in another. To illustrate this position, consider the two coaches shown in Figure 9.7. Vince Lombardi was a highly successful coach in the National Football League. By all accounts, he was a stern taskmaster who led by stridently exhorting his players to submerge their individualism for the greater good of the group. This leadership style worked well in the 1950s and early 1960s, when players were loyal to their team and respectful of authority. It is questionable whether such a leadership style would succeed in the present era. Today’s athletes are well-paid superstars who are used to having their own way. Phil Jackson is a highly effective basketball coach in today’s world. Jackson is a “Zen master” who has led the Chicago Bulls and the Los Angeles Lakers to numerous world championships by inspiring his players to rise above their egoistic concerns for the higher good of the team. Clearly, a coaching style that works in one era or situation may not work in another.

The notion that leadership effectiveness depends on both the person and the situation forms the heart of Fiedler’s (1967, 1978) contingency theory of leadership. This theory assumes that leadership effectiveness depends on two factors: leadership style and situational control. The first factor, leadership style, concerns the extent to which the leader is task-oriented or relationship-oriented. As noted earlier, some leaders are relatively inattentive to the emotional needs of the group, whereas others are concerned with maintaining group harmony.

The second factor in Fiedler’s model is situational control, a term that refers to the amount of control the leader has over the group. Three factors combine to determine situational control. The first concerns the nature of the relationship between the leader and its members. Some leaders have a good rapport with the group’s members, and some do not. The second factor refers to the amount of power the leader wields. Some leaders have a lot of power, whereas others have relatively little power. The third factor pertains to the structure of the task. In some situations, the group’s task is very clear and highly structured. For example, an organization deciding where to