



## How outstanding leaders lead with affect: An examination of charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders

Jennifer Griffith <sup>a,\*</sup>, Shane Connelly <sup>b</sup>, Chase Thiel <sup>c</sup>, Genevieve Johnson <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Alfred University, USA

<sup>b</sup> University of Oklahoma, USA

<sup>c</sup> Central Washington University, USA

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 2 May 2014

Received in revised form 16 December 2014

Accepted 19 March 2015

Available online 29 April 2015

Editor: Janaki Gooty

#### Keywords:

CIP model of leadership

Emotional displays

Influence tactics

Volatility

Authenticity

### ABSTRACT

Frameworks for understanding outstanding leadership have flourished in the past decade. Research into the charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic (CIP) model of leadership in particular has examined how leaders develop mental models, frame visions, communicate goals, and utilize political tactics to form relationships with followers and impact society in meaningful ways. However, a discussion of how these types of leaders use emotions and influence tactics to influence followers and affect society is notably absent in the literature. To fill this gap, the current effort focuses on how charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders differ in their use of emotional displays and influence tactics. Results suggest that the emotional displays and influence tactics that leaders use successfully discriminate between CIP leader types and create expected leader styles. Implications of these findings are also discussed.

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

John F. Kennedy declaring the challenging yet promising future of the United States' role in space to raucous applause. Ronald Reagan defiantly demanding Mikhail Gorbachev "tear down [the Berlin Wall]" amidst cheers from the audience. The strategies and approaches favored by Kennedy and Reagan during their presidencies stand in stark contrast to each other as charismatic and ideological leaders, respectively, but both leaders are recognized for their unique lasting impacts on society. Scholars have attempted for decades to pinpoint exactly what makes a leader truly outstanding. In that time, scholars have pointed to many variables that contribute to effective leadership, including traits like charisma and emotional stability (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Shamir & Howell, 1999); behaviors like supporting and encouraging followers (Howell & Costley, 2005; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007); and broader competencies like communication and enacting and managing change (Fleishman et al., 1992; Yukl, 2012). Throughout these various perspectives on leadership effectiveness, there is a common thread — a thread that is continued in the current effort — that the emotions that leaders display, whether tied to their personal traits or to their message, are linked directly and indirectly to their success as a leader.

Within the past several decades, the idea that the presence of particular clusters of individual characteristics influences the effectiveness of leaders has resurfaced (Bass, 1985; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). From previous research in this area, the appropriate use of affect is inherent to and critical for leadership. However, not all leaders display or use emotion in the same way as evidenced in the success of leaders with differing styles such as Kennedy and Reagan. A useful framework for examining how exceptionally effective leaders display and use emotions differently is the CIP model of leadership. Charismatic leadership and other positive forms of

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [Griffith.jennifer.a@gmail.com](mailto:Griffith.jennifer.a@gmail.com) (J. Griffith).

leadership have received the majority of attention, but other types of leadership that have shown an equally meaningful impact on society (i.e., ideological and pragmatic leadership) have started to gain traction in recent years (Mumford, 2006; Mumford & Van Doorn, 2001; Strange & Mumford, 2002). Drawing on Weber's (1947) early conceptualization of leadership, Mumford (2006) explicated the CIP model of leadership, suggesting that leaders create meaningful impact and have similar high-performing end states by using one of three broad pathways (Mumford, 2006, Mumford, Antes, Caughron, & Friedrich, 2008).

Based on the theoretical dimensions associated with a leader's cognitive processing and mental model development, Mumford and colleagues implicitly suggest that affect may be one factor in how outstanding leaders exert influence. In general, a broader literature in the area of leadership and emotions has supported the notion that emotion plays a role in leadership communication (Riggio & Lee, 2007), influencing followers (Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000; Groves, 2006; Yukl & Falbe, 1990) and leadership effectiveness outcomes (Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000; McColl-Kennedy & Anderson, 2002; Waples & Connelly, 2008) but has not examined these relationships specifically with the three CIP leadership types in mind. As a result, there is a need to better understand how emotional displays play a role in each of the CIP pathways. Aside from initial indications of an emotional display dimension within the CIP model regarding emotion valence (Hunter, Cushenbery, Thoroughgood, Johnson, & Ligon, 2011), empirical research examining how emotional displays influence key variables and outcomes is lacking.

Drawing from previous research, this study primarily seeks to expand the CIP dimensions to include valence and types of emotional displays (e.g., positive, negative, authenticity, and emotional volatility) and provide a starting point for understanding how the use of emotional displays differs for outstanding leaders across the CIP leadership types. Second, this study investigates how influence tactics might vary by emotional state and CIP leader type by examining hard and soft tactics and rational persuasion. Specifically, this study explores how these tactics differ across CIP leader types and how they are related to emotional displays. Third, the current effort examines whether emotional display and influence tactics function as a kind of emotional style that the outstanding leader types utilize.

### The CIP model of leadership

The CIP model holds that, contrary to many perspectives of leadership effectiveness that stress a prevailing style (e.g., transformational leadership; Bass, 1999), there are multiple ways that leaders make meaningful impacts on society. Additionally, the CIP model provides a concrete theoretical framework regarding how charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders arrive at the same high-performing end states through different pathways. Specifically, Mumford (2006) highlights several dimensions that differentiate between the prescriptive mental models of each leader type. Since its inception, empirical testing of the CIP model has provided compelling evidence for the three pathways to outstanding leadership while also validating the dimensions associated with differentiating between the leadership types (Bedell-Avers, Hunter, Angie, Eubanks, & Mumford, 2009; Hunter, Bedell-Avers, & Mumford, 2009; Ligon, Hunter, & Mumford, 2008; Mumford, 2006; Mumford, Hunter, Friedrich, & Caughron, 2009; Mumford & Van Doorn, 2001; Mumford et al., 2007a, 2007b; Mumford et al., 2008; Strange & Mumford, 2002). These dimensions include time orientation of key causes and goals (i.e., past, present, future) types of experiences used in interpreting events and communicating with followers (i.e., positive, negative, both), types of outcomes emphasized (e.g., positive, transcendent, or malleable), number of goals communicated (i.e., few, many, varying), central focus for the cause of conflict and crises (i.e., individuals, situation, or both), central focus for resolving conflict and crises (i.e., internal personal beliefs, external situational factors, dual focus), and perceived ability to control the situation (e.g., easy to alter, out of one's control, variable). These dimensions work together to form unique combinations of three broad leader styles, which are discussed below.

#### *Charismatic leadership*

Charismatic leaders tend to focus on the future, and their messages are typically vision-based, highlighting the multiple, positive outcomes that will occur if their goals are achieved (Mumford, 2006). Visions of charismatic leaders tend to point to the positive aspects of future goals (Conger & Kanungo, 1987) while at the same time conveying relevant aspects of the present conditions (Strange & Mumford, 2002). Theories focused on vision-based leadership such as transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) and charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Shamir et al., 1993) have been of particular interest in previous decades. However, it is worth noting that Mumford's (2006) conceptualization of charismatic leadership is more focused on leader cognition than previous iterations, which tend to focus either largely or exclusively on interactions between leaders and followers or the effects of charismatic leadership rather than the causes or antecedents (Van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013). This is not to dispel the importance of the process of leadership, which involves interactions between leaders and followers (Northouse, 2013). Rather, the CIP model considers these interactions from a leader cognition perspective, assessing the differential ways that outstanding leaders develop and communicate their mental models to others (Mumford, 2006; Mumford & Van Doorn, 2001; Strange & Mumford, 2002). For instance, the CIP model recognizes that charismatic leaders are generally excellent communicators (Holladay & Coombs, 1994) and have the potential to build a large amount of followers because of the hopeful, inspiring nature of their messages and goals. However, the CIP model does not rely upon follower attributions of charisma or liking to label an outstanding leader as charismatic. Instead, only leaders that communicate a vision aligned with or act in accordance with the particular prescribed mental model as dictated by the unique combination of cognitive dimensions are considered charismatic. This is a departure from past conceptualizations and measurement of charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, House, 1977) and ameliorates some of the critiques levied against assessment and understanding of the construct (Van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013).

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/887755>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/887755>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)