
RALPH E. HERSEY, SR., a retired telephone pioneer with over fifty patents for Bell Laboratories, whose work made direct distance dialing a reality. In looking back over his thirty-nine years of work with the telephone industry, he once commented that of all his contributions, the most rewarding aspect to him personally was that he became known as a developer of people.

and

the REAR ADMIRAL THEODORE BLANCHARD, USNR, former Naval officer who was decorated with two Silver Stars, the Bronze Star, the Presidential Citation, and a Navy Unit Commendation for his courageous and competent World War II leadership in the Pacific. In talking with people who worked for him over the years, he was always described as an inspirational, dedicated, and caring leader who always fought for his people and the “underdog,” whether in peace or war time.
The importance of a leader's diagnostic ability cannot be overemphasized. Edgar H. Schein expresses it well when he contends that the successful manager must be a good diagnostician and must value a spirit of inquiry. If the abilities and motives of the people under him are so variable, he must have the sensitivity and diagnostic ability to be able to sense and appreciate the differences. In other words, managers must be able to identify clues in an environment. Yet even with good diagnostic skills, leaders may still not be effective unless they can adapt their leadership style to meet the demands of their environment. This is the second of the three important leadership competencies. "He must have the personal flexibility and range of skills necessary to vary his own behavior. If the needs and motives of his subordinates are different, they must be treated differently."

It is easier said than done to tell practicing managers that they should use behavioral science theory and research to develop the necessary diagnostic skills to maximize effectiveness. First, much of the research currently published in the field of applied behavioral sciences is not even understood by practitioners, and often appears in final form to be more an attempt to impress other researchers than to help managers to be more effective. Second, even if practitioners could understand the research, many would argue that it is impractical to consider every situational variable in every decision, as advised by the management theorists and behavioral scientists.
As a result, one of the major focuses of our work has been the development of a practical model that can be used by managers, salespeople, teachers, or parents to make the moment-by-moment decisions necessary to effectively influence other people. The result: Situational Leadership.5

This approach uses as its basic data the perceptions and observations made by managers—parents in the home or supervisors on the job—on a day-to-day basis in their own environments, rather than data gathered only by professional researchers and consultants through instrumentation, systematic observation, and interviews.

SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard

Situational Leadership is based on an interplay among (1) the amount of guidance and direction (task behavior) a leader gives, (2) the amount of socioemotional support (relationship behavior) a leader provides, and (3) the readiness level that followers exhibit in performing a specific task, function or objective. This concept was developed to help people attempting leadership, regardless of their role, to be more effective in their daily interactions with others. It provides leaders with some understanding of the relationship between an effective style of leadership and the level of readiness of their followers.4

Thus, while all the situational variables (leader, follower(s), superior(s), associates, organization, job demands, and time) are important, the emphasis in Situational Leadership will be on the behavior of a leader in relation to followers. As Fillmore H. Sanford has indicated, there is some justification for regarding the followers "as the most crucial factor in any leadership event."5 Followers in any situation are vital, not only because individually they accept or reject the leader, but because as a group they actually determine whatever personal power the leader may have.

It may be appropriate at this point to note the difference between a model and a theory. A theory attempts to explain why things happen as they do. As such, it is not designed to recreate events. A model, on the other hand, is a pattern of already existing events that can be learned and therefore repeated. For example, in trying to imagine why Henry Ford was motivated to mass-produce automobiles, you would be dealing with a theory. However, if you recorded the procedures and sequences necessary for mass-production, you would have a model of the process.

Situational Leadership is a model, not a theory. Concepts, procedures, actions, and outcomes are based upon tested methodologies that are practical and easy to apply.

It was emphasized in Chapter 4 that when discussing leader/follower relationships, we are not necessarily talking about a hierarchical relationship, that is, superior/subordinate. The same caution will hold during our discussion of Situational Leadership. Thus, any reference to leader(s) or follower(s) in this model should imply potential leader and potential follower. As a result, although our examples may suggest a hierarchical relationship, the concepts presented in Situational Leadership should have application no matter whether you are attempting to influence the behavior of a subordinate, your boss, an associate, a friend, a relative, or a group.

Basic Concept of Situational Leadership

According to Situational Leadership, there is no one best way to influence people. Which leadership style a person should use with individuals or groups depends on the readiness level of the people the leader is attempting to influence, as illustrated in Figure 8-1.

Figure 8-1 Situational Leadership7

[Diagram of Situational Leadership model]
Before we look at the application of the Situational Leadership model, it is important that we understand leadership styles as they are used in the model and the idea of follower readiness.

Our earlier discussion of different leadership theories in Chapters 4 and 5 introduced us to our definition of leadership style—behavior by the leader as perceived by the follower(s). We also saw the ways that classifying leader behaviors developed, including the identification of task and relationship behavior.\(^6\)

Task behavior is defined as the extent to which the leader engages in spelling out the duties and responsibilities of an individual or group. These behaviors include telling people what to do, how to do it, when to do it, where to do it, and who is to do it.

An example of high amounts of task behavior might be the last time you asked someone for directions. The person was probably very precise and clear about telling you what streets to take and what turns to make. You were told where to start and where to finish. It is important to notice that being directive does not mean being nasty or short-tempered. The person helping you might have been very pleasant toward you, but the actions and statements were aimed at completing the task—that of helping you find your way. Task behavior is characterized by one-way communication from the leader to the follower. The person was not so much concerned with your feelings but with how to help you achieve your goal.

Relationship behavior is defined as the extent to which the leader engages in two-way or multi-way communication. The behaviors include listening, facilitating, and supportive behaviors.\(^8\)

An example of high amounts of relationship behavior might be when you reach an impasse with an assignment. You basically know how to do the assignment but need some encouragement to get you over the hump. The listening, encouraging, and facilitating a leader does in this example is an illustration of relationship behavior.

Task behavior and relationship behavior are separate and distinct dimensions. They can be plotted on separate axis of a two-dimensional graph, and the four quadrants can be used to identify four basic leadership styles.\(^9\) Figure 8-1 illustrates these styles. You will note that task behavior is plotted from low to high on the horizontal axis while relationship behavior is plotted from low to high on the vertical axis. This makes it possible to describe leader behavior in four ways or styles.

By using the four quadrants as the basis for assessing managerial success in different work settings, it became clear that it wasn't just one style that was effective. Each style was appropriate, depending on the situation.

![Figure 8-2 Leadership styles\(^1^0\)](image)

The following descriptions apply to the four styles:

- **Style 1**: This leadership style characterized by above-average amounts of task behavior and below-average amounts of relationship behavior.
- **Style 2**: This leadership style characterized by above-average amounts of both task and relationship behavior.
- **Style 3**: This style is characterized by above-average amounts of relationship behavior and below-average amounts of task behavior.
- **Style 4**: This style is characterized by below-average amounts of both task behavior and relationship behavior.

The important information presented by this model is in the operational definitions of task behavior and relationship behavior presented earlier. In leadership situations involving the family, schools, or other settings, different words may be more appropriate than task and relationship—for example, guidance and supportive behavior or directive behavior and facilitating behavior—but the underlying definitions remain the same.

**Readiness of the Followers or Group**

In Chapter 7 we looked at the situation—the complex pattern of conditions that exist within a given environment. We have noted that there is no one best style of leadership; it depends upon the situation within which the attempt to influence takes place. The more that leaders can adapt their behav-
iors to the situation, the more effective their attempts to influence become. The situation, in turn, is influenced, as we have noted, by the various conditions that are present.

Some of the primary factors in the situation that influence leader effectiveness include the:

- Leader
- Followers
- Boss
- Key associates
- Organization
- Job demands
- Decision time

These variables do not operate in isolation. They are interactive. For example, style 1 is often referred to as “crisis leadership” because it is appropriate in times of crisis. The important thing to remember is that we should use it to respond to crises, not to create them. If we treat an organization as if it is in crisis, that’s what we get . . . crisis. If we treat people like children, they will often begin to behave like children. This is one of the most important concepts in the field of applied behavioral sciences—the concept of the self-fulfilling prophecy. In working with others and helping them grow, leaders should have positive assumptions about followers’ potential. Effective leaders believe that people have the potential to grow and, given an opportunity, can and will respond.11

We need to remind ourselves that the relationship between leaders and followers is the crucial variable in the leadership situation. If the followers decide not to follow, it doesn’t matter what the boss or key associates think or what the job demands may be. There is no leadership without someone following.

In order to maximize the leader—follower relationship, the leader must first determine the task-specific outcomes the followers are to accomplish—on an individual and group basis. Without creating clarity on outcomes, objectives, subtasks, milestones, and so on, the leader has no basis for determining follower readiness or the specific behavioral style to use for that level of readiness.

**Readiness Defined**

Readiness in Situational Leadership is defined as the extent to which a follower has the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task. People tend to be at different levels of readiness depending on the task they are being asked to do. Readiness is not a personal characteristic; it is not an evaluation of a person’s traits, values, age, and so on. Readiness is how ready a person is to perform a particular task. This is to say, an individual or a group is ready or not ready in any total sense. All persons tend to be more or less ready in relation to a specific task, function, or objective that a leader is attempting to accomplish through their efforts. Thus, a salesperson may be very responsible in securing new sales but very casual about completing the paperwork necessary to close on a sale. As a result, it is appropriate for the manager to leave the salesperson alone in terms of closing on sales but to supervise closely in terms of paper work until the salesperson can start to do well in that area too.

In addition to assessing the level of readiness of individuals within a group, a leader may have to assess the readiness level of the group as a group, particularly if the group interacts frequently together in the same work area, as happens with students in the classroom. Thus, a teacher may find that a class as a group may be at one level of readiness in a particular area, but a student within that group may be at a different level. When the teacher is one-to-one with that student, the teacher may have to behave very differently than when working with the class as a group. In reality, the teacher may find a number of students at various readiness levels. For example, the teacher may have one student who is not doing the assigned work regularly; when the work is turned in, it is poorly organized and not very academic. With that student, the teacher may have to initiate some structure and supervise closely. Another student, however, may be doing good work but is insecure and shy. With that student, the teacher may not have to engage in much task behavior in terms of schoolwork but may need to be supportive, to engage in two-way communication, and to help facilitate the student’s interaction with others in the class. Still another student may be competent and confident in the schoolwork and thus can be left alone. So leaders have to understand that they may have to behave differently one-on-one with members of their group from the way they do with the group as a whole.

The two major components of readiness are ability and willingness.12

*Ability* is the knowledge, experience, and skill that an individual or group brings to a particular task or activity.

When considering the ability level of others, it is very important to be task specific. A person who has a Ph.D. in music and twenty years of professional experience playing the piano may be of little help in the design of a new jet engine. It is essential to focus on the specific outcome desired and to consider the ability of the followers in light of that outcome.

*Willingness* is the extent to which an individual or group has the confidence, commitment, and motivation to accomplish a specific task.
Willingness is only one word that describes the issue. Sometimes, it isn’t so much that people are really unwilling, it’s just that they’ve never done a specific task before. Perhaps they don’t have any experience with it, so they’re insecure or afraid. Generally, if it is an issue of never having done something, the problem is insecurity. The term “unwilling” might be most appropriate when, for one reason or another, the individuals have slipped, or lost some of their commitment and motivation. It might imply that they are regressing.

Even though the concepts of ability and willingness are different, it is important to remember that they are an interacting influence system. This means that a significant change in one will affect the whole. The extent to which followers bring willingness into a specific situation affects the use of their present ability. And it affects the extent to which they will grow and develop competence and ability. Similarly, the amount of knowledge, experience, and skill brought to a specific task will often affect competence, commitment, and motivation.

Readiness levels are the different combinations of ability and willingness that people bring to each task. (See Figure 8-3.)

The continuum of follower readiness can be divided into four levels. Each represents a different combination of follower ability and willingness or confidence:14

- **Readiness Level One (R1)**
  - *Unable and unwilling*
  The follower is unable and lacks commitment and motivation.
  - *Unable and insecure*
  The follower is unable and lacks confidence.

- **Readiness Level Two (R2)**
  - *Unable but willing*
  The follower lacks ability but is motivated and making an effort.
  - *Unable but confident*
  The follower lacks ability but is confident as long as the leader is there to provide guidance.

- **Readiness Level Three (R3)**
  - *Able but unwilling*
  The follower has the ability to perform the task but is not willing to use that ability.
  - *Able but insecure*
  The follower has the ability to perform the task but is insecure or apprehensive about doing it alone.

- **Readiness Level Four (R4)**
  - *Able and willing*
  The follower has the ability to perform and is committed.
  - *Able and confident*
  The follower has the ability to perform and is confident about doing it.

**Note:** Some people have difficulty understanding the development of followers from R1 to R2 to R3. How can one go from being insecure to confident and then become insecure again? The important thing to remember is that at the lower levels of readiness, the leader is providing the direction—the what, where, when, and how. Therefore, the decisions are leader directed. At the higher levels of readiness, followers become responsible for task direction, and the decisions are follower-directed. This transition from leader-directed to self-directed may result in apprehension or insecurity.

As followers move from low levels of readiness to higher levels, the combinations of task and relationship behavior appropriate to the situation begin to change.

The curved line through the four leadership styles shown in Figure 8-1 represents the high probability combination of task behavior and relationship behavior. These combinations correspond to the readiness levels directly below. To use the model, identify a point on the readiness continuum that represents follower readiness to perform a specific task. Then construct a perpendicular line from that point to a point where it intersects with the curved line representing leader behavior. This point indicates the most appropriate amount of task behavior and relationship behavior for that specific situation.

In selecting the high probability combination of task behavior and relationship behavior, it isn’t necessary to be exact. As you move away from the optimal combination, the probability of success gradually falls off, slowly at first and then more rapidly the farther away you move. Because of this, you don’t need a direct hit—a close approximation keeps the probability of success high.

**Selecting Appropriate Styles**

**Readiness Level 1: Style 1 Match—Telling**

For a follower or group that is at Readiness Level 1 for a specific task, it is appropriate to provide high amounts of guidance but little supportive behav-
ior. A word that describes this specific leadership style is *telling*—telling the followers what to do, where to do it, and how to do it. This style is appropriate when an individual or group is low in ability and willingness and needs direction. Other one-word descriptors for this leadership style include *guiding*, *directing*, or *structuring*.

**Readiness Level 2: Style 2 Match—Selling**

The next range of readiness is Readiness Level 2. This is an individual or group that is still unable, but they're trying. They’re willing or confident. The high probability styles are combinations of high amounts of both task and relationship behavior. The task behavior is appropriate because people are still unable. But since they’re trying, it is important to be supportive of their motivation and commitment.

This style is *selling*. It is different from *telling* in that the leader is not only providing the guidance but is also providing the opportunity for dialogue and for clarification, in order to help the person “buy in” psychologically to what the leader wants. If a leader simply says “go stand by the door and keep people from coming through,” that is *telling*. On the other hand, if the leader suggests “I’d sure appreciate it if you would be willing to stand by the door to guide people around the classroom because people coming through have been disruptive,” this would be an example of *selling*. The follower can ask questions and get clarification, even though the leader has provided the guidance.

The definition of task behavior includes providing the *what, how, when, where, and who*. The reason that *why* isn't included is that efforts to explain why bridge both task and relationship behaviors. One of the differences between *telling* and *selling* is the explanation of *why*. Other words for this leadership style include *explaining, persuading*, or *clarifying*.

**Readiness Level 3: Style 3 Match—Participating**

Readiness Level 3 would be a person or group that's able but they've just developed this ability and haven't had an opportunity to gain confidence in doing it on their own. An example is the fledgling salesperson who goes out on a sales call for the first time without the sales manager.

Readiness Level 3 could also be a person or group that was able and willing but for one reason or another is slipping in terms of motivation. Perhaps they're upset, mad at the boss, or just tired of performing this behavior and, therefore, are becoming *unwilling*.

In either case, the appropriate behavior would be high amounts of two-way communication and supportive behavior but low amounts of guidance. Since they have already shown that they are able to perform the task, it isn't necessary to provide high amounts of what to do, where to do it, or how to do it. Discussion and supportive and *facilitating* behaviors would tend to be *more* appropriate for solving the problem or soothing the apprehension.

In *participating*, the leader's major role becomes encouraging and communicating. Other descriptors for this style of leadership include *collaborating, facilitating*, or *committing*. Each of these implies high relationship, low task behaviors.

**Readiness Level 4: Style 4 Match—Delegating**

Readiness Level 4 is where the individual or group is both ready and willing, or ready and confident. They've had enough opportunity to practice, and they feel comfortable without the leader providing direction.

It is unnecessary to provide direction about where, what, when, or how because the followers already have the ability. Similarly, above-average amounts of encouraging and supportive behaviors aren't necessary because they are confident, committed, and motivated. The appropriate style involves giving them the ball and letting them run with it.

This style is called *delegating*. Other words for this leadership style include *observing, monitoring*. Remember—some relationship behavior is still needed, but it tends to be less than average. It is still appropriate to monitor the pulse of what's going on, but it is important to give these followers an opportunity to take responsibility and implement on their own.

One point to remember is that when an individual or group is developing, the issue is usually one of insecurity; when they are regressing, the issue is usually one of unwillingness. We will go into these ideas in greater detail in subsequent chapters.

It should be clear that the appropriate leadership style for all four of the readiness designations—low (R1), low to moderate (R2), moderate to high (R3), and high (R4)—correspond to the following leadership style designations: *telling* (S1), *selling* (S2), *participating* (S3), and *delegating* (S4). That is, low readiness needs a *telling* style, low to moderate readiness needs a *selling* style, and so on. These combinations are shown in Table 8-1.

Situational Leadership not only suggests the high-probability leadership style for various readiness levels, but it also indicates the probability of success of the other style configurations if a leader is unable to use the desired style. The probability of success of each style for the four readiness levels, depending on how far the style is from the high-probability style along the prescriptive curve in the style of leader portion of the model, is as follows:

| R1  | S1 high, S2 2nd, S3 3rd, S4 low probability |
| R2  | S2 high, S1 2nd, S3 2nd, S4 low probability |
| R3  | S3 high, S2 2nd, S4 2nd, S1 low probability  |
| R4  | S4 high, S3 2nd, S2 3rd, S1 low probability  |
### TABLE 8-1 Leadership styles appropriate for various readiness levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readiness Level</th>
<th>Appropriate Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Readiness</td>
<td><strong>S1</strong> Telling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable and unwilling or insecure</td>
<td>High task Low relationship behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low to Moderate Readiness</td>
<td><strong>S2</strong> Selling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable but willing or confident</td>
<td>High task High relationship behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate to High Readiness</td>
<td><strong>S3</strong> Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able but unwilling or insecure</td>
<td>High relationship Low task behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Readiness</td>
<td><strong>S4</strong> Delegating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able/competent and willing/confident</td>
<td>Low relationship Low task behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Situational Leadership, who has the problem? The follower. The follower can get any behavior desired depending upon the follower's behavior. The follower's behavior determines the leader's behavior. What a marvelous thing we now have available to use at home, at the office, in any kind of interpersonal situation. For example, how much easier parenting would be if children were to realize that it is not Mom and Dad who determine and control the children's behavior; it is they who control their own behavior. Another important consideration: Why is it that a leadership style that may not be our "natural" style is frequently our most effective style? This is because we have worked at these styles, we have practiced and practiced those behaviors, and we have worked at them with some expert help. We have also paid attention to the details of applying these learned styles. Those styles that we are most comfortable with we use as we are presently using them. Why? Because they are OK. We do not put the same amount of skill practice into them as we do our learned styles. As a consequence, they are not as effective.

One last thought: Situational Leadership is not a prescription with hard and fast rules. In the behavioral sciences, there are no rules. Situational Leadership as a major contribution to the behavioral sciences is attempting to improve the odds. In so doing, managers will be able to achieve the productivity of human resources they have been seeking.

### APPLICATION OF SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP

In using Situational Leadership, it is useful to keep in mind that there is no "one best way" to influence others. Rather, any leader behavior may be more or less effective depending on the readiness level of the person you are attempting to influence. Shown in Figure 8-4 is a more comprehensive version of the Situational Leadership Model that brings together our discussion of the past several pages. It will provide you with a quick reference to assist in (1) diagnosing the level of readiness, (2) adapting by selecting high probability leadership styles, and (3) communicating these styles effectively to influence behavior. Implicit in Situational Leadership is the idea that a leader should help followers grow in readiness as far as they are able and willing to go. This development of followers should be done by adjusting leadership behavior through the four styles along the prescriptive curve in Figure 8-4.

Situational Leadership contends that strong direction (task behavior) with followers with low readiness is appropriate if they are to become productive. Similarly, it suggests that an increase in readiness on the part of people who are somewhat unready should be rewarded by increased positive reinforcement and socioemotional support (relationship behavior). Finally, as followers reach high levels of readiness, the leader should respond by not only continuing to increase control over their activities but also by continuing to decrease relationship behavior as well. With people with high readiness the need for socioemotional support is no longer as important as the need for autonomy. At this stage, one of the ways leaders can prove their confidence and trust in these people is to leave them more and more on their own. It is not that there is less mutual trust and friendship between leader and follower; in fact, there is more, but it takes less supportive behavior on the leader's part to prove this to them.

Regardless of the level of readiness of an individual or group, change may occur. Whenever a follower's performance begins to slip—for whatever reason—and ability or motivation decreases, the leader should reassess the readiness level of this follower and move backward through the prescriptive curve, providing appropriate socioemotional support and direction.

These developmental and regressive processes will be discussed in depth in Chapters 10 and 11. At this point, though, it is important to emphasize that Situational Leadership focuses on the appropriateness or effectiveness of leadership styles according to the task-relevant readiness of the followers.
TASK BEHAVIOR—
The extent to which the leader engages in defining roles, telling, helping, coaching, and more than one person, who is to do what, how, when, where, and what in:
- Goal-Setting
- Organizing
- Establishing Time Lines
- Directing
- Controlling

RELATIONSHIP BEHAVIOR—
The extent to which a leader engages in two-way (mutual way) communication, listening, facilitating behavior, socio-emotional support:
- Giving Support
- Communicating
- Facilitating
- Interactions
- Active Listening
- Providing Feedback

LEADER BEHAVIOR

LEADERSHIP STYLES

DECISION STYLES

1. Leader-Made Decision
2. Leader-Made Decision with Dialogue/Information
3. Leader-Follower-Made Decision or Follower-Made Decision with Encouragement from Leader

ABILITY: has the necessary knowledge, experience, and skill
WILLINGNESS: has the necessary confidence, commitment, motivation

FOLLOWER READINESS

When a Leader Behavior is used appropriately with its corresponding level of readiness, it is termed a High Probability Match. The following are descriptors that can be useful when using Situational Leadership for specific applications:

S1
Telling
Guiding
Directing
Establishing

S2
Selling
Explaining
Clarifying
Persuading

S3
Participating
Encouraging
Collaborating
Committing

S4
Delegating
Observing
Monitoring
Fulfilling

Figure 8-4 Expanded Situational Leadership Model

Determining Appropriate Style

To determine what leadership style you should use with a person in a given situation, you must do several things.

First, you must decide what areas of an individual's or a group's activities you would like to influence. In the world of work, those areas would vary according to a person's responsibilities. For example, a salesperson might have responsibility in sales, administration (paper work), service, and team development. Therefore, before managers can begin to determine the appropriate leadership style to use with an individual, they must decide what aspect of that person's job they want to influence.

Once this decision has been made, the second step is to determine the ability and motivation (readiness level) of the individual or group in each of the selected areas.

The third and final step is deciding which of the four leadership styles (see Table 8-1) would be appropriate with this individual in each of these areas. Let us look at an example. Suppose a manager has determined that a subordinate's readiness level, in terms of administrative paper work, is low (R1); that is, the staff member is unable and unwilling to take responsibility in this area. Using Table 8-1, the manager would know that when working with this subordinate, a directive telling (S1) style (high task/low relationship behavior) should be used.

In this example, low relationship behavior does not mean that the manager is unfriendly to the subordinate. We merely suggest that the manager, in supervising the subordinate's handling of administrative paper work, should spend more time directing the person in what to do and how, when, and where to do it than providing socio-emotional support and reinforcement. Increased relationship behavior should occur only when the subordinate begins to demonstrate the ability to handle administrative paper work. At this point, a movement from telling to selling would be appropriate.

Components of Readiness

It has been argued that the key to effective leadership is to identify the readiness level of the individual or group you are attempting to influence and then bring to bear the appropriate leadership style. If that is true, how can managers get a better handle on what readiness actually means?

In examining the components of readiness, several comments should be made. First, according to David C. McClelland's research,16 achievement-motivated people have certain characteristics in common, including the capacity to set high but obtainable goals, the concern for personal achievement rather than the rewards of success, and the desire for task-relevant feedback (how well am I doing?) rather than for attitudinal feedback (how well do you like me?) . Of these characteristics we are most interested, in terms of task-relevant readiness, in the capacity to set high but attainable goals.

Second, in terms of education and/or experience, we are contending that there is no perceptual difference between the two. One can gain task-relevant readiness through education or experience or some combination of both. The only difference between the two is that when we are talking about
education, we are referring to formal classroom experiences, and experience involves what is learned on one’s own or on the job.

Third, in our recent work, we have argued that education and/or experience affects ability and that achievement motivation affects willingness. As a result, in discussing readiness in terms of ability and willingness, we are suggesting that the concept of ability consists of two dimensions: ability and willingness.

Ability (job readiness) is related to the ability to do something. It has to do with knowledge and skill. Individuals who have high job readiness in a particular area have the knowledge, ability, and experience to perform certain tasks without direction from others. A person high in job readiness might say: “My talent really lies in that aspect of my job. I can work on my own in that area without much help from my boss.”

Willingness (psychological readiness) is related to the willingness, or motivation, to do something. It has to do with confidence and commitment. Individuals who have a high psychological readiness in a particular area or responsibility think that responsibility is important and have self-confidence and good feelings about themselves in that aspect of their job. They do not need extensive encouragement to get them to do things in that area. A comment from a person high in psychological readiness might be: “I really enjoy that aspect of my job. My boss doesn’t have to get after me or provide any encouragement for me to do work in that area.”

It should be remembered that although readiness is a useful concept for making diagnostic judgments, other situational variables—the boss’s style (if close by), a crisis or time bind, the nature of the work—can be of equal or greater importance. Yet, the readiness concept is a solid bench mark for choosing the appropriate style with an individual or group at a particular time.

Instruments to Measure Readiness

To help managers and their followers make valid judgments about follower readiness, Hambleton, Blanchard, and Hersey have developed two different maturity instruments: the Manager’s Rating Form and the Self-Rating Form.17

Both readiness instruments measure ability and willingness by using five rating scales. Examples of these rating scales from the Manager’s Rating Form are given in Figure 8-5.

The five ability scales and five willingness scales were selected after pilot research from a pool of about thirty potential indicators of both dimensions. As is clear from Figure 8-5, corresponding to each scale, “behavioral indicators” of the end points were produced. Also, eight-point rating scales are used in the instrument. Low to high designations correspond to the four readiness levels (R1 to R4) associated with Situational Leadership.
In more recent work, Hersey, Blanchard, and Keilty developed a Readiness Style Match rating form that measures readiness using only one scale for each dimension—one measuring ability and the other measuring willingness. In this instrument, a person's ability (knowledge and skill) is thought of as a matter of degree. That is, an individual's ability does not change drastically from one moment to the next. At any given moment, an individual has a little, some, quite a bit, or a great deal of ability.

Willingness (confidence and motivation), however, is different. A person's motivation can, and often does, fluctuate from one moment to another. Therefore, a person is seldom, on occasion, often, or usually willing to take responsibility in a particular area.

The availability of both a Manager's Rating Form and a Staff Member Form of the Readiness Style Match is necessary to initiate a program combining Situational Leadership with Contracting for Leadership Style. We will discuss that process in some detail in Chapter 12.

**Components of Leadership Style**

Once managers have identified the readiness level of the individual or group they are attempting to influence, the key to effective leadership then is to bring to bear the appropriate leadership style. If that is true, how can managers get a better handle on the behaviors that comprise each of the four leadership styles?

**Instruments to measure leader behavior.** To help managers and their staff members make better judgments about leadership style, Hersey, Blanchard, and Hambleton have developed two different leadership scales: the Manager's Rating Form and the Staff Member Form. Both leadership instruments measure task and relationship behavior on five behavioral dimensions. The five task behavior dimensions and five relationship behavior dimensions are listed in Table 8-2.

After the five dimensions were established for both leader behaviors, behavioral indicators of the extreme of each of these dimensions were identified to help managers and their staff members differentiate between high and low amounts of each leader behavior. For example, with the task-behavior dimension “organizing” on the Staff Member Form, the end points of a rating scale were chosen to be “organizes the work situation for me” and “lets me organize the work situation.” For the relationship-behavior dimension “providing feedback,” the end points of the rating scale were chosen to be “frequently provides feedback on my accomplishments” and “leaves it up to me to evaluate accomplishments.”

In the Readiness Style Match instrument discussed earlier, each of the four basic leadership styles is described, rather than the separate behavioral dimensions that make up each style. The descriptions of the four leader behaviors follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8-2 Task behavior and relationship behavior dimensions and their behavior indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Behavior Dimensions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting time lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Behavior Dimensions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Telling (S1) Provide specific instructions and closely supervise performance
- Selling (S2) Explain decisions and provide opportunity for clarification
- Participating (S3) Share ideas and facilitate in making decisions
- Delegating (S4) Turn over responsibility for decisions and implementation

The advantage of using the readiness Style Match is that it permits managers and their staff members to rate leadership style and readiness on the same instrument. Figure 8-6 shows that integration. This figure provides a good summary of the key components involved in Situational Leadership.

**SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND VARIOUS ORGANIZATIONAL SETTINGS**

We have found that Situational Leadership has application in every kind of organizational setting, whether it be business and industry, education, government, military, or even the family. The concepts apply in any situation in which people are trying to influence the behavior of other people.
emphasize that in utilizing various labels for the two basic leader behaviors—task behavior and relationship behavior—we are not changing the definitions at all. Task behavior is essentially the extent to which a leader engages in one-way communication by explaining what each staff member is to do as well as when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished. Relationship behavior, even when we call it supportive behavior, is still the extent to which a leader engages in two-way communication by providing socioemotional support, “psychological strokes,” and facilitating behaviors.

The reason it is important to modify the use of various words is that a key concept in all behavioral sciences is communication. If you’re going to help people grow and develop, you have to learn to put frameworks, concepts, and research results into terminology that is acceptable to the groups you are attempting to influence. This has to be done if you want to have the highest probability of gaining acceptance and, therefore, affecting their growth.

**Parent–Child Relationships**

We have found tremendous application of Situational Leadership to the family and the parent–child relationship. The book *A Situational Approach to Parenting* is devoted completely to applying Situational Leadership to the family setting.

We suggest that when working with children (while they will need “different strokes even for the same folks”), there is a general pattern and movement in leadership style over their developmental years. Thus, when working with children who are low in maturity on a particular task, a directive parent style has the highest probability of success. This is especially true during the first few years of children’s lives when they are unable to control much of their own environment. This whole developmental process will be discussed in more depth in Chapter 10.

**Ineffective Parent Styles**

One of the useful aspects of Situational Leadership is that one can begin to predict not only the leadership styles with the highest probability of effectiveness but also which styles tend to be ineffective in what circumstances. For instance, we can take four examples of parents who tend to use a single leadership style during the child’s entire developmental period (see Figure 8-7).

First, let us look at the parent who uses a high directive/low supportive style (S1) with their children throughout the developmental years, that is, “As long as you’re living in this house, you’ll be home at ten o’clock and abide by the rules I’ve set.” Two predictions might be made. The first one is that the children might pack their bags and leave home at the earliest oppor-
situations. If this does not occur, they may succumb to their parents' authority and become very passive, dependent individuals throughout their lives, always needing someone to tell them what to do and when to do it.

A high probability result of a parent using exclusively a style of high directive/high supportive behavior (S2) might be called the "Mama's boy" or "Daddy's little girl" syndrome. Even when the children get older, they may chronologically be adults but they are still psychologically dependent on their parent(s) to make decisions for them. Since most of the direction for their behavior and socioemotional support has been provided by their parents(s), these young people are unable to provide it for themselves.

What happens when parents are unailingly supportive and never structure or direct any of their children's activities? The response to this high supportive/low directive style (S3) may be called a "spoiled brat" syndrome, for the children develop into individuals who have little regard for rules and little consideration for the rights of others.

A low directive/low supportive behavior style (S4) seems to be characteristic of two of the socioeconomic classifications described by Lloyd Warner, the upper-upper level and the lower-lower level. In both cases, the children may become products of their environment rather than products of the parents' style. In the upper-upper level, this responsibility may be delegated to a private school; in the lower-lower level, children are often left on their own and learn appropriately or inappropriately from their peers how to cope with the day-to-day contingencies of their environment.

As we mentioned in Chapter 5, some people might question why it is inappropriate to use the same leadership style all the time—"after all, we've been told that consistency is good." This advice might have been given in the past, but, as we argue, according to Situational Leadership, consistency is not using the same style all the time. Instead, consistency is using the same style for all similar situations but varying the style appropriately as the situation changes. Parents are consistent if they tend to discipline their children when they are behaving inappropriately and reward them when they are behaving appropriately. Parents are inconsistent if they smile and engage in other supportive behavior when their children are bad as well as when they are good.

This discussion of consistency urges parents to remember that children are often at different levels of readiness in various aspects of their lives. Thus, parental style must vary as children's activities change.

Management of Research and Development Personnel

In working with highly trained and emotionally stable people, an effective leader behavior style in many cases is low relationship/low task behavior. This was dramatically demonstrated in a military setting. Normally, in basically crisis-oriented organizations such as the military or the fire department, the most appropriate style tends to be high task (S1), since under combat or fire conditions success often depends on immediate response to orders. Time demands do not permit talking things over or explaining decisions. For success, behavior must be almost automatic. Although a high task style may be effective for a combat officer, it is often ineffective in working with research and development personnel within the military. This was pointed out when line officers trained at West Point were sent to command outposts in the DEW line, part of the American advanced-warning system. The scientific and technical personnel involved, living in close quarters in an Arctic region, did not respond favorably to the high levels of task behavior of the combat-trained officers. The levels of education, research experience, and readiness of these people were such that they did not need their com-
manding officer to initiate a great deal of structure in their work. In fact, they tended to resent it. Other experiences with scientific and research-oriented personnel indicate that many of these people also desire or need a limited amount of socioemotional support.

Educational Setting

Educational settings provide us with numerous examples of Situational Leadership in operation.24

Teacher–student relationship. In an educational setting, Situational Leadership is being used in studying the teacher–student relationship.

For example, Paul Hersey and two colleagues in Brazil, Arrigo L. Angelini and Sofia Caracushansky,25 conducted a study applying Situational Leadership to teaching. In the study, an attempt was made to compare the learning effectiveness scores between (1) students who attended a course in which a conventional teacher–students relationship prevailed (control subgroups) and (2) students who attended a course in which Situational Leadership was applied by the same teacher (experimental subgroups). In the control group classes, lectures prevailed, but group discussions, audiovisual aids, and other participative resources were also used. In the experimental classes, the readiness level of students (willingness and ability to direct their own learning and provide their own reinforcement) was developed over time by a systematic shift in teaching style. The teacher's style started at S1 (high task/low relationship—teacher in front of the class lecturing), then moved to S2 (high task/high relationship behavior—group discussions in a circular design with the teacher directing the conversation), then to S3 (high relationship/low task—group discussions with the teacher participating as a supportive but nondirective group member), and finally to S4 (low relationship/low task—the group continuing to discuss with the teacher involved only when asked by the class). The development of student readiness was a slow process at first, with gradual decreases in teacher direction and increases in teacher encouragement. As the students demonstrated their ability not only to assume more and more responsibility for directing their own learning but also to provide their own reinforcement (self-gratification), decreases in teacher socioemotional support accompanied continual decreases in teacher direction.

In two experiments with this design, the experimental classes showed not only higher performance on content exams but were also observed to have a higher level of enthusiasm, morale, and motivation, as well as less tardiness and absenteeism.

Administrator–governing board relationship. An important area for the top administrator (college president or superintendent) in an educational institution is the relationship this person maintains with the governing board. Since these boards have the ultimate power to remove college presidents or superintendents when they lose confidence in their leadership, these administrators often tend to use a high relationship style (S3), providing only a limited amount of structure for these decision-making groups.26 In fact, they sometimes seem to shy away from directing the activities of their board for fear of arousing their criticism. Situational Leadership questions this behavior.

Although the members of the governing board are often responsible, well-educated individuals, they tend to have little work experience in an educational setting. For example, in a survey of college trustees in New York State, it was found that less than 10 percent of the trustees serving on these boards had any teaching or administrative experience in an educational institution.27 In fact, the large majority of the 1,269 trustees sampled were employed primarily in industry, insurance and banking, merchandising and transportation, and medicine and law. Virtually half acted as corporation officials with the rank of treasurer, director, or above. In addition to their involvement in other than educational institutions, these trustees tended to be overcommitted and were probably unable to give the time to university problems they would have liked to give. In fact, the most frequent dissatisfaction expressed by trustees was the lack of time to devote to the board.

The relative inexperience of the trustees and the heavy commitment elsewhere suggest that it may be appropriate for college presidents to combine with their high relationship behavior an increase of task behavior in working with their trustees. In fact, the responsibility for defining the role of trustees and organizing their work should fall on the college president. Henry Wriston, former president of Brown University, has said it well:

It may seem strange, at first thought, that this should be a president's duty. A moment's reflection makes it clear that it can evolve on no other person. Trustees are unpaid; they have no method of analyzing talents and making assignments. The president is in a position to do so.28

Administrator–faculty relationship. In working with experienced faculty, the low relationship/low task style (S4) characterized by a decentralized organization structure and delegation of responsibility to individuals may be appropriate. The level of education and experience of these people is often such that they do not need their principal or department chairperson to initiate much structure. Sometimes they tend to resent it. In addition, some teachers desire or need only a limited amount of socioemotional support (relationship behavior).

Often an effective leader style in working with faculty tends to be low relationship/low task, but certain deviations may be necessary. For exam-
ple, during the early stages of a school year or a curriculum change, a certain amount of structure as to the specific areas to be taught, by whom, when, and where must be established. Once these requirements and limitations are understood by the faculty, the administrator may move rapidly back to low relationship/low task style appropriate for working with experienced, responsible, self-motivated personnel.

Other deviations may be necessary. For example, a new, inexperienced teacher might need more direction and socioemotional support until gaining experience in the classroom.

UNDERSTANDING EARLIER RESEARCH

One of the major contributions of Situational Leadership is that it provides a way of understanding much of the research findings that prior to a situational approach seemed to be incompatible with each other.

For example, at first glance, the extensive research that Likert did in industrial sections of the United States in the 1950s and a similar study that Hersey conducted in western Africa in the 1960s seem to be in conflict. Likert found in his studies that the tendency is for employee-centered supervisors who provide general supervision to have high-producing sections, while the low-producing sections tend to have job-centered supervisors who provide close supervision. Hersey’s findings were almost the exact opposite of the results generated by Likert. In emerging industrial settings in western Africa, he found the more effective style to be job-centered close supervision. However, by examining these different results using Situational Leadership, one may gain some insights into why these differing results are predictable.

As indicated, the population for Likert’s research was drawn from industrial sections of the United States. This is particularly relevant when one considers what we have come to call “cultural readiness” or “work force.” We have found that three phenomena—level of education, standard of living, and industrial experience—can have a pronounced effect on the task-relevant readiness level of the work force from which an organization is attempting to draw its employees.

In terms of Likert’s research, the level of readiness of the work force of his sample upon examination appears to be quite advanced. The level of education, standard of living, and industrial experiences of people in industrial sections of the United States in the 1950s were probably moderate to high. This is not surprising when one examines the research in terms of Situational Leadership. Likert found that moderate to low task behavior and relatively high relationship behavior (S3) tended to be the most effective leadership styles—that is, they had the highest probability of being effective given the cultural readiness involved. At the same time, it is not surprising to see the results Hersey found. In the middle 1960s, emerging countries in Africa seemed to have labor forces characterized for many by very little formal education, a subsistence standard of living, and little or no industrial experience. Considering this low level of work force readiness at that time, one could predict from Situational Leadership that the highly structured, close supervision style that Hersey found would have the highest probability of being effective in that environment.

The same kind of analysis can be made in comparing the results of the classical participation study done by Coch and French in an American factory in the Northeast and a replication of their study by French, Israel and As in a Norwegian factory. In the industrial setting in the United States, it was found that involving employees in decision making tends to be effective, but in Norway there was not significant difference in productivity between work groups in which participative management was used and those in which it was not used. Once again, these two studies support Situational Leadership and suggest that readiness levels and/or cultural work force differences in the followers and the situation are important in determining the appropriate leadership style.

Determining the Effectiveness of Participation

An analysis of studies in participation in terms of Situational Leadership also suggests some interesting things about the appropriate use of participation. Situational Leadership suggests that the higher the level of task-relevant readiness of an individual or group, the higher the probability that participation will be an effective management technology. The less task-relevant readiness, the lower the probability that participation will be a useful management practice.

Involvement and participation in decision making with people at extremely low levels of readiness might be characterized by a pooling of ignorance, or the blind leading the blind, and, therefore, directive leadership might have a higher probability of success. At the other end of the readiness continuum (extremely high levels of task-relevant readiness), some of these people tend to resist engaging in “group think.” Thy would prefer the individual with the highest level of expertise in an area to make the decisions there. “Bill, how do you think we should go on this? It’s your area.” Thus, according to Situational Leadership, participation as a management technique has a higher probability of success as one moves from low to moderate levels of readiness, and then begins to plateau in potential effectiveness as one’s followers become high in task-relevant readiness, as illustrated in Figure 8-8.

One further point about participation. Although participation tends to satisfy affiliation and esteem needs by giving people a chance to feel in on things and be recognized as important in the decision-making process;
should be remembered that self-actualization may not result from participation. The high-level need satisfaction most often occurs in a work environment where people are given a job that allows them an opportunity for achievement, growth and development, and challenge.

The Influence of Cultural Change

The scientific and technical advancements in United States society since the turn of the century almost stagger the imagination. As a result, we have become a dynamic, industrial society with a higher level of education and standard of living then ever thought possible. This phenomenon is beginning to have a pronounced effect on much of the work force utilized by organizations.

Today, many employees enjoy a higher standard of living and tend to be better educated and more sophisticated than ever before. As a result, these workers have increased potential for self-direction and self-control. Consistent with these changes in readiness, a large majority of our population, in Maslow's terms, now have their basic physiological and safety-security needs fairly well satisfied. Management can no longer depend on the satisfaction of these needs—through pay, incentive plans, hospitalization, and so on—as primary motivating factors that influence industrial employees. In our society today, there is almost a built-in expectation in people that physiological and safety needs will be fulfilled. In fact, most people do not generally have to worry about where their next meal will come from or whether they will be protected from the elements of physical danger. They are now more susceptible to motivation from other needs; people want to belong, to be recognized as "somebody," and to have a chance to develop to their fullest potential. As William H. Haney has said:

The managerial practice, therefore, should be geared to the subordinate's current level of maturity with the overall goal of helping him to develop, to require progressively less external control, and to gain more and more self-control. And why would a man want this? Because under these conditions he achieves satisfaction on the job at the levels, primarily the ego and self-fulfillment levels, at which he is the most motivatable.

This concept is illustrated in Figure 8-9.

This shift in the readiness level and need disposition of our general population helps us to understand why the findings of many studies of the relationship between leadership styles and productivity, such as those conducted by Likert and Halpin, seem to cluster around styles 2 and 3 but not at the extremes (1 and 4).

DOES SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP WORK?

The widespread acceptance of Situational Leadership for more than two decades as a concept with face validity is well documented. Practicing managers, parents, teachers, and administrators throughout the world say it has given them a practical, easy-to-use approach for determining what they should do in challenging situations. It has been a major factor in training and development programs for more than 400 of the Fortune 500 companies, such as Bank of America, Caterpillar, IBM, Mobil Oil, Union 76, and Xerox. It has been widely accepted in all of the military services and numerous fast-growing entrepreneurial companies. More than one million leaders received Situational Leadership development in 1987. While research stud-
ies have attempted to validate Situational Leadership from various directions, the real question that managers, teachers, parents, and administrators ask is: Does Situational Leadership work? We would like to present just two of the many studies that attempt to answer this question.

In 1974 the Information Systems Group (ISG) of Xerox, responsible for copier/duplicator products, made a major commitment to Situational Leadership as a training concept. Situational Leadership now is a cornerstone of ISG’s building-block training strategy and is taught to middle-level as well as new first-level managers. As Gumport and Hambleton indicate:

Despite the model’s intuitive appeal and quick acceptance by our managers, because of the training resources required, ISG management development had to answer a critical question: Are managers who use the model correctly in their interactions with employees more effective than those who do not? After all, if they are no more effective, there would be no point to training in situational leadership.37

Sixty-five managers in sales, service, administration, and staff functions participated in the study. These managers completed three types of forms.

- **A manager questionnaire**, which was constructed to provide demographic data, such as age, sex, years of service, and so on. The questionnaire also asked for perceptions of the managers’ job performance and use of Situational Leadership.
- **A professional maturity scale**, which was used to determine a subordinate’s level of maturity for a set of major job objectives. Each manager assessed one to four employees.
- **A manager rating form**, which allowed the managers to assess their own leadership styles and their subordinates’ job performance for each major job objective. The following job performance rating scale, identical to Xerox’s appraisal scale, was used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Performance Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consistently exceeds expected level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Expected level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meets minimal requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the validity of Situational Leadership, data were collected for two predictions:

- Highly effective managers will indicate more knowledge and use of Situational Leadership than less effective managers.
- Employees' job performance will be higher when managers apply Situational Leadership correctly than when they apply it incorrectly.39

The study led to these conclusions:

- Highly effective managers indicate greater knowledge and use of Situational Leadership than less effective ones.
- All managers in the study reported using Situational Leadership at least some of the time. This finding demonstrates that training in this area has had substantial on-the-job impact.
- On the average, managers who apply the model correctly rate their subordinates’ job performance higher than managers who do not. The data in this area are highly supportive of the Hersey-Blanchard model of leadership effectiveness.40

Gumport and Hambleton conclude:

Stated simply, highly effective managers knew more about Situational Leadership and used it more than less effective managers. Data supporting this came from the managers themselves. Also, there is strong evidence suggesting that when Situational Leadership was applied correctly, subordinate job performance was judged higher, and the gains in job performance were practically and statistically significant.41

Research was conducted on the impact of the video interactive Situational Leadership program on managers of a large firm that was undergoing major changes and internal restructuring. The sample of 161 managers who had received the training nine to eighteen months prior to the research completed a questionnaire booklet that included four sections: (1) an appraisal of training course content, (2) a test of skill/knowledge retention, (3) a report of a critical incident involving use of the training, and (4) an open-ended opportunity to provide feedback.

The results indicated that Situational Leadership was highly effective. Managers offered favorable appraisals of the course; they demonstrated an impressive level of mastery (retention) of course skills; and they reported successful outcomes as a consequence of using the skills on the job. The findings lend support to the claim that managerial training can improve managerial performance, even under conditions of change in the work place.42

**CHANGING LEADERSHIP STYLE APPROPRIATELY**

If managers are currently using a style that is appropriate for the level of readiness of their group, as Fred Finch of the University of Massachusetts suggested to the authors,43 one of the indicators that they can use in determining when and to what degree they should shift their style is performance,
or results. How well is their group performing in their present activities? If performance is increasing, it would be appropriate for managers to shift their style to the left along the curvilinear function of the Situational Leadership model. This would indicate that task-relevant readiness is increasing. If performance results are on the decline, it gives managers a clue that they may need to shift their leader behavior to the right along the curvilinear function. In the next chapter, we will discuss specifically the implications and implementation of these processes.
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