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**ABSTRACT**

This chapter reviews a variety of studies that explore leadership styles and how these styles may apply to different and new types of situations in a constantly changing environment. Historical research is explored to examine whether leadership styles as we know still apply today and in the future. What types of styles will leaders in this new information age be required to utilize in order to lead effectively? This is only a beginning for leaders. For the global economy age, will one leadership style fit all? In today’s world, leaders will no doubt need to comprehend how to lead effectively within a culturally diverse population. Armed with this knowledge, leaders leading in multicultural organizations can have an open mind-set and understand and at times even embrace cultural differences rather than not understanding and to ignoring the differences.

**INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter, the authors examine the different leadership styles and how these styles might relate to situations; especially in today’s changing world. An exploration of research looks at prior leadership theories and poses the question of whether these historical leadership styles might be important today and tomorrow. Leaders of today and tomorrow, in this global world are certain to lead a diverse group of individuals. Leaders may have to adapt to differences and will need to display an open mind-set. When we compare what we know about leadership and leadership styles, these leadership styles of today have not changed in this information age. The situations and circumstances, however, surrounding leadership and leadership styles have drastically changed in recent years. The business world has become more competitive and volatile influenced by such factors as faster technology change, greater international competition, the deregulation of markets, overcapacity in capital-intensive industries, an unstable oil cartel, raiders with junk bonds, and the changing demographics of the work force (Kotter, 1998, p. 40). Does this shift require further changes in leadership and leadership styles? Although the basic tenets of leadership and leadership styles remain the same
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regardless of the changes through the ages, our changing environment requires further examination of today’s leadership and leadership styles.

BACKGROUND

One may pose the question on whether the research conducted in the past relating to the different styles of leadership and leadership itself will relate to the types of situations encountered in this era. This section takes the reader on a journey to see if that question can be answered.

A classic study on leadership style was conducted by Lippit and White (1958) who examined the leadership styles of youth leaders. Jarvis (2002), Lippit and White (1958) highlighted a threefold typology: authoritarian, laissez-faire and democratic. They found:

- Authoritarian leaders create a sense of group dependence on the leader. Their presence held the group together and no work was done in their absence;
- Laissez-faire leaders achieve little work whether they were present or absent;
- Democratic leaders achieve group cohesion and harmonious working relationships whether they were present or not.

Since then, their finding has been applied to the business world, higher education etc. Later, other studies broke down the three leadership styles and divided them into more detailed categories. Numerous studies (Badaracco, 1998; Farkas & Wetlauer, 1998; Heifetz & Laurie, 1998; Mintzberg, 1998; Nohria & Berkley, 1998; Teal, 1998; Zaleznik, 1998) indicated that leadership should be viewed dialectically. On the one hand, it should be leader-centered. This is the so-called “follow me” approach. No diversity is encouraged in this kind of leadership. The advantage of this kind of leadership is that emergence of leadership from people is not encouraged. Whatever goals leaders have, followers do not buy into them. On the other hand, there is other-centered leadership. The obvious advantage of this kind of leadership is that people buy into something leaders try to promote. People take ownership. People assume responsibility for all their actions. Leaders help people get involved in tasks. The disadvantage of this kind of leadership is that it is not an easier form of leadership. Starting in the 1960s and 1970s, people grew disillusioned with this dichotomy of leadership, leader-centered versus other-centered. They developed a new kind of leadership. This new kind of leadership; also known as facilitative leadership encouraged the participation from others, rather than the leader simply giving direction (Rogers, 1951, 1961, 1969, 1980):

- Facilitative leadership allows for continuity of operation;
- Facilitative leadership recognizes that all people possess different values and beliefs;
- Facilitative leadership encourages objectivity in program evaluation;
- Facilitative leadership leads to shared leadership, and the effect of shared leadership do have the potential to exceed the sum of effects generated by individual members with one status leader. (this is called synergism)

Facilitative leadership became popular simply because people began to recognize humanism (Wang & King, 2006) where everyone has unlimited potential for learning. People have a propensity to become self-directed in learning (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 1998, 2005). People are capable of taking control of their own learning. Above all, people are responsible for their own actions and are responsible for making decisions. A leader is not synonymous with a dictator. The role of a leader is that of a helper, a facilitator who makes things easier for their followers.