

SOS POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION,

JIWAJI UNIVERSITY, GWALIOR

MBA FA II SEM

PAPER- FA (205)

SUBJECT NAME: ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR

UNIT-IV

TOPIC NAME: LEADERSHIP STYLES

The word “**leadership**” in psychology is linked to a name and an experiment: the one conducted by **Kurt Lewin** in the context of the **Second World War**. In this historical context we witnessed the rise to power of various dictators that were able to get a great number of people to believe in their projects, regardless of whether they were right or wrong.

This time period highlighted that in order for a new leader to emerge, there is almost always a void power or at the very least a strong current of doubt in the society about the established power.

We can appreciate why the interest in leadership that originated within military and political hierarchy has now expanded to other fields, as well. Such as, education field, sports and business. This has become a universally relevant issue.

Nowadays, unfortunately we don't have a single classification of the different types of leadership. Thus, we are going to describe one of the classifications that are most used and well-known within group psychology. This classification distinguishes **five types of leadership**, two more than the ones initially established by **Kurt Lewin**.



1. DELEGATIVE LEADERSHIP (LAISSEZ-FAIRE)

Here we're referring to the invisible leader, the one who allows others to do more. They're a kind of manager whose job is to distribute the tasks. It is especially effective in those groups of highly trained and motivated people who are simply waiting for someone to point them in the right direction.

That is to say, this type of leader is the one who provides guidelines and ensures communication among the rest of the members of the group. The danger of having a delegative leader stems from situations which require their actions, and in which they might not intervene.

The laissez-faire leadership style is at the opposite end of the autocratic style. Of all the leadership styles, this one involves the least amount of oversight. You could say that the autocratic style leader stands as firm as a rock on issues, while the laissez-faire leader lets people swim with the current.

On the surface, a laissez-faire leader may appear to trust people to know what to do, but taken to the extreme, an uninvolved leader may end up appearing aloof. While it's beneficial to give people opportunities to spread their wings, with a total lack of direction, people may unwittingly drift in the wrong direction—away from the critical goals of the organization.

This style can work if you're leading highly skilled, experienced employees who are self-starters and motivated. To be most effective with this style, monitor team performance and provide regular feedback.

Here we are dealing with a leader who sins by default instead of by excess. Therefore, it's easy for one destabilizing factor to make everything fall apart.

An example of a **delegative leader** could be **Gandalf** in this scene.



2. AUTOCRATIC LEADERSHIP

The phrase most illustrative of an autocratic leadership style is "Do as I say."

Generally, an autocratic leader believes that he or she is the smartest person at the table and knows more than others. They make all the decisions with little input from team members.

This command-and-control approach is typical of leadership styles of the past, but it doesn't hold much water with today's talent.

That's not to say that the style may not be appropriate in certain situations. For example, you can dip into an autocratic leadership style when crucial decisions need to be made on the spot, and you have the most knowledge about the situation, or when you're dealing with inexperienced and new team members and there's no time to wait for team members to gain familiarity with their role.

Unlike the previous leader, the autocratic leader is an interventionist type of leader. Their lane goes in only one direction, since they only speak to but don't listen to the group they are directing. On the other hand, they tend to be very controlling, which works especially well in groups that are very motivated but have a lot of doubts about how to develop the tasks that have been assigned to them.

The danger is that this leader can be very discouraging for groups that are very well prepared, making everyone fall off the edge once the leader unknowingly decides to move towards it.

Finally, the autocratic leader tends to harbor a feeling of superiority towards the people they lead, a contamination that can make the warning described above enough more dangerous.

An example of an **autocratic leader** in history is **Margaret Thatcher**.



3. DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP

As you can probably guess, this is the ideal in many Western political systems. A democratic leader tries to maximize communicative bidirectionality. They lead, but without forgetting the importance of being sensitive to the feedback provided by the group about their decisions. In fact, a constant consultant element characterizes this type of leadership.

Democratic leaders are good for groups that are prepared, but which don't have much motivation. The feeling of being listened to can be the best remedy for this kind of deficit, thus significantly increasing their interest, for the procedures as well as the objectives.

Democratic leaders are more likely to ask "What do you think?" They share information with employees about anything that affects their work responsibilities. They also seek employees' opinions before approving a final decision.

There are numerous benefits to this participative leadership style. It can engender trust and promote team spirit and cooperation from employees. It allows for creativity and helps employees grow and develop. A democratic leadership style gets people to do what you want to be done but in a way that they *want* to do it.

An example of a **democratic leader** in history is **Nelson Mandela**.



4. TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Transactional leadership is focused on objectives. This type of leader acquires the role of the guardian of the motivation for the group. They provide rewards and enforce punishments depending on the group's interest and performance.

This type of leader, if clever with their task, is good for long and tedious processes in which the group can't find intrinsic motivation easily — that is to say, motivation linked to the task itself — in the task they are performing.

Thus, since only external rewards can be provided, a good leader will focus on their distribution and will manage to do so effectively.

The danger of this type of leadership resides in the things surrounding the objective, such as the environment within the group itself, which many times ends up harmed by the competitiveness towards these rewards we spoke of (promotions, vacations, flexibility, etc.).

An example of **transactional leadership** can be seen in **soccer coaches**.



5. TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Transformational leadership is focused on the group's motivation, but viewed from the task itself. His intention is that the group will achieve its goals, but without neglecting other goals. These lateral objectives can be very different and varied: the acquisition of skills by the group members, the dynamic that is generated within the group, caring for the environment, etc.

This type of leader is especially good when they have to lead a group that doesn't have a high degree of knowledge or motivation, and one which doesn't have a very high degree of pressure to achieve its main objective.

An example of **transformational leadership** is **John. F. Kennedy**.



As we can now see, the types of leadership proposed by group psychology research constitute very definitive profiles. However, when it comes to managing and directing a group, leaders don't always behave uniquely. Diversity is usually the norm.

SOME OTHER COMMON LEADERSHIP STYLES :

At first glance, we may think that some leadership styles are better than others. The truth is that each leadership style has its place in a leader's toolkit. The wise leader knows to flex from one style to another as the situation demands.

AUTHORITATIVE STYLE

The phrase most indicative of this style of leadership (also known as "visionary") is "Follow me." The authoritative leadership style is the mark of confident leaders who map the way and set expectations, while engaging and energizing followers along the way.

In a climate of uncertainty, these leaders lift the fog for people. They help them see where the company is going and what's going to happen when they get there.

Unlike autocratic leaders, authoritative leaders take the time to explain their thinking: They don't just issue orders. Most of all, they allow people choice and latitude on how to achieve common goals.

PACESETTING STYLE

"Do as I do!" is the phrase most indicative of leaders who utilize the pacesetting style. This style describes a very driven leader who sets the pace as in racing. Pacesetters set the bar high and push their team members to run hard and fast to the finish line.

While the pacesetter style of leadership is effective in getting things done and driving for results, it's a style that can hurt team members. For one thing, even the most driven employees may become stressed working under this style of leadership in the long run.

An agile leadership style may be the ultimate leadership style required for leading today's talent.

Should you avoid the pacesetting style altogether? Not so fast. If you're an energetic entrepreneur working with a like-minded team on developing and announcing a new product or service, this style may serve you well. However, this is not a style that can be kept up for the long term. A pacesetting leader needs to let the air out of the tires once in a while to avoid causing team burnout.

COACHING STYLE

When you having a coaching leadership style, you tend to have a "Consider this" approach. A leader who coaches views people as a reservoir of talent to be developed. The leader who uses a coach approach seeks to unlock people's potential.

Leaders who use a coaching style open their hearts and doors for people. They believe that everyone has power within themselves. A coaching leader gives people a little direction to help them tap into their ability to achieve all that they're capable of.

AFFILIATIVE STYLE

A phrase often used to describe this type of leadership is "People come first." Of all the leadership styles, the affiliative leadership approach is one where the leader gets up close and personal with people. A leader practicing this style pays attention to and supports the emotional needs of team members. The leader strives to open up a pipeline that connects him or her to the team.

Ultimately, this style is all about encouraging harmony and forming collaborative relationships within teams. It's particularly useful, for example, in smoothing conflicts among team members or reassuring people during times of stress.

CHOOSING LEADERSHIP STYLES:

Knowing which of the leadership styles works best for you is part of being a good leader. Developing a signature style with the ability to stretch into other styles as the situation warrants may help enhance your leadership effectiveness.

1. KNOW YOURSELF.

Start by raising your awareness of your dominant leadership style. You can do this by asking trusted colleagues to describe the strengths of your leadership style. You can also take a leadership style assessment.

2. UNDERSTAND THE DIFFERENT STYLES.

Get familiar with the repertoire of leadership styles that can work best for a given situation. What new skills do you need to develop?

3. PRACTICE MAKES A LEADER.

Be genuine with any approach you use. Moving from a dominant leadership style to a different one may be challenging at first. Practice the new behaviors until they become natural. In other words, don't use a different leadership style as a "point-and-click" approach. People can smell a fake leadership style a mile away—authenticity rules.

4. DEVELOP YOUR LEADERSHIP AGILITY.

Traditional leadership styles are still relevant in today's workplace, but they may need to be combined with new approaches in line with how leadership is defined for the 21st century.

Today's business environments are fraught with challenges due to the changing demographics and the employee expectations of a diverse workforce. This may call for a new breed of leader who is an amalgam of most of the leadership styles discussed here.
