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Abstract
Most of the research on leadership in organisations draws on one of several basic conceptualisations, each of which derive from a single aspect of organisational behaviour. Leadership theories typically describe the styles leaders use on only one behavioural dimension, for example, whether their managerial focus is more on task issues or people issues. However, managerial practice requires the simultaneous exercise of leadership behaviour across many dimensions. This paper outlines Total Behaviour Leadership, a conceptual model which reflects the complexity of the multiple styles used by leader-managers in organisations. The Multi-Style Model posits that effectiveness results from the combined effect of a leader-manager's behaviour across multiple dimensions. The model points to a need for empirical investigation of the various style patterns across multiple behavioural dimensions and of the comparative effectiveness of the different combinations of leadership styles used by leader-managers in practice.

1. Introduction
Leadership is one of those topics that cycles in popularity in both the academic and professional business communities. At times almost a buzzword, at other times virtually ignored or considered passé. Regardless of its transient topicality most academics and practitioners would agree that leadership is of fundamental importance in modern organisations as the key to productivity (cf. Karpin, 1995). One of the periodic hot issues in this area is that of the relationship between leadership and management. The current received wisdom in the literature is that there is a basic difference between leadership and management (Kotter, 1990; Parry, 1996, 19-28). However, there is a growing body of opinion that questions this simple dichotomy (Alder, 1995, 7-8; Clegg & Gray, 1996, 35). In any case, in the real world of work it is not a question of ‘either or’ but rather of ‘both and’. In other words, organisations do not need their managers to
stop managing and start leading, but to do both (Kotter, 1990, 103). They must become ‘leader-managers’.

A leader-manager is here defined as one who exercises a managerial role within an organisation (via planning, directing, organising, etc.) but who does so using leadership skills to influence their subordinates (via visioning, inspiring, etc.). Someone in a managerial role cannot be fully effective unless they are both a leader and a manager. Leadership effectiveness is variously measured in terms of organisational outcomes, group commitment to goals, follower satisfaction or even leader status (cf. Yukl, 1994, 5-6). The effectiveness of a leader-manager is here considered in terms of their ability to influence the behaviour of others towards the achievement of group and/or organisational goals.

2. A New Perspective on Leadership: Multi-Style Model

The Multi-Style Model of leadership is presented in Figure 1. In essence the model aims to recognise the multiple behavioural dimensions that are faced everyday by real-life managers exercising leadership, specifically the dimensions of: influence, communication, management, motivation, decision-making, culture, conflict and change. The various boxes and the linkages depicted in the model will be considered in turn.

The bottomline in leadership is effectiveness, that is, the ability of a leader to bring out the best in their subordinates/followers (see the final box in Figure 1). Effectiveness refers to how well a leader-manager can influence others’ productivity or shape their behaviour towards the achievement of goals in both the short and long term. Of course, the absolute productivity level of a group depends on many factors besides their leader-manager’s behaviour, in particular, the subordinates’ individual competencies, their personal characteristics as well as group and organisational dynamics. But different leader-managers will vary in their ability to influence the productivity of a particular group of workers.
Figure 1. Multi-style model of Leadership for Managing Behaviour in Organisations
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LEADER-MANAGER EFFECTIVENESS
At the heart of the Multi-Style Model are the styles that leader-managers adopt on eight key behavioural dimensions (see Figure 1). There are a number of styles available on each dimension as depicted in Figure 2. ‘Style’ refers to the modes of action and interaction that characterise a leader-manager’s behaviour in an organisation. Central to a leader-manager’s behaviour is their style of influence. The primary determinant of influence style is the leader-manager’s power, a combination of their power sources and power tactics. The model follows Handy (1985) and distinguishes five power sources (physical, resource, position, expert, personal) and six influence tactics (force, rules, exchange, persuasion, ecology, magnetism) (see Dimension 1 in Figure 2). Thus, a leader-manager will use a range of power sources and tactics which together comprise their style of influence.

But a leader-manager’s influence style is shaped not only by power factors but also by their managerial style and their communication style (see Dimensions 2 & 3 in Figure 2). The model adopts the widely accepted distinction in managerial style between task versus people focus and allows for four basic styles depending on whether the leader-manager is high or low on each. Also, much of the leadership literature recognises the importance of communication for leader effectiveness (e.g., Mintzberg, 1973). The model posits that a leader-manager’s style of communication (open versus closed) contributes to their overall style and their overall effectiveness. Of course, this dimension is a continuum rather than a dichotomy – a leader-manager’s communication style can fall anywhere between fully open and totally closed.

The next two dimensions which comprise a leader-manager’s multi-style pattern are decision-making and motivation (see Dimensions 4 & 5 in Figure 2). Here we distinguish autocratic, consultative, group and collegial decision-making styles depending on the extent to which the leader-manager shares decision-making with their subordinates. In relation to motivational style, the present model posits that the basic style choice is between inspiration and exchange. Leader-managers who use inspiration to motivate their subordinates use charismatic techniques to inspire them to embrace a vision and give extra effort. The exchange style, on the other hand, is based on deals – giving rewards in exchange for effort by subordinates. As with the task-people distinction, inspiration and exchange are orthogonal approaches; thus a leader-manager can adopt any of four styles ranging from low to high on each approach.
Figure 2. Styles Available on the Eight Behavioural Dimensions Comprising the Multi-Style Pattern of Total Behaviour Leadership

**Dimension 1: Style of Influence (Power Sources x Tactics)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dimension 2: Managerial Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Task-focus</th>
<th>High Task-focus</th>
<th>Low Task-focus</th>
<th>High Task-focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low People-focus</td>
<td>Low People-focus</td>
<td>High People-focus</td>
<td>High People-focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dimension 3: Communication Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Dimension 4: Decision-Making Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autocratic</th>
<th>Consultative</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Collegial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Dimension 5: Motivational Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Exchange</th>
<th>High Exchange</th>
<th>Low Exchange</th>
<th>High Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Inspiration</td>
<td>High Inspiration</td>
<td>Low Inspiration</td>
<td>High Inspiration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dimension 6: Culture Management Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literal</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Dimension 7: Conflict Management Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertive</th>
<th>Non-Assertive</th>
<th>Assertive</th>
<th>Non-Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cooperative</td>
<td>Non-Cooperative</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dimension 8: Change Management Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coercive</th>
<th>Consultative</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
<th>Delegating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Together, this set of behavioural styles (influence, managerial, communication, decision-making and motivational) all come into play in shaping the three major aspects of organisational management, namely, conflict, culture and change. The Multi-Style Model posits that leader-managers make choices about their style on each of these three behavioural dimensions as well. With culture management, a leader-manager can make use of the elements of culture such as rituals, symbols, myths and heroes (symbolic style) or can totally ignore such cultural factors (literal style) (see Dimension 6 in Figure 2), or can operate somewhere in between.
Another key behavioural dimension which determines overall leadership style is conflict management. The model distinguishes between assertiveness (forcing one’s own views) and cooperativeness (conceding to another’s views) (see Dimension 7 in Figure 2). Again, this is an orthogonal model – a leader-manager can adopt a style based on high or low levels of both assertiveness and cooperativeness. Which conflict management style is most appropriate depends on a number of factors, namely, the level of cognitive and affective disharmony (disagreement and dislike) in the conflict situation, the amount of interaction between the conflicting parties and the stakes for the leader-manager (see Hede, 1990, 42).

The last and perhaps most crucial aspect of a leader-manager’s overall style is their approach to change management. The model distinguishes four styles, namely: coercive, consultative, collaborative and delegating (see Dimension 8 in Figure 2). As with decision-making, these change management styles vary in the amount of participation a leader-manager allows their followers/subordinates. These styles cover follower participation in choosing which changes are to be made and also their involvement in the implementation process. Under the fourth change management style (delegating) the leader-manager empowers their subordinates to develop and implement change within defined parameters. For example, a CEO might delegate to the R&D division the task of making changes in line with new organisational goals. Whether a leader-manager is willing to delegate change when appropriate is indicative of part of their multi-style leadership pattern.

The Multi-Style Model posits that the overall effectiveness of a leader-manager is measured by the combined effect on their followers of their behaviour across the eight dimensions, that is, their multi-style pattern of behaviour (see Figure 1). Although for simplicity only one box is used in the model to identify the eight dimensions, it is recognised that there are linkages among the various dimensions. The details of such linkages need further conceptual development beyond the point noted above that the dimensions of change, culture and conflict management are shaped by the other five dimensions.

The complex of behaviours which comprises a leader-manager’s multi-style pattern is also contingent on situational and personal factors as depicted by the initial two boxes.
in the model (see Figure 1). Personal factors include individual traits, personality, intelligence, emotional maturity, life experience and behaviour patterns. Situational factors include follower characteristics, group dynamics, organisational structure and processes, organisational culture, as well as the internal and external environment. How well a particular multi-style pattern works is contingent on the situational circumstances.

Finally, the dotted lines in the Multi-Style Model depict feedback loops. First, the productivity of subordinates alters the situational factors, for example, if a particular style increases productivity the leader-manager would factor that in when choosing their styles for the future. Also, the overall effectiveness of the leader-manager alters their own personal characteristics such as their self-esteem and their confidence (see Figure 1).

3. Comparison with Existing Research

Previous research on leadership has almost invariably been restricted to a single dimension of behaviour. The major theories of leadership focus on only one dimension. Indeed, the earliest behavioural models of leadership were based on survey research into one dimension, namely, managerial behaviour. The major studies in the 1950s came up with the distinction between leadership behaviour focused on task versus people. The so-called Ohio State studies distinguished between initiating structure (task) and consideration (people) (Fleishman, 1953; Stogdill & Coons, 1957). The Michigan studies, on the other hand, identified task-oriented behaviour and relationship-oriented behaviour (Katz, Maccoby & Morse, 1950). This same distinction was picked up by Blake & Mouton (1964) in their ‘managerial grid’ which proposed two dimensions (task-oriented versus person-oriented) on which a leader’s style can vary from low to high. This universalist model asserts that the most effective leaders are those who are ‘high-high’. Later contingency theories also draw on the task-people distinction but posit that different managerial styles will be differentially effective depending on the situation, for example, the theories of Fiedler (1967) and Hersey & Blanchard (1969). Clearly, management style is important for leadership, but it is only one dimension.
It is not valid to regard a single behavioural dimension as the only determinant of leadership effectiveness as implied by most models of leadership. Real behaviour is not fragmented but involves multiple dimensions. For example, in the one interaction with their staff (e.g., a strategic planning session) a leader-manager would exercise behaviour relating to the dimensions of power, motivation, communication and decision-making and possibly others. An integrated model is needed to reflect this reality.

One such integrated model is the Multiple Linkage Model proposed by Yukl (1994, 15-18, 294-304). This model emphasises the interactions among four groups of variables, namely, behavioural, intervening, criterion and situational. A leader’s behaviour is determined by their individual leadership traits as well as their power. These behavioural variables interact with intervening variables (e.g., subordinate effort, external coordination) and also with situational variables (e.g., technology, organisational structure). Leaders can improve their effectiveness by addressing deficiencies in intervening variables and also by acting to make the situation more favourable. Yukl’s model does not focus specifically on leadership style but does accommodate leader behaviour across multiple dimensions including motivation, communication, team building, decision-making and conflict management.

The Multi-Style Model advanced in this paper builds on existing research and theory essentially by combining the conceptual frameworks proposed by previous researchers on the eight key behavioural dimensions. On the first dimension, influence, the model adopts the framework suggested by Handy (1985) of five power sources and six influence tactics (see Figure 2). This is considered preferable to the other taxonomies of power/influence available in the literature (e.g., French & Raven, 1959; Bass, 1960; Kanter, 1983; Mintzberg, 1983). The second behavioural dimension is that of management and here the model incorporates the widely accepted distinction between task and people focus as discussed above (see Figure 2).

Although much of the leadership literature recognises the importance of communication for leader effectiveness (e.g., Mintzberg, 1973; Yukl, 1994), communication style has not been the basis of a previous leadership model. The current model makes a distinction between open and closed styles of communication as the third dimension on which leadership behaviour can vary (see Figure 2). Another single behavioural
dimension which has featured in leadership theorising is decision-making. The leader-participation model of leadership distinguishes styles according to the extent to which the leader involves their subordinates: from autocratic decision-making where the leader-manager makes the decision with or without input from subordinates, through consultative decision-making where subordinates have a say either individually or in a group, to group decision-making where the subordinates are a party to a consensus decision (Vroom & Yetton, 1973; Vroom & Jago, 1988). This established model is used in the current model but in addition to Vroom & Yetton’s (1973) autocratic, consultative and group styles, we add a collegial style (see Figure 2) where the leader-manager moves beyond consensus using ‘collective wisdom’ to harness the diversity among subordinates (see Hede, 1994, 79ff).

The fifth dimension in the Multi-Style Model is that of motivation and the four major styles are inspirational versus exchange-based with high and low levels of each (see Figure 2). Here the model draws on the distinction between transformational and transactional leadership (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1990) which is seen as essentially about motivational style. Transformational leaders use charisma, inspiration, individualised consideration and intellectual stimulation to encourage extra effort towards the achievement of goals whereas transactional leaders use processes such as contingent reward and management-by-exception to motivate their followers to achieve goals (Bass, 1990).

The current model also sees culture management as a key dimension which defines a leader-manager’s overall style (see Figure 2). Those who feel that culture is immutable or are simply blind to the subtleties of culture would display a literal style. The symbolic leader-manager, by contrast, believes that they can shape culture even if they can’t fully control it (see Robbins, 1996, 704-5). The seventh dimension addressed in the current model is that of conflict management and the two styles identified are based on the work of Thomas (1992) which distinguishes between assertiveness and cooperativeness (see Figure 2).

The final behavioural dimension in the current model, change management, draws on the model proposed by Dunphy & Stace (1990). Their two-dimensional model specifies differences in the method of change management (coercive vs collaborative) and the
type of organisational change (transformative vs incremental). The current model expands the dichotomy on the change management dimension to give a scale of four styles depending on the level of involvement of followers in the change process at both the conception and implementation stages: coercive, consultative, collaborative and delegating (see Figure 2).

We see then that the Multi-Style Model builds on the established theories of leadership. Its main differentiating feature is that it recognises that a leader-manager’s effectiveness depends on their multi-style pattern across many different behavioural dimensions, not only their style on a single dimension. Let us now consider how such an integrated model impacts on managerial practice.

4. Implications for Managerial Practice

The main practical implication of the Multi-Style Model is that it warns leader-managers against adopting a single-style framework based on only one behavioural dimension. It is so easy for practising leader-managers to be seduced by the latest single-dimension model discovered in the most recent course they have attended or article they have read. For example, they can resolve to become a ‘transformational leader’ or a ‘collaborative leader’ and if narrow-focused, they will restrict their day-to-day awareness and practice of leadership to only one behavioural dimension. Thus, they might focus on using an inspirational style of motivation or a collaborative style of decision-making without considering how an effective leader-manager must also simultaneously address other dimensions such as management, communication, culture, conflict and change. By monitoring their behaviour across multiple dimensions leader-managers can ensure that they take an integrated approach to leadership.

The Multi-Style Model is a contingency model which posits that leader-managers have a choice of behaviours across multiple dimensions and that the effectiveness of particular behavioural patterns depends on a complex of situational circumstances (see Figure 2). In practice, leader-managers do not select from the full range of styles across the different behavioural dimensions. Each leader-manager develops a set of habitual styles which they repeatedly exercise in practice. It would be naïve to think that practising leader-managers are able to continuously switch styles and to select the most effective multi-style pattern under each new situation. Rather, they tend to develop
habits in leadership just as with other aspects of behaviour in and out of the organisation.

Compare, for example, the four multi-style leadership patterns listed in Table 1. These profile four different possible habitual styles across the eight behavioural dimensions. Pattern A depicts a typical ‘no-nonsense’ leader-manager who bullies their subordinates to get short-term results – on all eight dimensions their behaviour is consistently geared around results not people. Pattern D, by contrast, profiles a typical ‘easy-going’ leader-manager who is content to drift along with their team and engages in behaviours which are at the opposite end of the spectrum on all dimensions. Pattern B and Pattern C depict two other mixes of behavioural styles on the eight dimensions. Of course, many other habitual patterns are possible in practice.

Table 1. Examples of Multi-Style Patterns Habitually Adopted by Different Leader-Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural Dimension</th>
<th>Multi-Style Pattern A</th>
<th>Multi-Style Pattern B</th>
<th>Multi-Style Pattern C</th>
<th>Multi-Style Pattern D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Managerial Style</td>
<td>High Task Low People</td>
<td>High Task Low People</td>
<td>High Task High People</td>
<td>Low Task Low People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communication Style</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decision-making Style</td>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>Collegial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Motivational Style</td>
<td>High Exchange Low Inspiration</td>
<td>High Exchange Low Inspiration</td>
<td>High Exchange High Inspiration</td>
<td>Low Exchange High Inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Culture Manag’t Style</td>
<td>Literal</td>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>Literal</td>
<td>Symbolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Conflict Manag’t Style</td>
<td>Assertive Non-Cooperative</td>
<td>Assertive Cooperative</td>
<td>Assertive Cooperative</td>
<td>Non-Assertive Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Change Manag’t Style</td>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>Delegating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key question for managerial practice concerns differences in the effectiveness of the different multi-style patterns used by leader-managers. There are two basic
principles that are likely to operate in practice. The first is the principle of style congruence which states that style congruence enhances leadership effectiveness (and as a corollary, style incongruence decreases effectiveness). Styles are congruent when they are consistent across behavioural dimensions such that followers experience consistency in how their leader-manager interacts with them. Thus, the use of a particular style on one behavioural dimension will be positively or negatively affected by the concurrent use on another dimension of a congruent or incongruent style, respectively. Specifically, the following practical implications are likely and warrant further investigation:

- the effectiveness of a people-focused managerial style will be lower when accompanied by an autocratic decision-making style because of style incongruence;
- the effectiveness of either of the two high people-focus managerial styles will be enhanced by a cooperative conflict management style and also by a group or collegial decision-making style because of style congruence;
- an inspirational motivational style will be more effective if the leader-manager also exercises a symbolic culture management style.

The second principle for managerial practice is the principle of style counter-balancing which states that the negative consequences of using a particular style on one dimension may be counter-balanced by a complementary style on another dimension. In practice, for example, we would expect the following:

- an open style of communication can be used to counter possible negative consequences of an autocratic decision-making style and a coercive change management style;
- a coercive change management style will be less threatening to followers if the leader-manager also uses personal power and magnetism tactics;
- a leader who uses a high-task/low-people managerial style will improve their effectiveness by also using a symbolic style of culture management.

These two principles of style congruency and style counter-balancing may at first seem contradictory. However, whether two styles on different behavioural dimensions are construed as incongruent or counter-balancing depends on one’s perspective. Open
communication, for example, can be used to counter-balance possible negative effects of styles on other dimensions, but an open communication style will itself be more effective if it is accompanied by a congruent style such as group or collegial decision-making. There is clearly a need for empirical research into such aspects of managerial practice.

The author plans to test the various practical implications of the model by means of research involving a survey of employees in different organisations. They will be asked to report on their supervisor’s leadership behaviour across multiple dimensions in order to determine the leader-manager’s multi-style pattern. By also obtaining ratings of perceived effectiveness the study will compare multi-style patterns and test the principles of style congruence and style counter-balancing. Another proposed survey of senior managers will use comparable reports on their leadership behaviour and effectiveness from both their supervisor and an immediate subordinate. Again, the comparative effectiveness of different multi-style patterns can be assessed from the two viewpoints.

A fruitful area for future research is that of sex differences. The literature is divided on the issue of whether women and men differ in their approach to leadership. There are many studies which suggest that there are no notable differences in leadership style between men and women (Dobbins & Platz, 1986; Bourantas & Papalexandris, 1990; Powell, 1990; Ferrario, 1991; Powell, 1993). Other studies, however, suggest that women are more democratic whereas men are more autocratic in their leadership style (Eagly & Johnson, 1990), that women are more people-oriented and cooperative whereas men are more task-oriented and competitive (Korabik & Ayman, 1989) and that women tend to be more transformational whereas men are more transactional (Bass & Avolio, 1994). It is unclear whether such differences are inherent in the population or whether they are sample-bound. In any case, individual leader-managers of either sex presumably have a fair degree of choice about their style of leadership. Rather than simplistic classification of results in terms of sex differences research should address the question of why and how leader-managers choose different styles. The proposed research on leadership multi-style patterns can consider whether women and men differ in their style choices. Of particular interest will be whether sex stereotypes influence such choices.
Another practical aspect of the Multi-Style Model is that it should help management educators explain how the different dimensions of organisational behaviour interact for practising leader-managers. Most courses and textbooks cover the various behavioural dimensions as distinct topics (e.g., Dunford, 1992; Schermerhorn et al., 1994; Robbins, 1996) and it is difficult to prevent management students forming the view that the behaviours can somehow be compartmentalised in practice. The present model enables educators to explain linkages across the main topics in a standard organisational behaviour course (viz., leadership, individual factors, motivation, communication, decision-making, power, conflict, culture and organisational change – see Figure 1).

5. Summary and Conclusions

The Multi-Style Model discussed in this paper depicts a number of behavioural dimensions on which leadership styles can vary, namely, influence style (based on differing power sources and tactics), management style (task-focus versus people-focus), communication style (open versus closed), decision-making style (autocratic to collegial) and motivation style (inspiration versus exchange). Each interaction between a leader-manager and their followers/subordinates involves several if not all of these dimensions. The model identifies three other key behavioural areas where leader-managers exercise further style choices, namely, conflict management (assertiveness by cooperativeness), culture management (literal versus symbolic), and change management (coercive to delegating).

The current model has implications for managerial practice, management education and future research. In practice, the model should encourage leader-managers to integrate their leadership behaviour across multiple dimensions. Focusing on only one dimension can lead them to ignore the impacts on other dimensions and may diminish their leadership effectiveness. Leader-managers may improve their effectiveness by being mindful of the principles of style congruence and style counter-balancing. For management educators the model provides a basis for getting students to look for linkages across the different topics in organisational behaviour courses and to realise that there are no conveniently compartmentalised topics in real-life organisations. Finally, empirical research is needed to test the principles of style
congruency and style counter-balancing and to determine which multi-style patterns of leadership are more effective in practice and under what organisational situations.
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