulated.
4. The customers should meet to determine the *Total Productivity* (total points accumulated, divided by two) for each team. The *Average Score For Each Product* can also optionally be computed to determine the overall quality of each product. The *Total Productivity Score* for each team should be posted beside the *Total Satisfaction Score*.
5. The observers are asked to summarize their results and prepare about a two minute presentation each explaining what they observed. Each observer should follow the format of the *Observation Sheet* shown in Figure 9.
6. The leaders are asked to prepare about a two minute presentation on what they observed as a leader regarding the effect of the leader's style on the productivity and satisfaction of their group members.
7. The instructor tabulates the *Total Score* for each team by adding together the *Satisfaction* and *Production Scores*. The *Exercise Analysis Sheet* shown in Figure 9 can be used to collect all of the scores.

Debriefing

As a suggested approach to debriefing the exercise, the following procedures are recommended:

1. The instructor reviews the results in terms of the *Satisfaction*, *Productivity*, *Average Score For Each Product*, and *Total Points*.

Figure 6**Customer Instructions and Scoring Sheet**

(One copy to be shared by the two persons acting as the customers)

Two persons should work together as the customers to increase the accuracy of the ratings. You should rotate from group to group and each time one of the teams completes a trademark, you are to rate the trademark on a ten point scale based on:

1. How well the trademark represents the company or organization it was designed to represent.
2. How creative the trademark is.

Each time that you rate a trademark, enter your scores on the form below. At the conclusion of the exercise, continue to rate any trademarks completed before time was called and then post the results including the *Total Productivity* (total points divided by "2") and *Average Productivity* (Total Productivity divided by the number of trade marks produced) scores for each team on the chalk board or tabulation sheet provided by the instructor.

You may be asked to make observations on the different leaders and the effect of their styles on their employees. If you are asked to share the score given to a trademark, you may do so. *The trademarks do not have to be built in the order listed below.*

Poor	Scale										Outstanding
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Trademark	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Team 4
1. ABC				
2. Adidas				
3. Arrow Shirts				
4. AT&T				
5. Continental Airlines				
6. Disneyland				
7. Dr. Pepper				
8. General Motors				
9. Hawaii Hilton Hotel				
10. IBM				
11. Jeep				
12. Kentucky Fried Chicken				
13. Kodak				
14. Las Vegas Sands Hotel				
15. McDonalds Hamburgers				
16. NASA				
17. 20th Century Fox				
18. Rolls Royce				
19. Schwinn Bicycles				
20. Tony Lama Boots				
TOTAL PRODUCTIVITY $\frac{(\text{Total Points})}{2}$				
AVERAGE PRODUCTIVITY $\frac{(\text{Total Productivity})}{\text{Total Trademarks Made}}$				

Figure 7
Satisfaction Survey
(One copy for each employee at the conclusion of the exercise)

Team Number _____

Instructions: Please answer the questions below based on your experience in your team by *circling* the numbers that best represent your honest feelings. After all members of the team have completed their ratings, give the ratings to a scorer.

1. I disliked my boss's leadership style.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I liked my boss's leadership style.
2. My boss was a very ineffective leader.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	My boss was a very effective leader.
3. The team's objectives were not made very clear.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The team's objectives were made very clear.
4. The team was not organized to do the best possible job.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The team was organized to do the best possible job.
5. Team members were poorly utilized.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Team members were highly utilized.
6. Poor communications with boss.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Excellent communications with boss.
7. Poor communications among employees.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Excellent communications among employees.
8. Employee commitment was very low.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Employee commitment was very high.
9. Team productivity was very low.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Team productivity was very high.
10. Team morale was very low.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Team morale was very high.

Team Averages (For Scorers Only)

Instructions: Compute a group average score for each question rounded to the nearest whole number and a total score for the team.

Question Number	Group Average Score
1.	—
2.	—
3.	—
4.	—
5.	—
6.	—
7.	—
8.	—
9.	—
10.	—
TEAM SATISFACTION SCORE	—

Figure 8
Exercise Analysis Sheet

Team Number	Leader's Style	Satisfaction Questionnaire										(A) Total Satisfaction	(B) Total Productivity	Total Points (A & B)	Average Productivity
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10				
1															
2															
3															
4															

Figure 9
Observation Sheet
(One copy for each observer—One or two/team)

Instructions: If possible, observe the team that you are assigned to from an observation room with one-way glass. Otherwise, observe as quietly as possible without disrupting the team. Take notes below on the following questions and be prepared to spend about two to three minutes sharing your observations with the class at the conclusion of the exercise.

1. What was the leader's leadership style (answer this after observing the group enough to determine a specific style)?
2. What were your clues to the leader's style in terms of (1) the way the leader started the exercise; (2) the way the task was explained; (3) how objectives and responsibilities were established?
3. During the exercise, how did the leader (1) communicate with employees; (2) motivate employees; and (3) make decisions?
4. How did the employees react to the leader's style (productivity, morale, group dynamics, commitment, etc.)?

2. The instructor conducts an analysis of each team as follows:
 - A. Team members are interviewed by asking them what leadership style they thought their leader used, how the style affected them, and what they learned about the style of leadership that they were exposed to (4 minutes).
 - B. The team observers are asked to give their report (2 minutes).
 - C. The team leader is asked to give his or her observations (2 minutes).
 - D. The instructor summarizes what should have been learned (2 minutes).

If the role leaders play their roles well, the total scores will generally show the following ranking in terms of overall results:

1. Democratic Leader
2. Human Relations Leader
3. Autocratic Leader
4. Laissez Faire Leader

Variations, particularly of the top ranking, should be explored and explanations sought. For example, a Human Relations Leader who in fact acts from a Democratic Style may affect the results or a Laissez Faire Leader who ends up with highly self-motivated and independent people may win.

Integrating Styles and Contingency Theories

The debriefing can be carried one step further by integrating the styles theories with the contingency theories. The leadership styles theories tend to portray an autocratic leader as a villain, a human relations leader as a country club director, a laissez faire leader as a nonleader, and a democratic leader as a hero or heroine. In addition, even though most leadership positions require a variety of responses to changing situations, the leadership styles theories either advocate the one best style approach (the democratic style), the one best style with a back-up style approach, or in recent more advanced theories, a democratic leader for some situations, an autocratic leader for other situations, and in-between styles for still other situations. However, few leaders can afford the luxury of using one approach to leadership, hopefully the correct one, for all situations, nor do they have the psychological makeup to switch from one style to another without confusing their followers or themselves. The exception to these observations is the Blake and Mouton Management Grid which tends to integrate both the styles and contingency theories.

The Contingency Approach

The contingency or situational approach to leadership suggests that different situations require different approaches to leadership. Although the contingency approach is just starting to emerge, Chester Barnard attempted to classify the variables found in management situations as early as 1938 in his classic book, *The Functions of the Executive* [16]. The early leaders in researching and conceptualizing situational leadership have been Tannenbaum and Schmidt [17] with their "Choosing a Leadership Pattern" model, Argyris [18] with his "Different Ways of Leading

and Organizing" model, Reddin [19] with his "3-D Management Style" model, Fiedler [20] with his "Leadership Contingency" model, House [21] with his "Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness," Vroom and Yettons [22] with their "Problem-Centered Approach to Leadership," and Hersey and Blanchard [23] with their "Life Cycle Theory of Leadership."

Much of the confusion surrounding the contingency and styles theories can be resolved by understanding three important issues:

1. Understanding the difference between style and skills.
2. Recognizing the need for using a style that facilitates rather than inhibits the use of a wide variety of skills.
3. Recognizing the need for style consistency.

Distinguishing Between Style and Skills

Some of the contingency theorists mistakenly assume that situational leadership means changing leadership styles with changing situations. Style refers to the emphasis a person places on performance and people and the characteristics, attitudes, mannerisms, and personality of the leader. As Blake and Mouton suggested, if a leader continuously changed styles, employees would be constantly confused in their attempts to predict and adjust to their leader's erratic behavior! Skills refer to the specific techniques that a person uses to accomplish goals such as staffing, planning, organizing, controlling, communicating, evaluating performance, handling problems and conflicts, and managing time. Each style of leader tends to apply these skills in a unique way and emphasizes some skills more than others. For example, an autocratic leader tends to emphasize centralized planning, organizing, and controlling, and to apply these skills in an authoritative, impersonal way. Once one understands the difference between style and skills, it becomes clear that *what an effective contingency leader changes is not his or her style, but rather the selection of skills and the way they are applied depending on the situation*. Thus, an effective leader may change skills depending on the requirements of the situation and still maintain a consistent leadership style. A democratic leader, for example, does not have to suddenly turn into an autocratic person to use skills such as close supervision and tight controls if they are appropriate to the situation.

The Need For a Leadership Style That Facilitates Skill Changes

An awareness of leadership styles and their consequences is very important for successful leadership because a leader's style may either facilitate or inhibit skill changes. For example, a style that gains the trust and respect of those affected by the style tends to give a leader considerable flexibility in changing skills with changing situations while the same changes would be viewed with suspicion and resistance if a leader's style is disliked and distrusted.

Any style could facilitate change if it gained the trust and respect of those affected by it. However, in most cases an autocratic style tends to create distrust, a laissez faire style lack of credibility, and human relations style lack of respect, thus limiting the flexibility of leaders using these styles. The style that most consistently results in trust and respect

and therefore increases the likelihood of a positive response to contingency management is the democratic or 9,9 style.

What the democratic style really describes is a reasonably healthy person who treats others with respect and places a high emphasis on both performance and people. It is the most appropriate style for contingency management and should be effective except in cases where those affected by the style resist healthy behavior, are unwilling to treat others with respect, or do not respond to a high emphasis on both performance and people.

Understanding the Importance of Style Consistency

An inconsistent leadership style causes those affected by the style to waste considerable time trying to figure out how to best work with a leader, predict how a leader will behave in different situations, and understand what a leader really means, wants, or expects. It also slows down decision making and problem solving processes and increases the stress of those affected by the leader. Even if a person has a style that is not well received, style consistency makes it possible for those affected by the style to learn to work around it. Ideally, a leader should have a style that is well received as well as consistent.

One last thing should be noted about a consistent leadership style. Consistency does not imply rigid, robot-like behavior. A style projects a particular emphasis on performance and people and can be expressed in a wide variety of ways by different people or even the same person in different situations.

Summary

The "Leadership Styles Exercise" is designed to be a theory based experiential approach to learning about leadership styles and their consequences. It is a fun exercise that generates a high level of involvement and interest and often produces dramatic results that students are not likely to forget.

References

1. Stogdill, R. M. and Coons, A. E., Eds., *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.
2. Fleishman, E. A., and Hunt, J. G., Eds., *Current Developments in the Study of Leadership*. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973.
3. Hemphill, J. K., *Leader Behavior Description*. Columbus, Ohio: Personnel Research Board, Ohio State University, 1950.
4. Katz, D., and Kahn, R. L., *Leadership Practices in Relation to Productivity and Morale*, in *Group Dynamics* (D. Cartwright and A. Zander, Eds.). Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson, 1950, pp. 554-570.
5. Likert, Rensis, *New Patterns of Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
6. Davis, Keith, *Human Behavior at Work: Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981, pp. 110-118.
7. Hersey, Paul, and Blanchard, Kenneth H., *Life Cycle Theory of Leadership*, *Training and Development Journal* 26-34 (May, 1969).
8. Blake, R. R., and Mouton, J. S., *The Managerial Grid*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1964.
9. Blake, R. R., and Mouton, J. S., *The New Managerial Grid*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1978.

10. Blake, R. R., and Mouton, J. S., Should You Teach There's Only One Best Way To Manage?, *Training* 24-29 (April, 1978).
11. Stogdill, R. M., *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: The Free Press, 1974.
12. Hollander, Edwin P., *Leadership Dynamics*. New York: The Free Press, 1978.
13. Fleishman, E., and Hunt, J., Eds., *Current Developments in the Study of Leadership*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973.
14. Vroom, Victor, H., and Yetton, Phillip W., *Leadership and Decision Making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1975.
15. Hunt, J., and Larson, L., Eds., *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977.
16. Barnard, Chester F., *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938, pp. 128-129.
17. Tannenbaum, Robert, and Schmidt, Warren, How to Choose a Leadership Pattern, *Harvard Business Review* 51:162-180 (1973).
18. Argyris, Chris, *Integrating the Individual and the Organization*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
19. Reddin, William J., *Managerial Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
20. Fiedler, Fred, *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967. Also, Fiedler, Fred, and Chemers, M. M., *The Leader Match Concept*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1977.
21. House, Robert, A Path-Goal Theory of Leadership, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 16:321-338 (1971).
22. Vroom, V. H., and Yetton, P. W., *Leadership and Decision Making*. Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973.
23. Hersey, P., and Blanchard, K. H., *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.