A similar set of ideas about leadership came from researchers at the University of Michigan (Cartwright & Zander, 1960; Katz & Kahn, 1966; Likert, 1961). Cartwright and Zander, for example, suggested that leaders help to guide two central group functions: contributing to the achievement of group goals and maintaining or strengthening the group itself. (Other studies used the terms employee orientation and job or production orientation. But in all cases, the essential distinction was between tasks and relationships.) Initially thinking that these were at odds with one another, the researchers pointed out that some leaders are so attentive to maintaining the group that the focus of the group on accomplishing its goals is undermined, whereas other leaders might concentrate so much on task achievement that they destroy the group’s morale. Later studies suggested that leaders can be attentive to both tasks and relationships.

One of the most recognizable of these approaches is the managerial (or leadership) grid, which first appeared during the 1960s but has been refined several times since (Blake & McCanse, 1991; Blake & Mouton, 1964). The grid has two key dimensions: concern for production and concern for people (essentially the task and relationship distinction once again). Concern for production might be expressed in a focus on results, performance, and the “bottom line,” whereas concern for people might be expressed in a focus on job satisfaction, working conditions, and wages and salary. Each of these concerns is found in differing degrees in different people, and indeed these concerns are found to differ from time to time in the same person. These degrees are represented on a scale from 1 to 9 and, when they are combined, yield the grid shown in Figure 7.1.

The various combinations of low and high concern for production and concern for people generate five key leadership styles. The 9, 1 style might be characterized by phrases such as “nice guys finish last,” “produce or perish,” and “results driven.” The 1, 9 style might be associated with phrases such as “don’t worry, be happy,” “see no evil,” and “can’t say no.” The 1, 1 style might be recognized in phrases such as “sorry, but it’s not my problem” and “hands off.” The 5, 5 style might be characterized by phrases such as “I can live with that” and “that’s acceptable progress.” Finally, the 9, 9 style might be associated with phrases such as “all for one, and one for all” and “interdependence and shared values.” Although there is some implication that each style has a place, the obvious preference is the 9, 9 style. Blake and McCanse wrote, “An organization can maximize its members’ contributions by applying these principles daily, which in turn helps ensure relationships among members based on mutual trust and respect. It then becomes possible to maximize the use of financial, technical, natural, and other resources” (1991, p. 265).

The Context of Leadership

Several approaches to leadership relate leadership style and leadership behavior to the context within which leadership occurs. One of the most widely known approaches to leadership behavior is what is called “situational leadership,” an approach developed by Hersey and Blanchard during the late 1960s and further refined since that time (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, chap. 8). Basically, the idea of situational leadership is that different situations require different styles
of leadership and, correspondingly, that leaders need to be able to understand key characteristics of the organizations they lead and then adapt their own behavior to fit the situation. The emphasis in situational leadership is on the relationship between the leader and his or her followers. (Although Hersey and Blanchard used examples drawn from hierarchical organizations, they claimed that the situational leadership approach will work no matter whether you are attempting to influence a subordinate, a boss, a friend, or a group.)

According to the model, the leadership style that should be used by the potential leader depends on the “readiness” level of the people whom the leader is attempting to influence. The styles that are available to the leader again are based on the distinction between task behavior and relationship behavior. 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
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what to do, how to do it, when to do it, where to do it, and who is to do it” (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, chap. 8). Relationship behavior, on the other hand, is defined as “the extent to which the leader engages in two-way or multi-way communication” such as listening, facilitating, and supporting. Using a low-to-high difference in task behavior on one dimension and a low-to-high difference in relationship behavior on another, Hersey and Blanchard came up with four possible leadership styles: S1 (high task and low relationship), S2 (high task and high relationship), S3 (high relationship and low task), and S4 (low relationship and low task) (Figure 7.2).

**Figure 7.2** Situational Leadership