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Fiedlers Contingency Model and Vroom-Jago Contingency Model Introduction Leadership is one of the most important tasks in management. It is an interpersonal influence that is practiced within the situation that is directed by the process of communication for the attainment of goals. Primarily, this task is often integrated with the decision making and needs a balance on the part of the leader. Effectiveness of a leadership may be viewed through different contingency models which depend on the interaction of the factors involved in an organization. Specifically, the leaders are dependent on the acuity of the members that really affects the whole organization.
Contingency models vary according to what theory they hold. As such, Vroom- Jago suggests that the effectiveness of the group demands a match between the style of the leader and what the situation needs. This is the same with Fiedler’s model which holds that the leader can influence how the group acts toward a given situation, at large. The mentioned models are just two of the variants of the contingency theories. Focusing on their similarities and difference can give a clearer view and understanding of a good leadership and be able to apply them on real life situations.
Discussion
Fiedler’s Contingency Model is proposed by Fred Edward Fiedler who is an Austrian psychologist. The model focuses on the personality of the leader and how he handles a given situation. It means that the performance of the leader depends on the situation where he or she operates. Fiedler integrates the efficiency of the leader to the factors in the environment that contributes a lot on how the leader manipulates the group (Fiedler 6).
On the other hand, Vroom- Jago Contingency Model focuses on the consideration of many factors in order for the leader to come up with a decision. It is a contingency model that caters on changeable levels of participative leadership and how it influences on the quality and accountability of the decisions of the leader.
Fiedler’s Contingency model is similar to the point of Vroom- Jago model through the idea of relating the decisions of the leader into the essential key factors. However they are different on how they act as a leader to the group. Fiedler points out that tight situation make the decisions come out more efficiently. Yet, a stress- free situation can make intelligence the key to success, but Fiedler believes that a stressful situation can boost the performance of the group and strive hard which will allow the group to express their performance to the highest level. In Vroom- Jago contingency model, the leader makes its own decision with the help of the information at hand (Vrrom and Jago 150). Unlike Fiedler’s model, it does not necessarily influence the behavior of the group in order to get a conclusion. Vroom- Jago gathers the vital information from the group and come up with his or her own decision. The involvement of the group is merely to help the leader come up with a solution through an organize meeting. The opinion of the group is largely sought by the leader unlike in Fiedler’s contingency model where in the leader depends on the favorableness of the environment.
Conclusion
Applying the given theories into a real-life situation, Fiedler’s contingency model can be depicted in a restaurant. Employees are largely influenced by the manager and as a leader he bases the decisions on what and how the environment responds. There is a manager- employee relationship though, but more often than not the leader has a high impact on the performance of the employees. In Vroom- Jago contingency model, it can be depicted on a higher level of management such as the leadership of the superior on his subordinates in a large company or a firm where the opinions of each member are necessary.
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