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**Chapter Thirteen: Contingency Theories of Leadership**

Contingency Theories maintain that leadership effectiveness is maximized when leaders correctly make their behaviors contingent on certain \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ characteristics.

Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX) argues that leaders do not treat all followers as if they were a uniform group of equals. Rather, the leader forms specific and unique linkages with each subordinate, thus creating a series of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ relationships.

In general, the linkages tend to be differentiated into two groups: (1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, (2) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Stages of development as the relationship develops overtime: (1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, (2) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, (3) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

LMX suggests behaviors that the leader should engage in to actively develop relationships and build more in-group relations across the follower pool, include:

* \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ overall organizational effectiveness by developing more in-groups and reducing the number of out-groups.
* \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ relationships with all followers, offering each an opportunity for new roles, responsibilities, and challenges, nurturing high-quality exchanges, and focusing on ways to build trust and respect with all subordinates – resulting in the entire team becoming an in-group rather than accentuating the differences between in-groups and out-groups.

Vroom and Yetton maintain that leaders can often improve group performance by using an optimal amount of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in the decision-making process.

Thus, the Normative Decision Model is directed solely at determining how much \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ subordinates should have in the decision-making process.

The Normative Decision Model was designed to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ some aspects of leadership effectiveness.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Process is when leader solves the problem or makes the decision him or herself using the information available at the time.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Process is when leader shares the problem with relevant followers individually, getting their ideas and suggestions w/out bringing them together as a group.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Process is when leader shares the problem with followers as a group. Together they generate and evaluate alternatives and attempt to reach agreement (consensus) on a solution.

Vroom and Yetton believed decision quality and decision acceptance were the two most important criteria for judging the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of a decision.

Leaders sometimes assume that they do not need to worry about \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ because they have so much power over their followers that overt rejection of a decision is not likely to occur.

Having settled on quality and acceptance as the two principal criteria for effective decisions, A Normative Decision Model was developed to \_\_\_\_\_\_ what ought to happen rather than describing what does happen.

A key \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of “Artful Procrastination” is never to make a decision today that can reasonably be put off to tomorrow.

With respect to timing, almost all great leaders have understood that making quick decisions is typically \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Delaying a decision as long as reasonably possible generally leads to the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ decision being made.

Although leaders often have different interactional styles when dealing with individual followers, is there an optimum way for leaders to adjust their behavior with different followers and thereby increase their likelihood of success? And, if there is, what factors should the leader base his behavior on – the follower’s intelligence? Personality traits? Values? Preferences? Technical Competence?

* The \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Leadership Model offers some answers.

As Situational Leadership evolved, so did the labels, but not the content, for the two leadership behavior categories: (1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, (2) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

The relative effectiveness of these two behavior dimensions often depend on the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Certain combinations of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_behaviors may be more effective in some situations than others.

The key contingency factor: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, refers to a follower’s ability and willingness to accomplish a task.

When leaders would like to see followers increase their level of readiness for particular tasks, they can implement a series of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Interventions to help boost follower readiness levels.

The only situational \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is knowledge of the task, and the only follow factor is readiness.

Although leaders may be able to change their behaviors toward individual members, leaders also have \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ behavioral tendencies.

Some leaders may be generally more supportive and relationship-oriented, whereas others may be more \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ with task or goal accomplishment.

The Contingency Model recognizes leaders have general behavioral tendencies and specifies situations where certain leaders, or behavioral \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, may be more effective.

**Chapter Fourteen: Leadership and Change**

Leading \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is perhaps the most difficult challenge facing any leader, yet this skill may be the one best differentiator of managers from leaders and of mediocre from exceptional leaders.

Leaders can use goal setting, coaching, mentoring, delegation, or empowerment skills to effectively change the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of individual direct reports.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in and of themselves are no guarantee for change; leaders must use power and influence, personality traits, coaching and planning skills, and knowledge of motivational techniques and group dynamics to drive change.

Beer offered a rational and straightforward approach to organizational change that addresses many \_\_\_\_\_.

Beer’s Model: C= \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ D \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ M \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ P \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ R \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Leaders can increase amount of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ by increasing level of dissatisfaction, increasing the clarity of vision, developing a well-thought-out change plan, or decreasing the amount of resistance in followers.

Followers’ level of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is an important ingredient in a leader’s ability to drive change.

There are four key \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to the model variable in the change formula, and these include environmental scanning, a vision, setting of new goals to support vision, and needed system changes.

Leaders wanting their organizational change initiatives to succeed will need to take a Systems Thinking \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ after setting organizational goals.

A Systems Thinking Approach asks leaders to think about the organization as a set of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ systems, and explains how changes in one system can have intended and unintended consequences for other parts of the organization.

Leaders changing organizational \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ will need to think through the needed changes in the organization’s structure, culture, systems, and leader and follower capabilities.

The Process component of the change model is where the change initiative becomes tangible and actionable because it consists of the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of the change plan.

These four reactions to change – SHOCK, ANGER, REJECTION, and ACCEPTANCE – make up what is known as the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Model.

Although organizational vision, goals, and change plans are often seen as a collaborative effort between the leader and followers, they are the primary responsibility of the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

It is almost impossible for an organization to successfully change if the person in charge does not have a compelling \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ or fails to motivate others to do something different.

Two leadership and management skills that are vitally important to driving change are:

(1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, (2) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Force Field Analysis (FFA) is a tool that can be used to gain a better \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of organizational change.

The rational approach provides a straightforward model for organizational change, however, many large-scale political, societal, or organizational changes were not this \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Charismatic leaders are passionate, driven individuals who can generate high levels of excitement among followers and build particularly strong \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ attachments with them.

Researchers have argued that the litmus test for charismatic leadership does not depend on the leader’s qualities or the presence of a crisis in which to recognize the relevance of a leader’s qualities, rather it depends on followers’ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to their leader.

The debate surrounding charismatic leadership shifted with publication of James M. Burn’s “Leadership.” He believed leadership could take one of two forms: (1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, (2) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

All transformational leaders are charismatic, but not all charismatic leaders are \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Both Charismatic and transformational leaders strive for organizational or societal change; the difference is whether the changes are for the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of the leader or followers.

Transformational leadership involves conflict and change, and transformational leaders must be willing to embrace conflict, make enemies, exhibit a high level of self-sacrifice, be thick-skinned and focused to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ their cause.

In addition to having vision, charismatic leaders are gifted in sharing their vision. These leaders have excellent rhetorical skills that heighten followers’ emotional levels and inspire them to embrace the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Transformational leaders build \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in their leadership and the attainability of their goals through an image of unshakable self-confidence, strength of moral conviction, personal example, self-sacrifice, and unconventional tactics or behavior.

One of the most important aspects of charismatic and transformational leadership is the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ nature of the leader’s power.

Two effects associated with charismatic leadership include a strong \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ for the leader and a similarity of follower \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ with those of the leader.

Charismatic leaders are able to stir followers’ feelings, and this heightened \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ level results in increased levels of effort and performance.

Followers of charismatic leaders are moved to expect more of themselves, and work harder to achieve higher \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Many researchers believe that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ factors also play an important role in determining whether a leader will be perceived as charismatic.

The bottom line for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ seems to be relationships certain leaders share with followers, and there may be a variety of ways in which these relationships can develop.

There is evidence that transformational leadership is a significantly better predictor of organizational effectiveness than \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ leadership.