
Leadership Academy: Leadership Styles

Transcript

>>Andrea Falzarano: Welcome to the ASHA Leadership Academy webinar, "Leadership Styles". This webinar content is appropriate for entry in emerging leaders. I am Andrea Falzarano, Director of Association Governance Operations at the ASHA national office. We planned today's webinar because understanding and adapting to applicable leadership styles are essential skills for audiologists and speech language pathologists who aspire toward becoming a leader. Each of you should have a copy of the handout which includes speaker information and slides. If you do not have the handout please pause the webinar now and access a copy from our website. You will need a copy for interactive sections of this presentation. At this time I would like to welcome our presenters, Kevin Nourse and Alice Waagen. Dr. Kevin Nourse is an executive coach organization development consultant and facilitator with nearly 20 years of progressive experience in both for-profit and non-profit organizations. He is a professional certified coach through the International Coach Federation and has extensive experience coaching leaders in the areas of emotional intelligence, career planning and transition, influence, risk-taking and strategic thinking. Dr. Alice Waagen is a business consultant who teaches management skills to business leaders. Alice has conducted hundreds of workshops and training classes at many of the country's top Fortune 500 companies, non-profit organizations and government agencies in the Washington, D.C. area. In just the last 5 years more than 132 leaders from 26 regional organizations have graduated from her unique leadership development workshop series. Now let's begin. Over to you Kevin.

>>Kevin Nourse: Thanks Andrea. We want to welcome everyone to the Leadership Academy webinar on Leadership Styles. We're happy to have you participating in the webinar and we'll be talking about leadership styles and adaptive leadership and provide you with some tools and some practical strategies to move immediately into action with these ideas. I'd like to review our disclosure statement. I am Kevin Nourse, Principal of Nourse Leadership Strategies and I'm an independent contractor. I am being financially compensated by ASHA for the leadership academy webinars and I do not have any non-financial interests with ASHA. My colleague, Alice Waggen is a subcontractor to Nourse Leadership Strategies. She is also an independent contractor financially compensated by ASHA for the Leadership Academy webinars and without any non-financial interests with ASHA. So before we get into our agenda I just want to set context. We've got two types of participants today on the webinar; those that are actually live in the classroom with us that we'll be engaging with and then of course those of you who are listening on the recording. What we've found is that one way to deepen your learning for those

listening to the recording is throughout the webinar we've got specific reflection questions. So we'll be inviting you to when we get to those points hit the pause button on your replay, take some time and reflect on the question in your workbook and then rejoin us in essence start the playback again and that will give you a chance to reflect on the content. So with that I'll pass it to my colleague, Alice.

>>Alice Waagen: Well thank you Kevin and I likewise want to welcome everyone to our webinar this morning, those of you who are live with us in the classroom and those of you who are listening after the fact so to speak. So let's go ahead and introduce our topic for today. We're going to talk about different leadership styles that people can use to direct the work of others as well as how to learn how to use and adapt to styles that perhaps aren't ones that you're using today. We are going to start with defining some key concepts. And then the three areas we're going to talk about are what are these styles, what are the behaviors associated with each of the styles so that you can understand how you might begin to apply them. And lastly we're going to give you a process to use to adapt your style to a specific person or situation to be more effective. So Kevin why don't you start us off with defining our terms for today.

>>Kevin Nourse: Okay. Well let's start at the very beginning then when we talk about leadership style what are we really talking about? We can think about it in terms of a pattern of leadership behavior in terms of your interactions with others. And so a pattern meaning a type of behavior, how you think, how you respond. When we refer to followers that could be direct reports but it could also be peers, volunteers, people at different levels. So the premise is that we can use different styles with different individuals depending on the situation. And that leadership style is really how we provide direction or implement plans or motivate people. And so the idea is there have been in some cases we refer to it as situational that as we know no one leadership style fits in every situation. And we know that really exemplar leaders know how to think about that and adapt their behavior from that perspective. Why is this topic important for CSD professionals? Well there's a couple of reasons listed but beyond that we know that what helps those that aspire into leadership really move up the ranks and really gain credibility as leaders. Again, it's this idea anchored to some extent emotional intelligence and awareness of self and adapting one's behavior depending on the situation. We're going to talk in a bit about really high functioning leaders and how they do this. So really it's an important part of building your tool kit as it relates to leadership and emerging leadership. Okay, so Alice I think you're going to talk a little bit about some of the research studies associated with the topic?

>>Alice Waagen: I sure am Kevin. Before I get into these different themes let me just highlight one thing that I think is really important when we approach a topic like this. As Kevin mentioned earlier there's different kinds of followers and when you look at that and sometimes people say to me well wait, a peer you know that's not, I'm not a leader I'm their colleague. Well, we're talking about leadership here I'd like to say with a lower case (l) not a big capital case (L). What I mean by that is we're talking about leadership not as a job title or a title of sorts but a set of behaviors. So when I step into a situation and I need to direct someone else it doesn't matter what my title is I'm now functioning as a leader. And so when we define leadership that way I hope you see that it can occur in many different situations with many different types of people. And that's why this concept of being able to adapt is so critical. So what we've done in all of these Leadership Academy webinars is to provide you with just a short sampling of current research out on this topic. Well I've got some studies here and there's plenty more out there but what's to me very important is a lot of what we're talking about today in terms of practices and procedures with leadership is really based on good evidence-based leadership -- excuse me, good evidence-based research. I'm getting my words mixed up already. For instance the second article that we list here, "The Impact of Leadership Style on Organizational Effectiveness" was a really great study where our researchers collected data on both leadership style in organizations and correlated to the organization effectiveness. They did this using some very sophisticated survey instruments to say this is the style of leaderless organization and these are the metrics that show that this business or this organization's being effective. And they did find a correlation of statistically significant correlation between them. This is a powerful thought because we're not just saying adapting leadership style is nice to have. What we're really saying here and the research backs it up is that when the top leaders or leaders in an organization or leadership in any endeavor is adaptive to the situation and the people around them they are more successful. Really a very important message to get across. The other study I will just cite, the "Leadership Styles and Theories" just again, a survey of the literature what's out there, what do they look like? And the third one I'll just pause momentarily on is the review of leadership theory, principle styles relevant to education management. That's the other thing is if you're in a particular profession, education, health care, academia, there have been really good studies that go into those particular environments and look at the styles and how they work. So we're going to start now with our first reflective thought to just get us going with the day. And as Kevin mentioned earlier I will ask in a minute to those who are listening to the recording to pause but wait until I set the question up. So what is the basis for a person's natural leadership style? Let me explain what I mean by that. If someone has not studied this program or others like it and are just really kind of on autopilot they go into a situation and act very naturally and so they're going to come out with a style. What do you think influences them building comfort with that? Where do you think we go to to draw from to produce our natural leadership style? That's more of a thought question more than anything else. So take a few minutes and when I'm quiet, I'm going to stop talking and I promise you those with the recording press pause; give this some thought and make some notes. And in the meantime we will ask, challenge our live

audience to also participate with answers to this question. So Kevin let me start with you; what are your thoughts on where does our autopilot style come from?

>>Kevin Nourse: You know it makes me think about the concept of nature versus nurture. In other words in terms of leadership what's baked into our DNA and what do we learn from our environment? And I think and everything I've seen in the literature really so much of what we do as leaders is a combination of both. So I know that for example we talk about some natural born leaders and there may be some you know again, empirical evidence that supports kind of the anchor in terms of how we are. Cause for example even personality we know the personality theory that to some extent personality is baked in. For example I saw some studies that looked at how pessimism and optimism there's biological roots to that. So I think it's really a combination of both nature/nurture as far as I'm concerned in certainly talking with some of my clients. What has your experience been?

>>Alice Waagen: Well, let me first go to our audience our live audience and then I'll wrap with some of my thoughts on it. Michelle mentions experience likewise, prior role models both good and bad and relationships you may have with others. I think that's a very interesting point especially prior role models as we enter our different professions and we look to see leaders act in a certain way we may model after them. We have two Michelle/Michele's joining us today. So Michele number two says observe, observing others and adopting what you're seeing characteristics from them. You know Leslie mentions again, role models and personality traits. And Michele likewise says people they've worked with or seen in the popular culture. I like that idea. You know you may see something even in you know TV or movies that say hey, that gives me some ideas on how to be here. Leslie comes back with possibly birth order. That's a very interesting thought. She mentions I'm a first-born so I have more leadership style with my siblings. That's a really interesting thought Leslie and one that I would love to ponder a little bit more because you're right. I think especially when there's a span of age between siblings where the first-born is maybe you know already started as being a small child when the second one comes along there is an expectation of leadership; excellent. Well you've all hit a lot of the things that I've put down on my list. I guess the only other one I'll mention is the culture of the organization. We're going to touch on this a little bit later. Sometimes the acceptable norms of behavior in an organization can adjust -- I was going to say the word mutate which is probably not a good word to use here; to adjust my style to be something different than I'm normally used to. Okay, Kevin I think you're going to open us up to what do these styles look like.

>>Kevin Nourse: That's right. So what I'd like to do now is just present the menu of styles. We can think about this in terms of the idea of adding tools to your tool kit, maybe some new styles you want to put in your kind of your back pocket. So I'd like to just do a real quick background on this. So what we did is we looked at the literature and there's been a lot written about leadership styles and we boiled it down to really these key seven styles. And we're going to go through these in a little bit more detail in just a moment. But what's important really fundamentally when you look at these styles there's really two dynamics to consider. Some of them are more task-oriented. They're focused on the work itself, the task, getting the job done. And others are more focused on the relationship and the person who's doing the task. And so ultimately that's a big distinction in terms of the different types of styles. And also fast forwarding when we talk about when do you use a specific style. Again, going back to the question what needs more focus the task or the person? So that's one perspective. And that you know generally we find and we've used this approach and protocol associated with styles with the larger ASHA Leadership Development program over the years and assess individuals on this but generally we find that most folks have a particular style that they really gravitate toward maybe a secondary one. But we come in the door with a comfort zone. So Alice, anything high level you want to point out in terms of our leadership styles overall?

>>Alice Waagen: Well, I think you've covered it very, very well. And I will say if you do like this area of study and you want to do more there are many different models out there. Some have four styles in them. Some have six, some have five but there's a lot of overlap between it. And so I think rather than saying one is right or wrong or whatever I think just what makes sense; that's really what we try to pull together here.

>>Kevin Nourse: Okay, great. Well, why don't we go into a deeper dive then into the individual styles and Alice and I will trade off and kind of bring these to life with some specific examples. I like to start off with laissez-faire. So laissez-faire, that style is one more of a hands-off approach and it could be manifest in terms of delegating, giving people authority and autonomy to function well. This could be a really useful style to use with followers and others that are skilled, competent, confident, fairly autonomous functioning individuals. And we see that a lot of leaders like to take this approach but of course implied in that is are your followers or your other stakeholders you're leading ready for that. Because we know that when people use a laissez-faire approach but their followers aren't ready it really can create some havoc in terms of errors and miscues and that kind of thing. So that's the laissez-faire approach. Alice I think you're going to talk about directive.

>>Alice Waagen: Yes. Directive I think is one of the easiest ones to understand because its name implies the definition. Directive is command and control. A leader steps in and says it is my way and only my way; do it this way and nothing else. It's a

very challenging leadership style. It has its value. As we mentioned here in crisis situations, in situations where safety is at risk or in situations where there is regulatory or legal issues involved you don't want to say should we do this or not. I mean this is the way to do it. The leader has to come in and be directive. But the challenge with that is that it over time can build a real sense of dependency. If I'm a leader that's always coming in and saying do it my way and no other way it really makes people just stop trying and just agree with everything that the leader says. So is it useful? Absolutely. Can it be overused and be damaging? Absolutely. So it's a bit of use in very much in as needed situation. So Kevin I think you're next.

>>Kevin Nourse: Okay. I was going to add to directive that that also tends to be much more task-oriented so it's less focused on the person and their needs and more focused on the task just to close that.

>>Alice Waagen: Oh good, yeah.

>>Kevin Nourse: In terms of visionary, our third style. So it's really about evoking commitment and we do that by creating a very compelling mission or vision as a leader especially if it's done inclusively. So this while it certainly is focused on achieving a task or a goal it often is very, very people focused. And it's a particularly effective style when people buy into the vision and you've got credibility and legitimacy. Cause I think all of us have been in organizations for example when someone you know perhaps we didn't respect as a leader presents a vision. Well generally it won't get much traction. So I think the icon of visionary leadership again I go back to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and you know we think about his compelling "I Have a Dream" speech and to me that is an example of a really amazing vision and his skills in terms of communicating that vision and painting it in a way that everyone saw themselves in the vision. So to me this is a really powerful way to lead. And I can imagine particularly in some instances where as participants you might be trying to get involvement and engagement with a compelling vision that that would be a really powerful way for you to lead and you know perhaps one that you want to add to your tool kit.

>>Alice Waagen: Well, let's talk --

>>Kevin Nourse: So Alice I think you're going to take affiliative.

>>Alice Waagen: Absolutely. Let's talk a minute about affiliative cause I think it's the first one where the name doesn't quite clearly define what we're talking about here. An affiliative leader is someone who focuses on relationships. So to get Kevin's you know point before is it task focused or is it people focused, this is clearly a people focused style of leadership. Why would one use this? Well oftentimes when I see leaders

stepping into a situation where there is as Kevin mentioned something like low morale, maybe it's a work situation, a clinic or a school situation that's really come under fire. And people are just feeling beaten down and really not -- they're at a point where they're not helping each other. They're just kind of pulling in. I hope nobody on the recording's been in situations like this but I have had at one point in my past I don't even care about anybody else I'm just here trying to get my job done and go home at the end of the day. What an affiliative leader will do is go in there focus on those emotional needs but focus on building the team, getting people out of their rut, out of their shell, talking with other, interacting with each other, supporting one another and really kind of working to turn around what might be a damaging or a negative situation. Very powerful, powerful leadership skill. And one I might say that I don't see a lot of. I think it is often overlooked. I've used this model with other organizations and you know I'm thinking beyond ASHA; engineering organizations where literally people scratch their head and said I've never seen it, I don't know anything about it. But think about it. Any situation where there's a need to pay attention to emotions and people working with each other well with each other the affiliative leadership behaviors and style are really critical. Kevin, I think you're next for us here.

>>Kevin Nourse: Absolutely. Right. So similar but different is the participative style. We think about this is more of a kind of a classic, democratic way of leading. The idea is we're trying to really enlist and foster teamwork, build consensus and so the idea is how to be more inclusive as a leader in engaging your folks and followers and stakeholders in terms of decisions that you may be making where you want people to have some sense of ownership of the decision. So it's versus a command and it may be more of a directive approach where you make the decision and push it downward. Here we're taking the time to build consensus and basically engage people. So this can be a really effective way. I think particularly I've found -- I do a lot of coaching on what I call transition coaching with new leaders in organizations which can be really a challenging time but the idea is maybe start off building the relationships but also engaging people. Because that will go a long way though it takes more time it will go a long way toward mitigating and reducing resistance on the other side. And it's particularly effective when the followers know as much or more as the leader. In other words if you've got individuals maybe who are inexperienced your efforts to include them while it may be important and have a positive impact if they don't have content, knowledge for example of the decision it's going to be hard to get really quality participation in that. So that's one of the caveats. So this is much more of a relationship oriented style versus the task. So I'll toss to you Alice for pacesetting.

>>Alice Waagen: Alright. Pacesetting makes me want to start talking really fast. But other than that pacesetting as a style as we say here is leading by example and setting very high standards. Now why would you do this? The most predominant reason I think for pacesetting is when there's an underperforming organization. For instance I've known managers who specialize in what are called turnarounds. And a turnaround is

they're called in for a team or a part of an organization that's basically failing and they go in and they adopt this pacesetting style normally in partnership with a directive style. And say okay, from now on end this is how we're going to work. These are the standards I'm holding you to and we're going to get this thing done. It is a very effective style when this turnaround needs to be done very quickly. In other words let's say it's a clinical situation that's been you know cited for some violations, safety violations to the point where patients are at risk. You know pacesetting and directive would make absolutely perfect sense. Now the problem with it I'm sure is already occurring in your minds is it can really lead to burnout. You can set a pace for just so long and after that people start to just get weary. So is it useful? Yes. Is it one you want to deploy frequently? Probably not. And like directive it's very much more on the task side of focus than on the people side. So Kevin you want to wrap us up with coaching?

>>Kevin Nourse: Yeah, absolutely. Our final leadership style of the seven we've been through coaching is one of the more I guess newer ones I guess in the grand scheme of things. But the premise is that and we see this more and more in organizations the idea of manager as coach or leader as coach. So you're really focused on building capacity, building skills and knowledge in your people which is really important. And it's particularly effective in building team capabilities and effectiveness. So as coaching manager you're really attuned, you're very focused on the person and the relationship. But beyond affiliative you're really focused on development and having those conversations and really creating trust with your followers and stakeholders in ways that they start to develop a relationship with you and they become open. In essence they're willing to reveal for example their incompetencies to you as a leader so that you can help them develop. So Alice do you want to take it from here on our reflection question?

>>Alice Waagen: Absolutely. Here's our second reflection question of this session. And what I'm going to ask you all to do at this point is to do a little bit of a mini self-assessment. Which of these styles that seem natural for you? And which styles do you feel that you might need to develop? Now you can have one or two or however many you'd like in these columns. But think to yourself based on our definition which ones -- when we were speaking Kevin and I were speaking did you kind of nod your head and say yeah, I kind of get that one. I'm using that whatever and which ones were you kind of shaking your head and going oh, that is so not me? So those of you listening please go ahead and hit pause and rejoin us after your assessment. And in the meantime we will ask the folks in our audience to provide their assessment with us. So Kevin what about you which are your natural styles, which ones do you struggle with?

>>Kevin Nourse: Well, I'm thinking of a client I'm coaching right now. This individual is a physician leader so he's actually a psychiatrist at a large medical center. And what I found was that his natural style was much more directive and visionary. You know he presented a very compelling vision when he started. However what he didn't realize is

that his followers were very relationship oriented and that he probably could have been more effective early on in his career with this medical center by taking more of a participative and/or a bit of a coaching approach because that's what his followers were looking for. So those really were stretch behaviors for him. So I think in addition to we have a natural style and a need to develop you know it's part of that situational frame to think yikes, I'm overusing this style in a situation when in fact I probably need to use another. And I think that's part of development is being aware of those situational cues. Yeah, what's your experience been?

>>Alice Waagen: Well that's a really great example of something that I've seen is when we heighten one of these oftentimes we're suppressing others. So in your example if somebody's very heightened and directive and visionary they probably are suppressing participative and possibly well definitely laissez-faire and possibly even coaching. Because it's like you know they're out there with the banner follow me but they're not really involving people in it. So let's see what our other participants have said here. Michelle mentions coaching and pacesetting are very natural for her but the affiliative one might be more of a challenge. Interesting. As I mentioned earlier it seems to be one that people is less on their radar. So I appreciate you noticing that. Leslie says natural leadership style, visionary and coaching, participative and pacesetting to develop. Interesting. And our second Michele says laissez-faire is one would like to develop a little bit because naturally directive, coaching, pacesetting, yeah. It's like I said it's almost like if you're really strong in one the others are kind of going to dip and I think that's a great way to look at it. And Michele also mentions where I am leading I use different styles; yes, absolutely. Oh yes, I love your example. Yeah, I have two sons who are out of the nest now but I'll tell you when they were growing up I was real directive. And today directive is not my natural style but you know when you're managing a household like that you have to be directive, absolutely. Yeah, I would say for myself because of the line of work I'm in I am almost always in a coaching and/or participative role; helping clients you know solve problems without obviously telling them what to do. And there are times when perhaps I should simply tell them; to say you know enough is enough I think what you're doing isn't working and be more directive. So I think for me that would be my area for development. Alright, I think Kevin you are going to take us in our next area here.

>>Kevin Nourse: Yes, that's right. I think what we'll do is we'll explore a second module which is around leadership behaviors. So the idea is to take these styles and go to the next level. So the premise is again for each of the leadership styles we can drill down on some more of the specific behavior that you might use as a leader in terms of demonstrating that style. And of course Alice and I will trade off in terms of going through the list. Again we start with laissez-faire and as I mentioned before it's really about delegation; it's providing autonomy. So you know I think there's a subtle distinction on laissez-faire. There's a difference between simply ignoring your people because you're so focused and love your task as a leader that you kind of ignore them.

There's a difference between that and being really intentional about these folks have earned the right to have autonomy and I'm going to think about it. So that's a subtle distinction I wanted to make because I think it's important when it comes to leadership styles is the choicefulness that goes into ah, let me really think about what's most important in this situation. So again, delegation and providing autonomy so that people can perform. But you could also think you know a lot of people that, a lot of leaders that delegate you know it takes a while to get to that point of trust so that their followers are ready to take on tasks and do it autonomously. So that's a bit of a caveat on that. So Alice you're next.

>>Alice Waagen: Well, I just have to pause cause I love the way you put that idea; that it's an intentional planned act. You know I have done coaching with leaders who have been called poor delegating. When I dig down with their subordinates and say what's going on? The phrase always comes around they don't delegate; they dump and run. So laissez-faire isn't abdicating your role. It is really saying in this situation, this project, this line of work, I feel I do not need to be that involved. It's not I don't want to do this anymore. So I think that's a good word we'll carry throughout this Kevin, intentional and planned not just default.

>>Kevin Nourse: Yeah.

>>Alice Waagen: Alright. So let's talk about directive and I think this is a good one to pause on with this model of what behaviors are associated. Because I know when we've used this model in ASHA's Leadership Development program oftentimes people have come out needing to develop more directive; that this is not a style that they're comfortable with or they're using it. So what would you need to look at in terms of growing behaviors to support this? Well certainly skill and in directing others. You know how good am I at clearly giving direction at stating the reason for things, at expressing what I believe needs to happen and defining the performance standards for this. The better I am at doing that, the more successful I am at deploying a directive style. If in other words I get directive with a person and say I need you to do this now, I need it whatever and I'm not clear about my expectations or how I'm defining success the next style is not going to be successful. So in these situations we mentioned earlier in crisis situations or risk situations to be effective in directive is I have to be a very good, solid communicator. If I'm not then you know what my followers will say is well good at barking orders but not really good at getting the results. And therefore that would not be effective. So Kevin what about the next one?

>>Kevin Nourse: You know I was going to add one note to the directive. I'm just wrapping up -- I just wrapped up a coaching engagement this was with a biostats manager in a pharmaceutical company, very, very relationship oriented. And his challenge was that people would interact with him about projects or whatever but they never really knew how they were doing. They weren't always clear because he spoke in such indirect language. And it was a classic case of perhaps in this case the client needed to develop more of a directive style because again, he wasn't always getting what he expected from individuals because he was so indirect about it. So I think it really underscored to me the importance of directive. But with regard to visionary so you think about I don't know I think the term facilitative leader can fall in here. The idea is how do you enlist and get input into a vision. So we can -- to me that would be a very concrete behavior. You've got some ideas but it's almost like formulating your vision from the ground up. Meaning you're going to ask perhaps the people on your team what their thoughts or their ideas or where is it they see your team or your department is struggling and what are some potential solutions. So it again, it takes time to do that. So facilitating, getting input and then boiling that, creating a vision and communicating that in compelling ways to your followers. So to me those are the really the essence of what it means to be a visionary. Collect input, elicit and then find a way to communicate it in ways that's compelling that's not just maybe fact based but also helps bring some of the emotional nature to a vision which is a compelling vision for the future. So back to you Al.

>>Alice Waagen: Yes, that's great. I love that facilitating input. You know somebody mentioned to me many years back that a vision not grounded in reality is a hallucination. So I think that it's great to be visionary but if that vision is in your mind only and it exists in nobody else's it's very easy to discount. So I like that issue; base it on something, input or from others. Alright, let's talk a little bit about affiliative as we've mentioned it's a tough one for people sometimes. And we mentioned you know behaviors that are in team building and relationship building I think to be good at affiliative is you have to really we mentioned focus on people, you really have to be aware of the emotional and motivational climate of where you are. You know there is a concept of emotional intelligence and we've got a whole webinar on that and I think it really plays in here that if you are not aware of the level of team interaction the level of relationships around you then this is not going to be easy to do. Basically it's focusing on people's individual needs but marrying them with the needs of the group and being able to leverage those to get results which again is what leadership is all about; achieving results but achieving it through building relationships with others that may not be there or may be damaged, yeah. So Kevin?

>>Kevin Nourse: Okay. Participative. Again, this is in some ways similar to visionary because in essence we're trying to get involvement and engagement but it also goes to that perspective of clarifying how decisions are made. And in this case the idea is how can you reach consensus with input to the vision. So I think it really is again almost like

a sister style to visionary but really kind of incorporates the idea of decision-making as part of it which is also being explicit how are we going to make decisions and what does it really mean to be in consensus. Cause that term is bandied about a lot but in a lot of teams I've worked in people didn't really know what that meant. Meaning if one person objects the decision doesn't move forward or is it in that manner. So I think to be a participative leader or choose that style I think it's really important not only just to gather input but be really clear about participants' power to make decisions; what do you own, what do they own and how will we reach consensus. So back to you Al.

>>Alice Waagen: Alright. So pacesetting. Again, we mentioned earlier that this is one where we're really trying to pick up the pace, set the standards and make sure the job gets done. When a leader who's skilled at pacesetting is very good at being a role model, is very good at putting themselves out there as a positive influence to be followed. You know they have to be very, very good at self-motivation and focus. I think the real asset of somebody pacesetting is they have that target, that goal laser glued you know in their path and they're going to it and bringing people with them at the same time. Kevin?

>>Kevin Nourse: So the last one, coaching. Again, consistent with what we talked about before here we're facilitating development. So what it does -- what's implied in that is for example providing feedback to your followers or making sure they're clear on what coaching is and isn't and that would be really an important part of it. Using the leadership style of coaching entails using powerful questions to help build awareness. So this premise is and again we cover this in the coaching webinar in the leadership academy series but the idea is the premise is that your followers and stakeholders have more knowledge and wisdom inside of them than they really know. And that part of your job as a coach is to engage them and enlist them and help them find that wisdom and that knowledge. Okay, so I think we're ready Alice for our next reflection question and I'll take that one this time.

>>Alice Waagen: Alright.

>>Kevin Nourse: So for those of you who are on the recording let me introduce the question then we'll invite you to hit the pause button. So we'd like both on the recording as well as our classroom participants to reflect on this idea of a leader that you admire. So think about someone you've worked with or for currently or in the past what style did they use and to what extent or what was that impact that that style had on you? And let's just see what comes up here. So for those on the recording go ahead and hit the pause button now. Okay Alice, what have you noticed in terms of either leaders you've worked with in your professional life or even as a coach or consultant?

>>Alice Waagen: Well, it's interesting when I reflect on this question I like to even reflect on it personally. And I will say a number of years ago I was in a volunteer role with a non-profit and the board chairman was a person who I tremendously admired. He actually came up to the board chair position from the finance committee. He was a CPA, very much a numbers guy which made me kind of nervous cause sometimes they can put money above everything else. But he was extraordinarily good at participative married with directive. He really loved to get everybody involved but at a certain point he'd say I think we've talked this to death. This is what I hear and I believe this is the way we should go and especially if it was an issue that would have affected the recipients of the services of this non-profit in a way that might be negative. He really was able to very nicely segue into that directive in a positive way which I had up to that point always thought of directive as you don't ever want to do that. And watching him do it skillfully to achieve the mission was just excellent to watch and something you know I still admire 'til today.

>>Kevin Nourse: And it's funny. All the years we've worked together I've never heard that story Alice. It's really great, thank you.

>>Alice Waagen: You're welcome.

>>Kevin Nourse: So let's look at some of the observations from the group. Michele number one visionary was super helpful. So the idea of transitioning into two hospital systems into one. So a system implementation which is huge. And to me that's kind of the iconic place to create and share a vision and get engagement with. Michele, thank you for that observation. Leslie points out my church pastor. So the role modeling in terms of relationships, maintaining vision, to meet long-term goals. So it looks like the pastor incorporated multiple different leadership styles. Michelle number two coaching especially powerful questions allow me to hear my own voice. But to me isn't that the essence of a leader which is you know you think about your role as a leader is growing other leaders and that coaching is such an amazing way to do that. And I think that's how we're changed by it. It's interesting Michelle it reminds me of my first part-time job was at a Ponderosa Steakhouse and I worked for Mr. Douglas and he believed in me. And I remember what it evoked in me in terms of the innovative ways I tried to figure out how to cook steaks and do dishes because working for this individual who believed in me, who coached me, who was there to help me think about my long-term career. And it's funny that I didn't think about it until I read your statement that those days at the good old Ponderosa Steakhouse. Alice anything you notice in the observations before we move on?

>>Alice Waagen: Well, I'm just laughing thinking I'm glad you learned enough but you did move on because it wouldn't be good if you were still back there you know throwing steaks on the grill. No, I think this is great. I love what people put here in our dialogue that in just to say sometimes we have a negative reaction to a style. For instance like directive to say oh, I would never want to do that. And I think one thing I hope people picked up by now is there is no negative to any one of these. There is a misuse of them or using them in a wrong situation. But it's not like it's a bad style and I should never use it. They're all of value.

>>Kevin Nourse: Okay, Alice I think you're going to take us into our next content area.

>>Alice Waagen: Absolutely. Let's go ahead and jump in. This is the payoff section which is how do I adapt. So you've seen these styles and you say gee, you know some of these I probably should be using now but I don't know in what situations, when, how, what, how do I pick the right one? Well you see on this slide it's a three-step process. Assess the task; what's the job that needs to happen. The second one, what person should I select for the job based on what criteria and then the third, simply to choose your style. So let's talk about these in a little bit more detail. So Step 1: Assess the task. And this you know again, I really caution you all but this is sequential in this order because mistakes that I have seen people make is I have a person who's asked me to find them work to do and so let me take the work and give it to them. In other words that's putting 2 before 1. What I like to do I think is more successful is to say let me objectively look at the work itself to determine what is needed and then I will go to my resources and make those assignments. So what do we do with the task? How complex is it? How visible is it? It there cross impact on others? Depending on the answers to these the task's criticality level is going to go up or down. If it's highly complex, requires a tremendous amount of skill, knowledge and experience. If there's mistakes made it's going to impact people across the organization et cetera, et cetera. That may determine a different resource or another. So I always tell people when you're trying to figure how to approach a situation take a few minutes, close your door, sit down and say what's the situation? What am I facing before we look at the people involved? Kevin let me pass to you on this.

>>Kevin Nourse: Great. So let's talk about Step 2: Assess the person. In this case so we're clear about what we need to get done. Now we've got to think about the person or persons that we conceivably might enlist and bring in in terms of the work that we're doing. So again we go back to knowledge, skills and experience. So we're drawing upon what our experience has been with that person or have observations of them performing in other contexts. The other part of that is confidence. And so you know really it's a balance between skill and confidence. Someone who is highly skilled but lacks confidence means they're probably not going to try; they're not going to take risks. The flip side is also a dangerous situation of having confidence but no skill. And

oftentimes I've seen with newer employees that maybe are over confident that's part of their developmental challenge which is to better balance that equation. Also how available is that person to taking on a new task and then openness to new assignments. Alice anything you want to add?

>>Alice Waagen: No, I think that's you know a perfect situation is you know assess the resource you have. You know assess the person you have and know their strengths, know their limitations. Because it's a marry -- gosh marrying -- I will say it marrying these two together that you get to Step 3 which is Choosing your style. So for instance let me give some examples. Let's say the task is complex but when you go to your resources you really don't have a person fully ready to do it yet. I mean that's really the reality of life. So the person does not have the skills, lacks confidence but they're available and they're open to new assignments. Well then I might jump into starting with directive a little bit and then moving into coaching. I know if I pick laissez-faire or participative that's probably not going to be the best solution. Or I could invert that and say I've got a job that's fairly routine. It's been done before and I've got a number of people on staff around me who can do this. Wow! I can immediately go into a laissez-faire situation basically a handoff and say here, I'm going to fully delegate this to you. So it's marrying these two together that allows you to do your choice. Now one thing about choice and we've kind of put it as a prompt at the bottom of this page in reality and many people that I know when we've presented this information to say well don't you change over time? And the answer is yes. In most real life situations you will move through or blend a number of these together. So you might start with directive as we have in our example here but then start to pull back into the more participative situations. You may start with pacesetting to correct a situation and realize you know these folks have got it. I can move to participative, okay. So there's ways that you can move through these. The key issue here is to constantly keep your eye on the situation to say what's happening, are things changing that would cause me to change and adapt my style? Kevin can you think of maybe situations where that makes sense for you in your world where you've seen you know successful leaders adapt a number of styles based on the situation?

>>Kevin Nourse: Yeah, you know I was thinking about my role as an HR director with a big consulting firm and I had about 8 direct reports. And I found that -- again, I had to skin. I had one individual who was physically challenged with cerebral palsy all the way up to a very senior HR employee relations specialist. So the task was navigating. I was an employee relations guy which are very sensitive situations with sexual harassment or all those kinds of issues. So you know literally I had to go through and really look at each individual in my experience with them. And also there was a developmental path for each of my followers in terms of helping them grow into the role of employee relations specialist. So it was kind of a classic case where you know I really literally did an inventory of my team to think about where they were at, what were some of their career interests and how I could support them in growing as part of this process of not only

presently the tasks they had in front of them but the idea of growing them into roles so that they could become more autonomous. So I will remember that and this just really brought it all back for me.

>>Alice Waagen: Really good point. You know and then that actually caused me to remember a situation both negative and positive a few years back that I will share very briefly in a volunteer capacity. I was volunteering with my association, my state association which by the way is not ASHA and I won't mention which one it is because it was the situation that wasn't very good. One year I volunteered to help with the state conference and it was a real struggle because the leader at the time every time there was a job that needed to be done she'd say who wants to do it? And so a person would volunteer who might or might not have the background skills or experience to do it. Now this individual was also very much a laissez-faire person. And so she'd say who wants to do it and then kind of walk away. The next year it was very interesting. The person who volunteered to chair this before the whole thing started said whoever wants to volunteer tell me what your interests are in an e-mail and I'm going to take what jobs that need to be done and assign them based on your -- basically your knowledge, skills and experience. What a difference, what an amazing difference. I will share that the person who did it the second time better was a person who her career was she was a recruiter. So she understood the importance of matching person to task. Now the moral of my story there is as a volunteer leader she didn't have a lot of time to devote to this. So she wanted those assignments to be good matches right away; not to be matches that required her to be directive and involved in the assignment. So I just thought that was really a neat thing. So anyway Kevin, let's go ahead and I believe that you've got the reflection question here?

>>Kevin Nourse: Yeah, so one final piece. So that the idea is think about a situation I think Alice you were a good segue into that where maybe a manager or a leader you worked for was using a style that was not effective. So kind of a negative example what was the impact. And is there a better style that would have been more effective? So for those listening to the recording now would be a good time to hit the pause button and reflect a bit. We'd love to hear from the participants in the class now. And you know it's interesting Alice I'm reminded again of when I was employee relations manager in the consulting firm I worked for a highly command and controlled director. And I remember how miserable my life was in terms of her second guessing and controlling the infinite details of everything I did and it was painful. I felt overwhelmed. I felt frustrated and ultimately the gift, the silver lining was it caused me then to rethink my career and actually start a business. So I was able to turn it around. Anyway so the dire effects of that of disengaging people is huge. So let's see what some of the participants shared. Michelle you talk a bit more of a struggle than needed. Both, right the relationship and task and disengaging which is in essence I know your pain having lived that. Anything else that you've experienced Alice as it relates to mismatch of styles or observations

before we wrap up?

>>Alice Waagen: Well the point that you make Kevin and it's one that we actually have an article in our appendix for additional research is Dan Goleman of Harvard, a psychologist did some correlations between leadership style and organizational culture. And found that the directive style like you were just mentioning over time has a very negative effect on culture as well as pacesetting. So I think that's a really good observation that the one style over time has more than just -- hurts individuals. It hurts the whole organization. So I think that's a really good example you gave of that.

>>Kevin Nourse: Okay, I think we're going to wrap up now. You're going to take us from here Alice?

>>Alice Waagen: Absolutely, yes. Let me go ahead and just you know give us our key points for today. Every style has situations where it's appropriate and inappropriate. If you take one thing away that's it. There's no good or bad. It is the application that you really need to focus on. And how do you do that? Read the situation. Read the people and adapt. And those that can adapt are much more successful as leaders than those who cannot or who do not. So what's next? We always like to wrap these with giving you assignments to do after this to deepen your learning. So interview somebody you admire and find out what do they do to adapt, what are they looking at, what are thinking about? Do a self-assessment. Again, what's your comfort with these styles and challenge yourself to use something that's outside of your comfort zone. And lastly observe. [Inaudible] observing is probably the best learning tool that [Inaudible]. So with this I'd like to pass the mic back to Andrea for closing [Inaudible].

>>Andrea Falzarano: Thank you Kevin and Alice and thank you everyone for joining us. This webinar is part of a series in ASHA's Leadership Academy. For more information including information on continuing education credits visit www.asha.org and search leadership academy. We also encourage you to join the ASHA community focused on leadership topics. Go to asha.org and search leadership academy. You will find a link to the online community on this page. This concludes the ASHA Leadership Academy webinar on "Leadership Styles". Goodbye from the ASHA national office.