

“THERE EXISTS A STYLE OF LEADERSHIP THAT IS UNIVERSALLY MORE EFFECTIVE THAN ALL OTHER LEADERSHIP STYLES”

By

Lukman, S.Psi., M.App.Psy.

Nirwati Yapardy, S.Pd., M.HRM,IR

Abstract

There are many leadership styles exist, but to evaluate the effectiveness of leaders behavior is determined on a number of factors namely, the selection of appropriate criteria, the person whom making the evaluation, and factors that used to evaluate its effectiveness. This essay will examine and compare the effectiveness of two leadership styles namely, Misumi PM Theory, and transformational leadership. Arguments and examples from both styles would demonstrate that national culture might affect the effectiveness of leadership. Therefore, this essay shows that there is no one style of leadership to be applied universally.

Key words: *leadership, leadership styles, effectiveness.*

A good leadership can be a key in organizational performance (Northcraft & Neale, 1994). Most organizations would have same opinion that good leadership is crucial for organizations and they would agree that leadership role is an important as one factors in contributing the successfulness of organizations (Ancok, 2000). The notions of leadership effectiveness however, differ as a reflection of research's conception leadership. There are three criteria commonly used to evaluate leadership effectiveness. The most commonly measure used is to what extent leader performs its task successfully and attains its goals. Another criterion is to what extent leader satisfies their followers' needs and expectations. And lastly, the leader contribution to quality of group processes as perceived by followers or observes

(Yukl, 1998).

In addition, Casimir and Keats (1996) argue that leadership preferences differ in view of individualism-collectivism, as individualist and collectivist tend to perceive their psychological needs (e.g., autonomy, affiliation, nurturance, abasement), work values (individual or collective goals), and attitudes towards authority (e.g., parent-child, student-teacher, leader-subordinate) differently. As a result, these factors subsequently affect individual's conception of work relations and together with inherent ideals (the ideal leader-subordinate relationship) strongly influencing individual desired on leader-subordinate relationship.

Furthermore, Robbins (2003) argues that emotional intelligence (EI) is another factor in leader's effectiveness. As demonstrated by trait theory of leadership, although leaders need some basic intelligence and relevant knowledge to lead, these IQ and technical skills are not sufficient for leadership. To become an effective leader, individual also needs five components of EI namely, self-awareness, self-management, self-motivation, empathy, and social skills, which allows individual to become a long-term vision. Self-awareness is being aware with our own feelings. Effective leaders must exhibit self-confidence, realistic self-assessment, and a self-deprecating sense of humor. Self-management is an ability to manage our own emotions and impulses. Leaders also have to demonstrate trustworthiness, and integrity, comfort with ambiguity and openness to change. Self-motivation is the ability to persist and facing obstacle and failures. Leader should possess strong drive to achieve, optimism, and high organizational commitment. Empathy is the ability to sense how others feeling. Leaders must have sensitivity and appreciate follower's feelings and problems, identify followers' opinion from their perspective. Lastly, social skills are the ability to handle emotions of others. Leaders should exhibit strong ability to lead change, persuasiveness, and expertise in building and leading teams (Goleman, 1996).

Great leaders should possess these traits as individuals move up in an organization. The evidence indicates that the higher rank of a person in organization to be a star performer, the more EI capabilities needed for his or her effectiveness. Nearly 90% of the differences between star performers compared with average ones in their effectiveness were attributed with EI rather than basic intelligence

(Robbins, 2005).

In terms of leadership styles, there has been much debate on the most effective styles of leadership (Nahavandi, 1995). Furthermore, is leadership style can be applied universally? The subject is whether there is generalization about leader behavior within different cultural context. This essay will compare two theories of leadership namely Misumi PM theory and transformational leadership on the effectiveness of leaders behavior and examine factors that could affect the effectiveness of these styles to be applied universally.

In order to understand the effectiveness of leadership style, it must be examined both in terms of general structures and specific expressions. For instance, the transformational model defined effectiveness as the successfulness of large-change in an organization (Robbins, 2003). The general structure for transformational leader is the successfulness of the organization which is determined by the attainments of its goals. In specific structure, leader should transcend their own self-interest and by using their profound effect on followers with charisma, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and consideration to their followers, leader will achieve the general objectives of their organizations. In other words, there might be a general or inherent nature of leader-subordinate relationships, but skilful leader need to express these general structures in a variable manner which is affected by numerous factors in a specific (environment) cultures. However, transformational model of leadership did not explain how to understand followers in terms of their different cultural background. Understanding how culture might influence the

effectiveness of follower's perception would be best understood using Misumi's leadership concept.

In addition, organizational structure might affect the transformational style. In a high bureaucratic and tall structured organization, transformational leadership probably would be unsuccessful because transformational leader have difficulty to communicate and share their visions to their subordinates (McShane, & Travaglione, 2003).

Study by Boehnke, Distefano and Bontis (cited in McShane and Travaglione, 2003) found that transformational leadership is more suitable in Australia (individualist country) than other countries. For the reason that Australian organizations were challenged to adapt more and since many aspects of transformational leadership such as the way visions are formed and communicated are found in this country. This finding shows that the application of transformational leadership was affected by organizational readiness. To what extent leader formed, communicate and share their vision in the organization and how organization should change to adapt more. Conversely, Jung, Bass, and Sosik (1995) argue that transformational leadership will be more effective in collective cultures than in individualistic cultures as a high level of a group orientation among followers, authority, and obedience, were considered respectful in collective cultures, contribute to the process of the transformational leadership style.

Misumi PM Theory

Misumi's leadership theory proposed that optimal leader effectiveness occurs when subordinates perceive the leader as being concerned with both performance (P) and the maintenance (M) of group relations. P represents leadership that is oriented towards the attainment of group goals, whereas M represent leadership aims at maintaining and increasing group cohesiveness. Although any leader behavior reflects some degree on one function than the other, certain behavior will tend to focus more on one function than the other (Misumi & Peterson, 1985).

Typical P-type leadership emphasizes high quality, cost effectiveness, monitor progress, and enforce rules and regulations. Typical M-type leadership creates a comfortable and pleasant workplace, expresses appreciation for subordinate efforts and shows concern for subordinate personal and work-related problems.

These two functions are interrelated. Four leadership style are obtained by treating the two functions as axes, each with two levels, high and low. (See table 1.). Misumi high/low categorization is not based on absolute scores for each function but, rather, on the average function score given by all subordinates to they're supervisors on particular setting. Consequently, the leaders might be rated as high on one setting and low in another.

So, PM style leadership involves an above average concern both subordinate performance and the maintenance of group processes. The M style leadership rates above average in its emphasis

on the maintenance of group process and below average on the emphasis placed on subordinate performance. The P style of leadership rates above average in its emphasis on subordinate's performance and below average on the emphasis placed on group process. Lastly, the pm style of leadership involves a below average concern with both subordinate performance and group process.

Table 1. Four leadership styles

High P	P	PM
Low P	<i>Pm</i>	M
	Low M	High M

From a number of studies, it has shown that the PM leadership is consistently the most effective in terms of both objectives and cognitive criteria (e.g., accident rates and willingness to work, respectively), whereas pm leadership is consistently the least effective. M leadership is usually on the second rank, especially in the long-term projects, and P-leadership is the third (Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Peterson, & Bond, 1989).

The consistency superiority of PM type leadership is due to the interrelatedness of P and M functions. That is, although P function is central for subordinate to perform effectively, but P functions are likely might cause anxiety and resentment. The-type leadership, overcome the anxiety and this resentment, and therefore, M-type function could be seen as catalyzing or facilitating effect on P functions.

According to the Misumi PM Leadership style, specific leader's behavior might not have the same meaning in different situations. Leadership will be effectively fulfilled by different specific behaviors in each setting, depending upon the meanings attributed to the behavior in that setting (Misumi & Peterson, 1985; Smith, Peterson, Bond, & Misumi, 1992). Misumi & Peterson (1985) postulate that the influence of cultures is strong since specific behavior in one culture might have different meanings in another culture. For instance, among American employees, discussing problems with supervisors was strongly related to satisfaction but this was not so among Peruvians employees in the same context (Whyte & William 1963, cited in Casimir & Keats, 1996).

Smith et al. (1989) study with British, Hong Kong, American, and Japan' employees found that specific behavior for M supervisors are individual who concern about a team member's personal difficulties and responds sympathetically, spending times to discuss subordinates' careers and plans, and accept suggestions for work improvements. Furthermore, specific behaviors for high P supervisor are individuals who are talking about progress in relation to a work schedule, sharing information, and being within sight. However, checking work quality and improvement is perceived as high M in America and British, whereas in Hong Kong and Japan is perceived as high P. Speaking out subordinate personal difficulties with others in their absence rather than face to face is perceived as high M in Hong Kong and Japan, in contrast, followers in British and America

would perceived their supervisors as high P if they consult their difficulties with others without their attendance.

Therefore, from these findings, it is clear that people in different culture might perceive things in differently and although there are transcultural dimensions of leader style across cultures, but the skill of executing it varies by cultural setting. The findings also indicate that within Western data, behavior which pressure subordinates are a much stronger element in P than they are in the Eastern data. Conversely, planning and goal facilitation are much stronger in the Eastern conception of P. these findings suits well with Hofstede's findings, which indicate that Western countries (individualist) values a leader's who are expected to exerting direct pressure towards a goal whereas, Eastern countries (collectivist) leaders is more likely to emphasize reciprocal influence processes.

Misumi conceptions of leadership have different view with House's path goal theory and Fiedler's contingency model. Both theories are based on the idea that the most appropriate leadership style depends on the situation and these models assumed that the behavior of leaders always have the same meaning regardless of context and culture (Robbins, 2003). According to both theory, leader effectiveness occurs only when situations match with an individual's natural leadership style, and leaders focused mainly on the motivation and satisfaction of subordinates.

In addition, a participative leadership style have no positive impacts in Taiwan or Mexico due to strong central leadership and their high collectivism, which discourages the desire of subordinates to influence organizational processes. Dorfman, Howell, Hibino, Lee, Tate, and Bautista (1997) found that for many South Koreans, sharing information and expressing opinions in a work environment is difficult. Similarly, in Taiwan and Mexico, it is difficult to expect a subordinate's suggestions, thought to give input, and to modify proposals in light of subordinate's objections. Therefore, Taiwanese supervisors tend to use authoritarian decision styles and maintain power distances with their subordinates. While in Mexico, the lack of organizational structure for participation, high collectivism, and lack of trust, make participative leadership ineffective. As a result, authoritarian styles of leadership would be appropriate where superiors are supposed to make all the decisions, and the subordinates merely have to accomplish a superior's objectives (Dorfman, et al, 1997).

Hofstede Cultural Values

Hofstede argues that societies differ along four major cultural dimensions: power distance, individualism, masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance. According to Hofstede (cited in Matsumoto, 1994), power distance is the extent to which the less powerful individuals in a society accept inequality in power and consider it as normal. Although inequality exists within every culture, the degree to which it is accepted varies from culture to culture. Hofstede defines individualist cultures as being those societies where individuals are primarily concerned with their own interests and the interests of their immediate family. Collectivist cultures, in contrast, assume that individuals belong to one or more "in-groups" (e.g., extended family, clan, or other

organization) from which they cannot detach themselves. The “in-group” protects the interest of its members, and in turn expects their permanent loyalty.

Masculinity, according to Hofstede, is the extent to which individuals in a society expect men (as opposed to women) to be assertive, ambitious, competitive, to strive for material success, and to respect whatever is big, strong and fast. Masculine cultures expect women to serve and to care for the nonmaterial quality of life, for children, and for the weak. Feminine cultures, on the other hand, define relatively overlapping social roles for both sexes with neither men nor women needing to be overly ambitious or competitive. Masculine cultures value material success and assertiveness while feminine cultures value qualities such as interpersonal relationships and concern for the weak.

Uncertainty avoidance is defined as the extent to which individuals within a culture are made nervous by situation that are unstructured, unclear, or unpredictable, and the extent to which these individuals attempt to avoid such situations by adopting strict codes of behavior and a belief in absolute truth. Cultures with strong uncertainty avoidance are active, aggressive, emotional, security-seeking, and intolerant. On the other hand, cultures with weak uncertainty avoidance are contemplative, less aggressive, unemotional, accepting of personal risk, and relatively tolerant.

All four of these cultural dimensions relate to ethics in the sense that they may influence the individual's perception of ethical situations, norms for behavior, and ethical judgments, among other factors. The implication is that as societies differ with regard to these cultural dimensions so will the various components of their ethical decision making differ. The specific manner in which these cultural dimensions may influence leadership styles will be discussed later.

Different styles of leadership were influenced by leaders' assumption regarding subordinates' motivational and psychological needs and capabilities. In countries with high uncertainty avoidance and high power distance, leaders might assume that their subordinates are reactive and averse to risk (Hofstede 1980), cited in Matsumoto, 1994). Due to this notion, leadership style is formed in such ways that leaders closely supervise and guide their subordinates. Such directive styles would be more appropriate for subordinate with low need for autonomy or achievement, and with low level of skills (Aycan, Kanungo, & Sinha, 1999).

In contrast, a supportive and delegation style would be better exercised in countries that practice low power distance and uncertainty avoidance such as Australia, because leaders might assume that in such cultures, subordinates are more risk taking, have strong ambitions for advancement, and strong motivation toward achievement (Hofstede 1980, cited in Matsumoto, 1994). Similarly, such a style would suit subordinates with a high need for autonomy and achievement (Aycan, Kanungo, & Sinha, 1999).

Further, different cultures might interpret specific leaders behavior differently. For instance, Hong Kong managers were perceived as high on maintenance when they are talking about work

problems in the workplace whereas in the US not being so likely to talk about work problems was perceived as high on maintenance. In Japan, managers who meet with subordinates socially after hours were perceived as high on attainment toward group goals, whereas in the US quite the opposite (Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Peterson, & Bond, 1989).

Alternatively, the effectiveness of particular leadership styles depends on a subordinate's perception of what good leadership is. Individuals from different cultures might prefer different leadership styles as they expect different things from their leaders. For example, superiors and subordinates might have different ways of defining effectiveness (Nahavandi, 1997). In collectivist countries such as India, employees were familiar with an authoritarian leadership style rather than a democratic leadership style. Paternalism in India appears to be the most exceptional feature of leadership. Consequently, subordinates accept a leader's authority and depend on them to search for guidance and direction. Sinha (cited in Matsumoto, 1994) proposes that participative leadership is ideal, but would only be successful under certain conditions that often are not present in India. For example, Indian people prefer personal over contractual relationship, rules and regulations can be bypassed to accommodate friends or relatives, and late arrival at work and long lunches are considered as an outcome of status. These factors make an authoritarian-nurturant style necessary.

Goal attainment orientation also might influence the practice of leadership as different societies might value goal attainment differently. The differences between collectivist and individualist cultures could be seen given that collectivist countries would be concerned with community respect, whereas individualist countries would be more concerned with self-fulfilment. For instance, El-Hayek and Keats (1992) found that Lebanese leaders were more concerned with maintaining family needs and community respect, whereas Anglo-Australian leaders were more concerned with financial independence and achieving high income. Predominantly, to establish effectiveness, supervisors might focus mainly on outcomes that are commonly measured from the successful task performed and goal attainment, whereas subordinates might consider satisfaction at work and honesty or processes to achieve the outcomes (Yukl, 1998).

Lastly, becoming a good leader takes practice and involves learning from one's mistakes (Nahavandi, 1997) and is a painful trial and error process (Smith, et al., 1992). Substantial differences in the way certain specific behavior are interpreted means leaders operating in cultures other than their own need to be more aware than usual of the meanings, which may be placed on their actions by others. Therefore, organizations that discourage risk taking, experimentation, and making mistakes are obstacles to effective leadership in such context.

In conclusion, there is no one correct style of leadership which can be applied universally because effective leadership should take into account perceptions of their subordinates' ability to adapt to different situations, and the internal and external environment of an organization is represented by its task or employee focus, organizational structure and complexity, and lack of opportunity to practice is represented by the national culture.

To be an effective leader, individuals with leadership potential can enhance their skills through learning and develop their awareness of understanding subordinates' needs. Leaders should also develop their ability to adapt to a changing environment as well as work in different cultures and adjust themselves in accordance with the situation. In addition, organizations need to have flexibility to practice leadership by reducing organization rigidity.

References

Aykan, Z., Kanungo, R.N., & Sinha, J.B.P. (1999). Organizational culture and human resource management practices: The model of culture fit. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, Vol. 30(4), pp501-526.

Casimir, G., & Keats, D.M (1996), The effect of work environment and in-group membership on the leadership preferences of Anglo-Australians and Chinese Australians. In Lasry, J.C., Adair, J., & Dion, K. (Eds.) *Latest Contribution to Cross-Cultural Psychology*. Pp.436-457. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.R. (1988), The empowerment process: Integrating leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management*, Vol 12, pp. 637-647.

Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.R. (1988), "The empowerment process: integrating theory and practice". *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp 471-482.

Dorfman, P.W., Howell, J.P., Hibino, S., Lee, J.K., Tate, U., & Bautista, A. (1997). Leadership in western and Asian countries: commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures. *Leadership Quarterly*. Vol8(3), pp 233-247.

El-Hayek, T., & Keats, D.M. (1992). Leader characteristics and motivations in Labanese and Annglo-Australians. In S. Iwawaki Y. Kashima, & K. Leuang (Eds.), *Innovations in Cross-Cultural Psychology*. (pp. 257-268). Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Goleman, D.C. (1997). *Emotional Intelegency*. Jakarta: Gramedia

Jung, D. I., Bass, B. M., & Sosik, J.J. (1995). Bridging leadership and culture: A theoretical consideration of transdormational leadership and collectivistic cultures. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, Vol. 2, pp. 318.

Matsumoto, D. (1994). *People: Psychology from a Cultural Perspective*. USA: Waveland Press, Inc.

McShane, S., & Travaglione, T. (2003), *Organizational Behavior on the Pacific Rim*. Sydney: McGraw-Hill.

Misumi, J., & Peterson, M.F (1985), The Peformance-maintenance (PM) theory of leadership: Review of a Japanese research program. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol30, pp 198-223.

Nahavandi, A. (1997), *The Art and Science of leadership*. New Jersey. Prentice Hall.

Nortcraft & Neale. (1994), *Organizational Behavior: A Management Challenge*. 2nd Ed. The Dryden Press.

Robbins, S.P. (2003), *Organizational Behavior*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Smith, P.B., Misumi, J., Tayeb, M., Peterson, M., & Bond, M. (1989), On the generality of leadership measures across cultures. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, Vol 62pp. 97-109.

Smith, P.B., Peterson, M. F., Bond, M., & Misumi, J. (1992). Leader Style and Leader Behavior in Individualist and Collectivist Cultures, In S. Iwawaki, Y. Kashima, & K. Leung (Eds.), *Innovations in Cross_Cultural Psychology*. (pp. 76-85). Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in Organizations* (4th Ed), New Jersey: Prentice: Hall.