The Full-Range Leadership Model: A Brief Primer

Developed by Dr. Matthew Stafford,
Squadron Officer College (2009)

The following article is based on the two books on Full-Range Leadership: Sosik, John J,. and Don I Jung, Full Range Leadership Development *(New York, Psychology Press, 2010) and Bass, Bernard M., and Ronald E. Riggio,* Transformational Leadership, Second Edition *(Mahwah, New Jersey, Erlbaum Associates, 2006). The tables under each FRLM behavior were contributed by Lt Col Alex Barelka, AFIT. The examples and applications are my own. If there are any factual errors, they are my own as well. Readers desiring additional information on FRLM concepts should reference the two works listed above.*

Dr. Matthew Stafford, Squadron Officer College

Background on Leadership Theory

One could argue that leadership theory is nearly as old as humanity. Even before humans could read and write, they undoubtedly sat and wondered why some members of their societies rose to leadership positions while others did not. As mankind's curiosity increased, undoubtedly humans wondered what it was that made leaders "tick."

The earliest attempts to answer this question were the historical biographies written about great leaders. Whether intentionally or unintentionally, these biographies served as leadership texts of a sort. People could read these texts to discern basic characteristics and behaviors of leaders, potentially modeling their behavior and decisions similarly in hopes of rising to similar levels of success in their own lives.

Interestingly, this approach to leadership study still exists in what is often referred to as "The Great Man (or Woman) Theories." Adherents to these theories study biographies to discern leadership traits, encouraging students to adopt those traits determined to be the most successful.[1] Trait-based leadership instruction is problematic, however. Perhaps most important is the question "how does one develop a trait?" Even when and where people have identical traits, however, outcomes differ widely varying on context and the way in which leaders interact with that context. Instead of teaching leadership, this trait-based approach only affords an analytical tool by which scholars can identify traits but not necessarily replicate them consistently and successfully in students. Even were that possible, however, how could students learn to employ those traits given the unlimited variations in situations that are probable within a single leadership experience? There would have to be additional instruction

---

[1] In studying leadership theory, it is important to grasp the meanings of the words "trait," "behavior," "personality," and "leadership style." Traits are distinguishing characteristics or qualities. Having large ears or being habitually late are both traits. They are observable aspects of personal nature. Behaviors are the ways in which humans conduct themselves. People can select and are therefore ultimately responsible for their behaviors. Personality refers to the sum total of a person's physical, mental, emotional and social characteristics and the manner in which these affect others through interaction. In most people, personalities evolve over time from youth and do not change quickly or dramatically. Leadership styles are a collection of behaviors related to the act of leading others.

on analyzing contextual variations to include situations, followers, levels of authority, etc. Trait-based theories address none of this. Those that subscribe to trait based leadership tend to favor the notion that leaders are born not made. Although it is true that leaders who have certain traits tend to excel, the evidence is equally clear that education and training can improve leadership effectiveness. This supports the notion that leaders can certainly be made so we move on.

In the 1930s and '40s, building upon the pioneering work of Sigmund Freud, experts introduced the psychodynamic theory of leadership. This is a personality-based approach to leadership study that argues that followers and leaders are drawn to their roles, and achieve success in those roles by virtue of personality types. Those familiar with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® should recognize psychodynamic theory in its approach. The goal is for people to understand themselves, to identify their preferred approaches to situations and then work within the constraints of their preferences to achieve success. Leadership and personality are dependent upon one another. That too is problematic in terms of leadership instruction. It is true that an understanding of personality traits helps leaders operate more effectively, however, as with trait based theory, little instruction can be provided to help guide a student towards developing their own personality or the personality of others.

In the second half of the 20th Century, researchers introduced Skills and Styles theories of leadership. The skills theories focused on resolving tensions that exist within relationship, teams and organizations through use of human or conceptual skills. Style theory, in contrast to the trait theories of the past, focused less on who the great leaders were and more on what these leaders did. From these studies, researchers deduced two great camps of leadership: task-oriented and people-oriented leadership (also referred to as "initiating," "structure" and "consideration"). Adherents to this approach adopted methods to improve both task- and people-orientation levels in students, arguing that successful leaders possessed both qualities. Style theory also focused on behaviors instead of traits or qualities, a characteristic of FRLM leadership theory.

In 1967, Contingency Theory was advanced as a new approach to developing leaders. Building on the task-vs-people orientation advanced in psychodynamic theory, adherents of contingency theory sought to match leaders to situations in order to achieve success. Unlike the Situational Leadership model, Contingency theory suggests that leaders are not able to change their basic behaviors. As a result, it would recommend that leaders be "swapped" into and out of various leadership situations based on the contextual factors present.. In the real world, however, leaders encounter a variety of situations within every leadership experience. Instead of "swapping" leaders, a more realistic approach is to create leaders who can adapt their leadership style based on any number of different environmental, organizational, and personnel related factors beyond those espoused by the Situational Leadership Model that would follow.

Blanchard's Situational Leadership approach, introduced in the 1980s and formerly in use at Squadron Officer School (SOS) also focused on behaviors. It offered an analytical approach to assessing context and a formulaic approach to matching leadership behaviors to the context to achieve success. The leader adopts a directive, coaching, supporting, or delegating approach to leadership, depending on the situation. Although compelling in its complexity, the approach is not supported by objective research data despite lengthy scientific scrutiny. Further, there is a great deal of ambiguity in the approach as situations and leadership actions seldom fit the prescribed molds precisely. Lastly, the model does not account for the wide variations that exist within leadership behaviors, variations that are the direct result of individual leaders' differing personalities. The result is a theory that may be extraordinarily valuable as an analytical tool, but not for developing leadership.

Enter the Path-Goal Theory of leadership. This theory casts the leader as trail-blazer, clearing a path for followers' success. After assessing their followers and the situation, leaders choose one of four behaviors: supportive, directive, participative or achievement-oriented to lead their followers to success. In this way, it is similar to the Situational Leadership approach. It differs, however, in its focus on the leader as a trail-blazer, creating the conditions for subordinates' success. Unlike trait theories, it relies on behaviors which can be studied and taught. Like the FRLM approach that would follow, it encouraged leaders to structure transactions with followers and encouraged followers' development. Unlike FRLM, however, it drew clear lines between leadership behaviors. Clearly leaders can be both participative and directive simultaneously, a reality ignored in the path-goal theory.

In the 1990s, Leadership-Member Exchange Theory was introduced to better explain the relationships between leaders and followers. It argued that the relationships between leaders and individual followers vary widely even within a given leadership experience, but that the interactions – or exchanges – between leaders and followers could be assessed and manipulated to create mutually beneficial results. It offered a complex social order within the organizational structure that defined the "haves" and "have-nots" among followers. While the emphasis on "exchange" is consonant with the transactional leadership portion of the FRLM and there is more emphasis on follower development – a function of transformational leadership – the theory virtually ignores the inspirational and intellectual aspects of the FRLM that have proven so powerful in organizational success.

In 2005, Avolio and Gardner published their work on Authentic Leadership Theory. Avolio, a widely published advocate and researcher in FRLM and Gardner, an acknowledged expert in leadership theory, offered authentic leadership as a descriptor for leaders' motivations. They argued that effective leaders are those that are true to themselves and others, have positive psychological states, and adhere to strong morals and values. Their work was prompted by questions about the megalomaniacal tyrants of history. They asked themselves, "Was Hitler a transformational leader?" Despite the fact that he inspired a nation to a adopt policies that accepted atrocities and violence, Avolio and Gardner argued Hitler was not transformational because he was not an "authentic leader." He was "inauthentic" they concluded, because of his essentially evil intentions. Later, Bass argued that Hitler was "pseudotransformational," explaining that he exhibited qualities and behaviors associated with transformational leaders but his behavior was inconsistent with human behavioral norms and recognized standards of morality and decency.

One can see within the various leadership theories briefly overviewed in this article some elements of the FRLM. Certainly all were contributing factors in its development – either positively or negatively (things to be included or excluded, depending on their descriptive and developmental value). Armed with this background, readers are ready to begin learning about the FRLM in use in the SOS curriculum today.

The Full-Range Leadership Model (FRLM)

Although all of the theories previously discussed had an impact on the development of the FRLM, the paradigm represented in its approach evolved directly from James MacGregor Burns' work. In 1978, Burns argued that leadership was either transactional or transformational. Transactional leaders lead through social exchanges; transformational leaders develop their followers and motivate and/or inspire them to achieve extraordinary levels of success. This last offering was critical as it explained those situations in which followers exceeded all expectations – even their own – to achieve success.

Of particular interest is the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and military leadership challenges. Given the "unlimited liability" of military service – the chance that military personnel might lose their lives in the performance of assigned missions – is there any transaction that can explain continued sustained performance in the face of such a risk? Of course not; there is something more at work. Military personnel are not all mercenaries; they fight and take extraordinary risks for other reasons. They are driven by other motivations. Esprit, camaraderie, patriotism, pride … these are all qualities that do not fit neatly into leadership theories of the past but are afforded a place of honor in the transformational portion of the FRLM. Essentially, the entire FRLM appears as follows:

Laissez-Faire	**Transactional**			**Transformational**			
Hands-Off Leadership	Management by Exception (MBE)		Contingent Reward (CR)	Individual Consideration (IC) *Caring*	Intellectual Stimulation (IS) *Thinking*	Inspirational Motivation (IM) *Charming*	Idealized Influence (II) *Influencing*
	Passive MBE	Active MBE					

Figure 1. The Full-Range Leadership Model

Individual traits within the FRLM can be measured using the Multifaceted Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). This is a scientifically validated assessment mechanism for determining individuals' development levels in each of the areas depicted in the FRLM depicted above. SOS uses its own assessment mechanism, the Leadership Profile Measure (LPM). Developed in concert with Leadership experts at the Air Force Institute of Technology, the LPM is an Air Force-specific FRLM assessment tool that allows assessments on par with the MLQ.

Knowing one's strengths and weaknesses in terms of the FRLM is an important first step in personal leadership development. It is important to note, however, that there is no "ideal" score. Students completing the LPM will gain greater insight into their individual strengths and weaknesses. They can then develop a personal development plan that will focus on strengthening those aspects of the FRLM where they feel growth will be most valuable in their personal success. Of course, interpreting an LPM score will be impossible without fully understanding the FRLM. Because of its relativity to the profession of arms, this discussion will begin by describing transformational leadership.

Transformational Leadership

What is a "transformational leader?" What are they "transforming?" Fair questions! And both can be addressed with a single answer: Transformational leaders are those who transform their followers. Through the use of inspiration and motivation, they motivate their followers to do more than was originally intended – often more than either the leader or follower thought was possible. In their book *Transformational Leadership*, Bass and Riggio argue that, "Transformational leadership involves inspiring followers to commit to a shared vision and goals for an organization or unit, challenging them to be innovative problem solvers, and developing followers' leadership capacity via coaching, mentoring, and provision of both challenges and support."[i] Transformational leaders achieve these superior results by employing one or more of the behaviors described below.

Idealized Influence (II)

One can conceive of II as role-modeling, or "walking the talk." II often relates to morality and ethics. There are, however, two aspects of II to consider. First is the leader's actual behavior. Leaders with high levels of II behavior will emphasize shared values (unit, Service, or national), and the collective mission. They exhibit the Air Force value of service before self, sacrificing personal gain for the mission and their subordinates. They do the right thing. They are consistent rather than arbitrary and are willing to take risks for the greater good.

In addition to II behaviors, II leaders exhibited attributes ascribed to them by their followers. The leader's behavior will generate respect and admiration among followers. They are endowed by their followers with qualities such as persistence, determination and courage.

The difference between behaviors and attributes might seem confusing at first, but it really makes a lot of sense. A few years ago, a wing commander noted that his executive officer had spent a large sum of money reserved for hosting distinguished visitors to the wing. The money had been provided to the wing by a local community group with the intention that it would be spent in support of an annual civilian-military event. The executive officer did not spend the money on himself, but used it to pay for wing personnel's get-well gifts and cards, flowers, birthday cards and cakes, funeral flowers, celebratory lunches, etc. – those small expenses that arise constantly at our jobs. It was not until the annual celebration approached that the wing commander realized the allotted pot of money was nearly gone.

At a senior staff meeting, the wing commander explained to his staff what had happened and asked each person present to contribute a sum of money to replace the "missing" funds. At the conclusion of the meeting, a single Colonel stayed behind to question the decision: "If any other officer in the wing had mishandled the money, there would have been an investigation." He knew the investigation would embarrass the wing, but his conscience would not allow him to participate in such a blatant cover-up. Over his commander's protests, he contacted the proper authorities and launched an investigation.

The Colonel demonstrated II behavior by doing the right thing. He took a personal risk in terms of his career by challenging his boss. When word leaked of the Colonel's behavior, his subordinates ascribed to him additional characteristics: boldness and courage, for instance. Was it the Colonel's intent to be bold or courageous? No; he merely insisted that his boss "follow the rules." This story demonstrates the behavioral and attributed nature of II behaviors.

General Characteristics	*Highly credible and trustworthy.*
Actions of Leader	*Conveys a clear sense of integrity.*
Reactions of the Associates	*A desire to emulate the leader.*
A Behavioral Example	*Displays in actions and words a strong sense of purpose.*

Figure 2. Summary of "Idealized Influence"

Inspirational Motivation (IM)

If II is "walking the talk," one could argue that IM is "talking the talk." Leaders with high levels of IM behaviors motivate and inspire their followers via the spoken word. They develop and clearly articulate a vision and the expectations for their follower's performance. In doing so, they "raise the bar" for their organization, setting new standards and new targets for their followers' efforts.

Years ago, a maintenance flight commander was facing a particularly difficult leadership challenge. His maintenance group, and consequently the entire wing had failed a nuclear surety inspection (NSI). The fault lay entirely with the flight he had recently inherited. They had inadvertently violated technical data in such a manner that the entire wing "busted" the inspection. A follow-on inspection had determined the wing was in compliance, but still an ominous cloud of self-doubt hung over the entire flight, and the inspection team was coming for another annual inspection in weeks.

The entire flight had undergone massive retraining following the previous inspection debacle. Competence was not the obstacle. The flight commander also implemented a review schedule, to make sure that every aspect of the flight's operations had received a "second look" prior to the inspection, however, that was not the "real problem" either. He realized it was the workers' lack of self-confidence that was seriously hampering their ability to perform their mission, let alone to prepare themselves and their equipment for the scrutiny of another NSI. Positive meetings with his NCOs and encouraging words to his teams simply were not enough. He needed something more.

The flight commander called a flight meeting and announced that he needed help planning the "post-IG victory celebration" for the flight. It would be an extravaganza – a night out with spouses invited, special recognition for the identified "outstanding performers," etc. The NCOs were surprised. Planning a victory celebration for a victory that had not occurred yet was new to them, but the flight commander's confidence and determination won their support.

The flight commander hung banners congratulating his teams as being the best in the command and "counted down" the days to the big celebration. He talked as if the inspection was already complete and the scores already announced. His infectious enthusiasm prompted others within his leadership sphere to echo his sentiments. Soon he noted that his personnel were "walking taller," with their chins up. They were thinking less of their past failure and looking forward to the opportunity to prove just how good they were.

The actual inspection was almost a let-down; the teams were so well prepared. They moved like well-oiled machines through their inspectable tasks. Checklists were run with the precision of drill teams. Even the maintainers who were not highly regarded for their professionalism or technical competence got into the act. The inspectors were effervescent in their praise for what they had seen. The flight received an "outstanding" rating and multiple personnel were singled out for special recognition as "outstanding performers."

Throughout the preparation period, the flight commander had repeatedly revisited his vision – his personnel basking in the glory of their combined achievement. He helped his followers understand both the desired outcome and the important milestones that had to be achieved on the way. His vision of a successful flight, celebrating their achievements managed to dissipate the cloud of self doubt that restrained the teams from reaching their full potential. Through his positive leadership and his demonstrated IM behavior, the flight commander transformed his entire flight.

Creating and sharing a vision for the future, and spurring followers to achieve that vision is a phenomenal motivator. It lets people know where they are going and encourages them in the journey. People are more confident if they have a good feel for their future; they feel a sense of belonging and are more likely to commit to their organization's efforts.

General Characteristic	*Clarifies "ideal" future state.*
Actions of Leader	*Aligns individual and organizational goals.*
Reactions of the Associates	*Willing to exert extra effort for the leader.*
A Behavioral Example	*Arouses in associates emotional acceptance and identification with their challenges.*

Figure 3. Summary of "Inspirational Motivation"

Intellectual Stimulation (IS)

There is an old saying that "none of us are as smart as all of us." For many years "brainstorming" has been a proven technique for eliciting input to overcome challenges and solve problems. Yet how has brainstorming been inculcated into the Air Force?

One can argue that the Air Force Smart Operations for the 21st Century (AFSO 21) program is an attempt to inculcate brainstorming. It is certainly a proven approach for improving performance and processes. Leaders can use AFSO 21 tools to identify and address weaknesses and waste in their processes. In terms of individual leaders, however, we typically do not think of AFSO 21 tools. AFSO 21 tools tend to be team-focused.

Leaders accomplish similar outcomes, however, by employing IS. Through IS, leaders stimulate followers' creativity. Leaders employing IS question assumptions, processes and existing paradigms, forcing their followers to rethink their solutions and create new approaches to problems. Such leaders include their followers in decision-making related to such improvements. They support some risk-taking, allowing subordinates to try their ideas and not over-reacting to failure. If a leader is not accepting of occasional failures, their followers will be unwilling to take risks.

A few years ago, when Hanta Virus was first detected in the Midwest, there was concern over military members who had to work in areas where the virus might be present. Although it was known that the virus was resident in rodent droppings, there was no immediate plan for how to deal with the virus in warehouses, garages and isolated buildings where rodents were often found. Except for "avoidance," there were no instructions from either the Public Health Services or the Center for Disease Control. At one base, tensions were elevated when a civilian worker at a grain elevator just off base contracted the disease and died within a week of exhibiting symptoms. Work was postponed in those areas that might be harboring the virus. Higher headquarters was stymied by the problem.

At one wing a team was formed to address the military members' concerns. Spurred by the squadron commander, the team conducted research and offered a number of suggestions. Ultimately the team developed what looked to be a workable solution. A backpack-sprayer filled with highly chlorinated water would be used to soak down suspect rodent dwellings, droppings, etc. The liquid ensured the rodent materials would be sufficiently soaked so that the dust, in which the virus was transmitted, would not become airborne. Equipped with gloves and a facemask, the teams could then remove the potentially harmful materials.

With the squadron commander's backing, a sample kit was purchased and procedures developed. The kit was tested. The kit, procedures and test results were forwarded to higher headquarters. The kit and procedures were authorized for all affected wings a short time later. The commander, not a virologist himself, motivated his followers – also not experts in the field – to research and solve a problem that posed a major challenge to mission success. Ultimately, the experts concurred that the team's recommendation was the right solution and adopted it force-wide. No military personnel using the approach contracted the virus and work that had been delayed until a solution could be found was resumed.

General Characteristic	*Challenge old ways and habits.*
Actions of Leader	*Creates a readiness for changing one's way of thinking.*
Reactions of the Associates	*Displays a willingness to think and develop new perspectives.*
A Behavioral Example	*Discusses new trends and ideas and offers examples to change associates' perspective on a problem/opportunity.*

Figure 4. Summary of "Intellectual Stimulation"

IS cannot solve every problem. Sometimes the people do not possess the expertise or access to the expertise needed to solve a problem. In other instances, innovative efforts are stymied by external requirements. In most instances, however, people can and will innovate improvements in their jobs and the processes in which they are involved if only afforded opportunities. The results are improved job performance but also increased job satisfaction as people take ownership of their performance and realize that they are trusted and empowered to make improvements.

Individual Consideration (IC)

J. M. Burns, in his 1978 book *Leadership*, noted that the ultimate aim of great leaders is to develop their followers into future leaders. IC is that transformational leadership trait focused on the development of followers. IC involves a range of behaviors, to include listening, coaching, mentoring and teaching and directly addresses followers' need for achievement and growth.

As people think back to the great leaders they have known in their lives, invariably they recall those leaders that helped them reach their full potential. Whether it was a coach, a favorite teacher, a commander, or even a parent or a grandparent, most people recall those leaders most favorably who invested time in getting to know and develop their followers.

A former wing commander adopted the habit of having a company-grade officer (CGO) "shadow" him one afternoon each week. CGOs were nominated from their squadrons, selected by group commanders, with each group getting a "slot" one afternoon each month.

The wing commander would meet with the CGO at lunch time; discuss what was happening in the wing and what the afternoon schedule would entail, and then talk about the CGO's duties and career plans. At the end of each afternoon session, the wing commander would spend a few minutes with the CGO, answering any questions that might have arisen. At the end of the day, the wing commander and CGO spent as much as thirty minutes reviewing the day, discussing career goals and any concerns that the CGO wanted to raise. Importantly, the wing commander spent a lot of time talking about the CGO and listening intently to what the CGO had to say. These were extraordinary mentoring opportunities; however, they served other purposes as well.

The fact that a busy wing commander would make so much time to mentor his junior officers helped increase loyalty and job satisfaction across the wing. This practice was repeatedly praised by unit personnel in their promotion and departure speeches and figured prominently in unit climate assessment feedback.

Often the mentored CGOs would elevate concerns from their workplaces that the wing commander could address at his level. In a less gifted leader's hands, such an approach could have led to ill will among subordinate commanders. This wing commander, however, had a knack for bringing his subordinate commanders on board. They quickly realized that they were not "penalized" for recommendations, but praised for their quick responses in meeting their people's needs. In this way, the wing commander was mentoring his subordinate commanders too. Consequently, they were eager to send CGOs up for these opportunities often preparing the CGOs with issues they wanted raised.

Another benefit of these sessions was the wing commander really came to know his people and their concerns. Not only that, but he could often link CGOs to others who had encountered and overcome similar challenges in their work centers. The result was this wing commander contributed to a network of top-flight, committed officers across his wing.

The open communication and the genuine concern exhibited by this wing commander strengthened the wing's camaraderie and tore down walls that separated levels of command and the various units within the wing. Everyone who worked for this commander knew that he cared about them and the challenges they faced. Clearly he demonstrated strong IC behavior.

General Characteristic	*Understanding and developmentally focused.*
Actions of Leader	*Coaches individuals who need it.*
Reactions of the Associates	*Willing to continuously improve and develop.*
A Behavioral Example	*Continuously enlarges individual discretion commensurate with ability, needs and motivation.*

Figure 5. Summary of "Individual Consideration"

Transactional Leadership

Because it is less focused on emotion and inspiration, transactional leadership is sometimes afforded less respect than transformational leadership. This is unfortunate, because most leadership positions require elements of both transactional and transformational leadership. Most commanders, for instance, not only lead people but are also responsible for managing resources – budgets, facilities, vehicles, etc. These kinds of responsibilities lend themselves well to the behaviors inherent in transactional leadership.

Contingent Reward (CR)

CR is an active form of management that is effective in a wide variety of situations. It recognizes the inherent transactional nature of most supervisor-subordinate situations and encourages leaders to "contract" with employees to achieve desired outcomes.

For CR to work properly, the leader needs to set goals for their subordinates, explain the expectations for the subordinates' work, and define the roles, levels of authority and responsibility, and pertinent processes so the subordinates will understand what is expected of them. The subordinates will respond to these instructions by meeting the performance requirements levied upon them. In response, the subordinates will receive some agreed upon reward.

Typically, we think of the CR as a factor of pay and benefits. This is true for most routine work, however, there are also CRs for non-routine work. For instance, it is common in many units for "of-the-quarter" award winners to receive a pass – time off from work for their outstanding work. If personnel are motivated to superior performance to get this pass – and the accompanying rewards (often a bag of gifts or even a check) that accompany the award – then they are working toward a CR; a reward contingent upon their outstanding work.

CRs need not be positive. One can think of CR as a "carrot-and-stick approach" to management. In return for good performance, subordinates get a reward. In return for failing to achieve established performance objectives, the subordinates get a negative reward. For instance, if a parachute-packing line has as its goal 500 parachute packs in a given week, the supervisor might offer the line this deal: "We will pack and inspect 100 chutes a day. If we pack and inspect more, we can get off early on Friday. If we pack and inspect fewer, we will work Saturday and even Sunday until all of the chutes are packed and inspected." Clearly the CRs for the chute-packing and inspecting are connected to time off. The supervisor has specified the performance standards in terms of quantity and quality and has set CRs to meet those standards.

CR is entirely appropriate when dealing with committed, talented people who know the requirements of their jobs and need little additional encouragement to achieve success. This is not to say that leaders should not try to employ transformational leadership in those areas that are exceeding production goals, only that leaders can focus their attention on those groups, offices, or organizations within their span of control that need more time and attention.

Some major shortcomings of CR are that it typically fails to inspire people to exceed the performance standards outline for them. In fact, in some work settings workers might actually ostracize co-workers who exceed standards arguing that they are "giving for free" work that should be compensated. This is not usually a factor for uniformed personnel, but is a common them in production-worker contract negotiations.

Another potential shortcoming of CR, far more relevant to military personnel, is leadership's failure to discern which CRs work and which do not. Military leaders need to understand their subordinates' wants and needs in order to offer CRs that actually stimulate desired behaviors. A senior civilian employee earning 160 hours of annual leave each year and carrying a use-or-lose leave balance of over 100 hours is not going to be particularly stimulated by an end-of-year time-off reward. A captain whose wife is expecting next month may not appreciate a coveted TDY that would have him away on the due date.

Clearly, leaders need to understand both their people and the potential CRs that are available to them – both positive and negative - in order to employ transactional CR effectively. Failure to achieve this understanding seriously limits leaders' ability to employ this highly effective leadership behavior.

General Characteristic	*Clarifies Goals and Expectations.*
Actions of Leader	*Provides feedback on agreements.*
Reactions of the Associates	*Achieves expected performance.*
A Behavioral Example	*Provides support for associates in exchange for required effort.*

Figure 6. Summary of "Contingent Reward"

Management by Exception (MBE)

Like CR, MBE is a recognized and often effective way of managing systems, processes, resources and in some circumstances, even people. Unlike CR, however, MBE focuses less on building that contractual relationship between leaders and followers and more on intervention when followers fail to achieve standards. In short, it is less proactive and more reactive in nature than CR. It is a form of transactional leadership because MBE is essentially a corrective transaction – an intervention by leadership to correct a situation. Also like CR, MBE can be positive or negative, however, most people typically think of a leader's intervention into their work areas as a decidedly negative event.

Because their intervention may be perceived negatively by their subordinates, MBE leaders may generate fear and stifle open communications with their followers. Further, because these leaders' emphasis is so clearly on maintaining standards and performance objectives, it is likely that creativity will be stifled as well. Risk-taking might adversely affect desired outcomes, so such behavior will likely be discouraged in an organization run exclusively using MBE techniques.

MBE takes two forms, active and passive. In active MBE (MBE-A), leaders constantly monitor the processes and subordinate performance for which they are responsible and intervene at the earliest sign of a problem. A leader exhibiting strong MBE-A behaviors focuses on mistakes, complaints, adverse trends, failures, deviations from standards, broken rules or regulations, etc.

The passive form of MBE (MBE-P) is even more reactionary than MBE-A. Instead of monitoring processes and work performance of subordinates, MBE-P leaders simply wait for something to go wrong. Leaders exhibiting strong MBE-P tendencies will often claim, "if it's not broken, don't fix it." They are not risk-takers. Leaders exhibiting strong MBE-P behaviors are unlikely to be perceived as role models by their subordinates.

General Characteristics	*Reactionary: Monitors and corrects problems (MBE-A) or waits and responds to problems as they occur (MBE-P)*
Actions of Leader	*Avoids trying to change processes as long as they work. Alert to mistakes (MBE-A)*
Reactions of the Associates	*Maintain status quo and avoids making any mistakes.*
A Behavioral Example	*The leader will instruct associates on how to make improvements only when necessary and only teaches associates how to correct and avoid mistakes.*

Figure 7. Summary of "Management by Exception"

So is MBE bad? No, not always. MBE is entirely appropriate in those situations where a leader has talented followers who can be trusted to deliver expected results. When, for instance, Gen Norman Schwarzkopf led the coalition forces for Operation DESERT STORM, he was not able to engage with every unit commander every day. His focus was rightly placed on the cutting edge of his attack. When the Iraqis countered with their unexpected push South into Khafji, however, Gen Schwarzkopf's attention rightly turned to the small number of Marines remaining in the occupied city. Schwarzkopf had employed an MBE-A approach to those units not on the spear-point of his offensive, but adjusted as appropriate to counter the unanticipated threat – the "exception" to his plan of attack.

Laissez-Faire Leadership

The final leadership behavior to address is *laissez-faire* (LF) leadership. It is difficult to describe LF leadership because it is essentially non-leadership. LF leaders do not take stands on issues, they do not make decisions, they do not develop their people … in short, they do not lead. There is no exchange between leaders and followers simply because the leaders do not particularly care about their followers or the challenges they face.

Some erroneously argue that LF leadership has a place in today's leadership environment. They argue that teams can perform best with little or no intervention from leaders, except in extraordinary circumstances. Even if they are correct, they mistake LF leadership for MBE. In most cases, however, people perform best when they get inspiration and motivation from their leaders – transformational leadership. LF leadership is the absence of all such inspiration and motivation. It is the absence of caring and direction. So why are there such leaders?

Clearly, very few people would ever set out to become LF leaders. They devolve to this leadership style because they are distracted by other events in their lives. Perhaps they are overwhelmed by personal problems or are experiencing physical or psychological problems that prevent them from being more effective.

Still, most FRLM experts agree that the majority of leaders demonstrate behaviors across the range of the FRLM model – to include LF leadership – in the performance of their duties. Is it possible that good leaders might demonstrate LF behaviors? Absolutely. Good leaders can become distracted and, consequently, fail to pay proper attention to areas under their control.

Clearly LF leadership is not a goal; it is not a type of leadership leaders typically try to embrace. Instead, it is the result of being distracted; of failing to provide leadership when and where it is needed. Yet it is important for leaders to grasp LF, its signs and its consequences, if only to be aware of the tendency for LF behaviors to manifest themselves when leaders' attention is diverted.

General Characteristic	*Delays*
Actions of Leader	*Diverts attention away from hard choices.*
Reactions of the Associates	*Frustrated and may usurp the role of the leader.*
A Behavioral Example	*The leader is not engaged in our work.*

Figure 8. Summary of "*Laissez-faire*"

FRLM: Continuum or Cafeteria Line?

Much of the literature on the FRLM argues that leadership is a continuum, stretching from *laissez-faire* leadership, at the lowest level of leadership, to idealized influence at the highest level. This approach argues that transformational styles are better than transactional, and that individual styles within the major subsets are also ranked. Contingent reward, for instance, is thought by some researchers to be superior to management by exception.

Such an approach is problematic, however. In the vast majority of situations, leaders will find themselves confronted with a wide variety of leadership challenges. Some can be handled appropriately and effectively employing transactional behaviors. Others will require transformational behaviors. The same leader will have to be able to apply both simultaneously in order to achieve success.

Take for instance a maintenance squadron commander. One maintenance shop might be led by experienced, motivated NCOs who require minimal supervision and direction to achieve extraordinary results. MBE-A might be an entirely acceptable and successful approach for a squadron commander leading such a shop. In the same squadron, however, there might be a maintenance shop being led by newly promoted personnel in their first leadership position. The squadron commander would be wise to emphasize IC in such a situation, developing these followers to reach leadership levels commensurate with expectations and the performance level of the shop identified above.

A major problem, such as a recently detected problem in a major assembly for which the unit is responsible, might require emphasis on IS to encourage followers to develop innovative new solutions. An upcoming deployment might require more IM and II to aid members in preparing for and overcoming the challenges of a long deployment into a potentially hostile area. At the same time, however, the commander will also want to make sure his people have the training and equipment they need for the deployment. MBE-A, will be necessary even while IM and II efforts are continuing. In short, the best leaders develop their abilities in all of these areas and use them appropriately, individually and in concert with one another, as the situation dictates.

Return to the example of Gen Schwarzkopf in DESERT STORM. The Marines in Khafji were not the General's top concern as his forces advanced into Kuwait. The General was applying MBE-A in dealing with such forces. Yet his reaction to the Iraqi threat was instantaneous. The General applied transformational leadership as he inspired the overrun Marines to continue their important intelligence-gathering work in the occupied town. There was no doubt in those Marines' mind that there leader was aware of their peril and was vitally concerned about their safety

Clearly, the FRLM is not a continuum. The behaviors described by transactional and transformational leadership can be entirely appropriate, given the circumstances. It is also important to note that they can be used alone or in concert with one another.

Augmenting Behaviors

FRLM researchers call the mix of transactional and transformational behaviors "augmenting." Research reveals that transformational leadership can augment transactional leadership approaches in ways that enhance follower satisfaction and performance.[ii] How does one augment?

The squadron commanders who establish a three-day-pass award for his "of-the-quarter" winners are using CR to motivate their people to try for those awards. If the same commanders also ensure that their winners are praised publicly, get their names in the paper, etc., then they are augmenting the transactional CR with transformational behaviors. These commanders' public praise is IM behavior. Their public use of their winners' behavior as models for others is IC behavior for others in their units.

Leaders who establish CRs for their followers should also exhibit transformational behaviors to elevate their followers to achieve beyond the performance standards that are a baseline in the CR approach. These leaders will also use IS to inspire their followers to develop new and better ways of approaching their work.

Clearly, the FRLM is an adaptive approach to leadership. It is not a continuum, but a smorgasbord of behaviors that leaders can apply in varying situations. Further, like food from a smorgasbord, the contents can be blended to meet the specific needs of the user. Leaders can blend leadership behaviors as necessary to achieve results that exceed their and their followers' expectations.

It is also important to note that the FRLM empowers leaders to achieve success. It does not negate individual leaders' responsibility to properly analyze their individual leadership challenges and select and apply the appropriate FRLM behavior(s) to achieve success.

The FRLM and Team Leadership

So far, this article has confined its discussion of leadership to the interactions that occur between leaders and followers. What of those situations where there are no designated leaders and followers? The ways in which leadership is exercised within teams provides insights into how FRLM concepts can be incorporated to aid teams in achieving success.

Shared/Empowered Team Leadership

Teams are essentially a collection of individuals united in a shared purpose. They are typically led in two ways, either by an appointed leader or by the team itself. Think of the first method as "leadership of teams" and the second as "leadership by teams." This discussion will focus primarily on the second approach, arguing that teams that lead themselves effectively have the potential to achieve extraordinary success through the use of FRLM concepts.

Within effective team-led teams, leadership responsibilities are shared. Sometimes responsibilities are allocated through some process of distribution/assignment; however, quite often the sharing is unplanned. Team members simply rise to meet the challenges their team is facing depending upon their individual strengths and talents. Team members apply appropriate leadership behaviors – those in which they excel – to meet specific challenges. Yet responsibility for the team's performance remains shared among the members. Each member understands that they are responsible even if a formal team-leader is present.

Another way in which leadership is shared among such teams is in the decision-making authority. Teams share this authority. Each team member is empowered to make decisions that will affect the entire team's performance. Since, however, each team is fully committed to the desired outcomes, there is no reason that the decisions would run contrary to those outcomes.

Shared decision-making authority might result in some conflicts within the team, but again if all of the members are committed to the desired outcome, those conflicts will be subordinated to the greater good. Sosik and Jung describe this conflict as "growing pains," necessary by-products of an empowered team's quest to achieve its desired outcomes.

A third way in which empowered teams share leadership is through increased interaction and communication. Empowered team members are far more likely to communicate and interact with one another. Both the quality and quantity of interactions will be greater among such teams. Contrasting this empowered-shared approach with traditional leader-follower approaches, one could say that in a traditionally aligned team the leader establishes the norms for performance and behavior. In empowered-sharing teams, however, the team members themselves establish the norms. These norms become the governing mechanism for their shared leadership within the team. Within these norms, they develop a shared accountability. Each team member is accountable for their contributions to the group, but each also realizes that they are also accountable for the entire group's performance

FRLM concepts have a powerful place in team-led team leadership. Through II behavior, the team members model their commitment to the shared outcome and inspire their teammates to greater efforts. Through IM, team members develop and share their common vision; the expected outcomes of their efforts. This too encourages team members and allows them to support one another through difficult times. It also allows them to discuss the tasks ahead and devise new ways to marshal their strengths to achieve success. Through these efforts, the team achieves synergies that propel it to even great success.

How do such teams develop? This is an important concept, relevant both to the SOS student experience and to situations encountered throughout life. In 1977, social psychiatrist Bruce Tuckman offered a five-stage description of team development that remains a standard underpinning team behaviors: forming, storming, norming, performing and adjourning. Sosik and Jung correlated these classic stages of team development to FRLM behaviors as follows:

Stage of Development/ Performance Level	Tuckman's Five Stages of Development	Correlated FRLM Behaviors
Early in group's life Lowest level of performance	Forming	Unstructured Group (LF)
Deadline approaching Low level of performance	Storming	Semistructured Group (MBE-P)
Deadline is imminent Mediocre performance	Norming	Structured Group (MBE-A and CR)
Due date for team's task Performance is high	Performing	Team (IC and IS)
Due date and beyond Excellent performance	Excelling and Adjourning	Highly Developed Team (II and IM)

Figure 9. Correlating FRLM to Stages of Team Development[iii]

Accepting this correlation, it appears that teams develop through stages of FRLM behaviors, from *Laissez-faire*, through transactional and finally to transformational behaviors. An explanation is warranted.

When people are first placed together, they function as a group and not a team. Groups consist of individuals, each with their own objectives and desires. Group members are not inclined to surrender their individual authority and may retain personal accountability for outcomes. Some members may place themselves and personal well-being above the group's and engage in social loafing at the expense of the group's success, allowing others to "carry the weight" for them.

When teams first form they often are indistinguishable from groups. The new team members do not know one another. They do not know the skill sets and talents of their teammates. They may be "in it for themselves," not yet trusting their teammates enough to rely on them for support. In terms of the FRLM, they tend toward a LF approach to leadership.

As the group begins to coalesce towards whatever task it hopes to achieve, its members will start to wonder who is in charge, who their fellow group members are and what talents these members can contribute to the outcome. Members may start to vie for specific roles within the group. They tend toward MBE-P behaviors and, as a result, the total output of the group remains low.

As the group's deadline for performance looms closer, however, the group will begin to coalesce into a team. They will begin to establish norms for their behavior, roles for their members, and begin rewarding performance that propels them toward their collective goal. At this stage, the team tends to rely on MBE-A and CR leadership behaviors – transactional behaviors – to enhance the structure of their team and propel the team toward success. Team performance will have improved, but may still be mediocre.

At the "finish line," when the team is delivering its completed project, the motivation will be at its highest. Team members will recognize each other's talents and weaknesses and probably have begun efforts to develop one another to maximize strengths and overcome weaknesses. The team will be energized by its collective success. Team members will inspire one another through IM and II behaviors. At this stage, the team is operating primarily using transformational behaviors and is at its highest level of productivity.

Knowing this, how can Service members put FRLM concepts to work to accelerate a group's progress toward achieving its full potential? Sosik and Jung argue that there are four leadership behaviors that can accelerate this evolution:

1) Instill pride in team members for being associated with the team
2) Go beyond self-interest for the good of the team
3) Emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission
4) Help team members to develop their strengths[iv]

Although any of the FRLM transactional and transformational behaviors can aid a team in its quest for success, the four listed above have been determined to be particularly effective in expediting success. In them, one can see elements of II, IM, and IC behaviors.

So how does this team-building play out in real-world situations? In their book *Full Range Leadership Development*, Sosik and Jung use the rock group The Beatles to show how four very talented musicians were able to subordinate their personal ambitions in order to achieve their goal of being the top rock group in the world. It is an interesting discussion, one that reveals at different times, different band members took leading positions, with each contributing unique talents in addition to their musical skills to propel the group to success.

The Beatles' experience is instructive, but not unique. Despite the vastly different objectives, teams coalesce in decidedly similar ways. One need only look to one's own experiences, whether in a sports team, an educational setting (a new class, study group, or group project), or a newly assigned professional team (perhaps on a deployment or a TDY to conduct a special mission) to realize the applicability of these concepts.

Unless there is a formalized leadership structure that subordinates these "natural" team behaviors, the individual members will struggle with the challenges described above. Ultimately, each will assert their particular talents and skills for the good of the group. Knowing this and knowing how to bring about these very positive outcomes could help members bring about high levels of performance more quickly.

Conclusion

The concepts underpinning Full-Range Leadership are not particularly complicated. One can learn about and discern these behaviors in a relative short period of time. The more difficult task is applying these concepts to strengthen leadership behaviors – both in one's self and in one's subordinates – and to discern the situations in which these behaviors might be applied most effectively to achieve desired results. This constitutes the leadership-development journey that can and should last a lifetime.

---

[i] Bass and Riggio, 4
[ii] *Ibid*, 10
[iii] Sosik and Jung, 310
[iv] *Ibid*, 312