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The Relational Learning Model (RELEMO)
This model, presented in figure 1, presents some of the components needed in establishing a relationship between leader and lead, joined together due to their mutual motivation to learn transfer and develop knowledge. At the center of this relation, is the concept of the Learning Alliance (Bordin, 1979, Frischer, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005). At the core of the learning alliance, is the mutual development of a platform facilitating the learning and communication processes. The platform is manifested through mutual agreement on goals, tasks, and on the process to reach the goals. Both the leader and the lead need to express and make explicit their needs, demands, responsibilities and authority on the cooperation (Frischer, 1993, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005). By making each party’s expectations responsibilities and authority clear, as well as making the process leading to their goal visible, comprehensible and acceptable for both parties, a mutual agreement (a learning alliance) can be established between them. However, the quality of relationships can vary considerably, which has implications on this alliance (Frischer, Scheinberg & Alænge 2000) (Frischer & Larsson 2000, 2003)

Quality of relationship
Relationships between leader and lead can be qualitatively characterized as instrumental, affective or ethical (Kanter, 1967) Instrumental relationships focus solely on the task. Affective relationships include the parties expressing what they like and dislike. Ethical based relations include expressions of values and views on what is good, bad, righteous or wrong- A leader-lead relationship of a pure instrumental nature is lacking the potential for transferring more subtle and tacit components of knowledge and authority. The more affective and ethical dimensions that are included into the relationship, the more of tacit knowledge has a potential of being transferred. However, relationships including affective and ethical dimensions need considerable time to develop, as the parties need to develop a deeper understanding of each other.
Scrutiny - The motivating and innovative dynamics of the Learning alliance

Any alliance, pact or agreement is by definition a ‘frozen’ structure that soon becomes irrelevant or even worse, counterproductive as to the process of creativity and learning. (Leonard-Barton, 1998) (Frischer 2005) Therefore, it is important that standardization processes include processes of continuous evaluation. Where are we now and where do we go? How do we get there? (Greenson 1967) What are our present means and tools? These are questions to be stated and reflected upon by both partners in the relationship. In this way, each step will be scrutinized and reflected-in-action (Schön, 1995) and the alliance will be redesigned and established according to the constantly changing situation. The constant scrutiny of how the parties in the relationship are working together, the mutual concerns with the learning alliance, are themselves factors that serve to enhance the learning alliance. (Greenson, 1967) (Frischer 2005).

The integrating impact of standardization processes¹, organizational cultures and values on the Learning Alliance

In order to make sure that strong learning relationships are being developed between leaders and the lead, institutions where they work can develop routines into what to consider and how to proceed when aiming at establishing learning alliances. By introducing more standardized ways of entering into good working relationship, these routines can provide a means of limiting variations and integration between different leaders / lead relationships (Frischer, 2000, 2002, 2005).

¹ Rules and regulations,