



LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

REDDIN ON HERSEY – BLANCHARD STYLE DIMENSIONS

Dear Sir:

Your May 1969 issue contained an article by Hersey and Blanchard entitled the "Life Cycle Theory of Leadership." Part of the article was written as if to suggest that they had first proposed a third dimension of effectiveness to the two-dimensional Ohio State model. It may have been simply an oversight on their part but this innovation was developed by me and one statement of it was contained in your *Journal* in April 1967.

W. J. REDDIN

*Associate Professor,
The University of New Brunswick,
Fredericton, New Brunswick*

A RESPONSE TO REDDIN

Dear Sir:

The comments made by Professor Reddin on the article "Life Cycle Theory of Leadership" (May 1969) are well taken. It certainly was not our intention to suggest that we had first proposed a third dimension of effectiveness to the two dimensional Ohio State model. Our footnote to Reddin's April 1967 *Training and Development Journal* article, when discussing an effectiveness dimension, indicated a recognition of his innovation in this area. In fact, the pioneer work of Reddin in his 3-D Management Style Theory had a tremendous influence on the development of our Tri-Dimensional Leader Effectiveness Model of which Life Cycle Theory is an extension. While Reddin's contribution is clearly evident in our work, it might be appropriate at this time to point out some significant differences between his 3-D Management Theory and our Leader Effectiveness Model.

In examining the two models, it appears that Reddin's model is similar to the Managerial Grid in a number of aspects, while our model is an outgrowth of the

Ohio State Studies. There are several reasons for making such a statement.

First of all, the dimensions of both the Managerial Grid (*concern for production and concern for people*) and Reddin's 3-D Model (*task orientation and relationships orientation*) seem to be attitudinal dimensions. Concern and orientation are feelings or emotions toward something. On the other hand, initiating structure and consideration are dimensions of *observed* behavior. Thus the Ohio State and Leader Effectiveness Models emphasize *how* people behave, while the Managerial Grid and Reddin's 3-D Model emphasize predisposition toward production (task) and people (relationships).

Secondly, both the Managerial Grid and Reddin's 3-D Model give popular labels to various management styles. The main difference between these two models is that Reddin describes a number of "more effective" and "less effective" management styles, while in the Managerial Grid, the implication is that the only desirable management style is "team management" while the least desirable style is labeled impoverished management. Although Reddin adds an effectiveness dimension to various styles, the labels he gives the more effective styles are also value laden as are the Grid names. For example, given a choice, most managers in our society would undoubtedly rather be called an "executive" than branded a "benevolent autocratic" or a "bureaucrat." In neither the Ohio State Model or our adaptation of it are any popular labels used to describe various styles.

Thirdly, the Managerial Grid and Reddin's 3-D Management Theory are both management models, while the Ohio State Studies and our Leader Effectiveness Model are concerned with leadership. The distinction between management and leadership is important. Reddin defines a manager as "a person occupying a position in a formal organization who is responsible for the work of at least one other person and who has formal authority over that person."

Thus when Reddin talks about management styles he is limiting his discussion to a formal organizational setting. Leadership is a broader concept than management since it includes formal and informal settings. The key difference between the two concepts, therefore, lies in the words "formal organization."

While leadership can occur in efforts to accomplish organizational goals, it may also appear in efforts to accomplish merely individual goals, i.e., obtaining power or controlling the rate of productivity. In fact, as the Hawthorne studies revealed, the informal leadership which develops in any organization can be a

powerful element affecting productivity. Consequently, the Ohio State and Leader Effectiveness models apply to more situations than management models which are limited to formal organizational settings.

One final and important difference between Reddin's 3-D Management Theory and the Leader Effectiveness Model is that in discussing effectiveness Reddin seems to emphasize only output variables. He argues that the effectiveness of a manager should be measured "objectively by his profit center performance, by the objectives he has met, or by a comparison of his achievements

to an established optimum or maximum output, market share or some other measure." On the other hand, in the Leader Effectiveness Model in discussing effectiveness, we consider both output and intervening variables. According to Rensis Likert, intervening variables "reflect the current condition of the internal state of the organization; its loyalty, skills, motivations, and capacity for effective interaction, communication, and decision-making."

PAUL HERSEY
KENNETH H. BLANCHARD
*Ohio University,
Athens, Ohio*

JOB LICENSING ON INCREASE, BARS POOR FROM WORK

A maze of occupational licensing requirements blocks the poor and the disadvantaged in a wide variety of work where there are manpower shortages, the U.S. Department of Labor reports.

The lead article in the July issue of *Manpower* magazine surveys the findings of a number of studies on licensing practices and regulations.

Titled "Occupational Licensing: Protection for Whom?", the article declares that most licensing boards are composed "solely of people in the trade, who may have a direct interest in limiting competition."

More than seven million of the Nation's 69 million workers in 1960 were in occupations requiring licenses.

Occupational licensing laws have been increasing rapidly. In the last 25 years such laws have doubled the number of professions, skilled trades, and even semiskilled jobs a worker cannot enter until he has submitted to a licensing authority.

Old standbys in licensing are occupations such as barber, beautician, plumber and electrician. But now the steadily growing list includes such diverse occupations as jockey, horseshoer, moving

picture operator, and watchmaker.

"Regulation of occupations through licensing originally was intended to protect the public from dishonest practitioners and promote high performance standards," says the article. "However, whether by design or accident, many current licensing practices serve another purpose: They make it unnecessarily difficult for people to obtain licenses, thus limiting the number of practitioners."

Altogether there are almost 2,800 statutory provisions requiring occupational licenses, according to a review of State codes for 1968-69. The number of licensed occupations varies greatly from state to state. In Illinois and California, for example, nearly 200 occupations are subject to State regulations, compared with less than 70 in North Dakota, Alaska, Missouri, Montana, South Carolina, and West Virginia.

The *Manpower* magazine report is based upon a Manpower Administration monograph to be titled: "Occupational Licensing and the Supply of Nonprofessional Manpower," prepared by the Department's Office of Manpower Research.