



Leadership Effectiveness

Adelphia Communications, John Rigas, CEO; AOL Time Warner, Robert Pittman, CEO; Arthur Andersen, Joseph Berardino, CEO; Bristol Myers, Fred Schiff, CEO; Citigroup, Sanford Weill, CEO; Enron, Ken Lay, CEO; Merrill Lynch & Co., David Komansky, CEO; Qwest Communications, Joseph Nacchio, CEO; Sunbeam, Al Dunlap, CEO; Tyco International, Dennis Kozlowski, CEO, and the list goes on—companies that were icons of success have now become icons of dramatic failure, unethical practice, or simply bad judgment. One day these companies and their leaders were lauded as the embodiments of leadership effectiveness and the next day as embodiments of what is wrong with the system.

SIDEBARS:
Leadership Effectiveness as Viewed by James Fenimore Cooper

The concept of leadership effectiveness is difficult to define because it is a complex concept that attempts to capture myriad components: multiple organizational contingencies and various personal and interpersonal behaviors. Here we shall attempt a normative definition and explain how its many components help us grasp a complex subject.

DEFINITION

People define the concept of leadership effectiveness in many ways. Indeed, Stogdill (1974), Bass (1981), and Bass and Stogdill (1990) catalogued and interpreted almost five thousand studies of the concept and found great variance in its definition. Burns (1978) captured the problem most vividly in a statement still widely quoted today: "Leadership," he said "is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (Burns 1978, 2). People seem to accept a default position that leadership is simply what leaders do and that leaders are simply people in positions of power over others. An alternative to this position will be offered later. Still, we must have a starting point for our understanding of leadership effectiveness—even if it means that almost immediately we will create controversy.

One inclusive definition of *leadership effectiveness* is "the successful exercise of personal influence by one or more people that results in accomplishing shared objectives in a way that is personally satisfying to those involved." This definition arouses controversy when examined from perspectives based on behavior in different contexts. Although this definition most comfortably applies to the interpersonal, small-group, and network levels found within typical work environments, in almost all political arenas and in some huge organizations, leadership effectiveness will be defined differently.

For organizations in which members or employees are significantly affected by decisions and actions that take place at a distance with only representative participation at best, leadership effectiveness is the successful exercise of personal influence attempts by one or more people that results in accomplishing organizational objectives congruent with a mission while earning the general approval of their constituencies (in the case of political leadership) or stakeholders (in the case of business and civil society organizations). Stakeholders are people who have an interest in an outcome.

In both cases, the definition's several conceptual components require further explanation because each has inspired a literature of its own to help clarify its meaning and to help us understand how to use it appropriately.

"SUCCESSFUL EXERCISE OF PERSONAL INFLUENCE BY ONE OR MORE PEOPLE"

A limited view of leadership sees it as a set of behaviors and functions specifically tied to one role or formal position. Holding this view, one would expect that only the CEO could be the leader. A somewhat wider view would recognize that leadership of a division, a committee, a department, or an office is equally important for the accomplishment of organizational goals because each person's work contributes to achieving the overall purpose of the organization. The broadest view of leadership recognizes that everyone who exercises his or her personal influence, whether selecting office supplies, choosing a site for the company picnic, or deciding the location of a new plant, could be engaging in leadership.

Furthermore, the interaction among people before a consensus is reached or simply during the process of working together results in incremental, often subtle influences that occur so quickly that the combined result of the collective exercise of influence is leadership by the group itself rather than by any one individual. Consider the performance of a planning committee. Even when it has a formal leader or convener, inevitably the input of each member, as influenced by others through discussion and decision making along the way, results in the group as a whole creating a plan no one could have managed alone. Thus, the planning committee effectively leads the larger organization when its work is done.

“THAT RESULTS IN ACCOMPLISHING SHARED OBJECTIVES”

Using influence unilaterally because one has the legitimate organizational right to do so is more illustrative of the use of intimidation than interpersonal influence freely accepted by others. The distinction is important because accomplishing shared objectives requires the participation of relevant people in the decision-making process or their tacit, if not explicit, acceptance of decisions made on their behalf. Organizations have a huge number of objectives distributed to every person and unit. To meet this criterion and to build the trust of each employee or member in the management of the organization, the organization should have a clearly articulated vision and mission. In that way, each person will know whether any particular decision or objective will help achieve the overall organizational purpose. Thus, each person, even if not directly involved in making every decision or in creating every objective, can still feel that objectives are shared when they sensibly fit the vision and mission.

“IN A WAY THAT IS PERSONALLY SATISFYING TO THOSE INVOLVED”

Although effective leadership requires the accomplishment of the organization's objectives that serve its vision and mission in a way that is personally satisfying to those involved, both the degree to which objectives are accomplished and the satisfaction of those involved are quite subjective. Indeed, often inherent contradictions and conflicts make it virtually impossible to please everyone all the time. An organization that is meeting its financial targets but at the same time laying off people creates such a contradiction. A company that is registering many new high-tech inventions while its stock price drops precipitously is experiencing a conflicted state perceived by some as success (therefore indicative of effective leadership) and by others as failure (therefore indicative of ineffective leadership).

STAKEHOLDER VIEW OF LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

About the only statement that can be made about leadership effectiveness with any certainty is that, more often than not, it is in the eye of the beholder. In large organizations, the various objectives being served reflect the importance of serving diverse stakeholders. What appears obvious at first—that the objective of business is to increase the bottom line, or that the objective of a political party is to elect candidates—becomes rather complex and muddled when seen in the midst of either surviving in the marketplace or campaigning for office.

In the case of political parties, we can readily understand the various constituencies and interests that must be convinced. In the business world, stakeholder interests that once included only the investment community and the board of directors now include employees, customers, suppliers, regulators, local communities, civil society organizations, and even competitors in some cases when joint ventures or the development of industry standards is considered. Leadership effectiveness at the top of an organization is no longer seen as simply increasing the bottom line or satisfying any one priority because there are equally important, if competing, interests to be served.

Similarly, at other levels in the organization, leadership effectiveness is subject to a diversity of objectives. Work flow and interdepartmental decisionmaking processes, the pursuit of mutual efficiency targets and the development of external relationships with key stakeholders (e.g., customers and suppliers) are different objectives from those that are created within a work team or that serve the interests of one's own department and staff. All of this suggests that leadership effectiveness includes a dimension associated not only with just one's followers but also with one's colleagues.

FORMS OF INFLUENCE IN ADDITION TO LEADERSHIP

If we see influence style as the personal product of one's power and values disposition as a continuum of possibilities, we can then distinguish several forms of influence. In other words, a value important to a person is translated into a belief system that causes one's behavior, in this case one's form of influence. Nirenberg (2002) identified six forms of personal influence in organizations. (See Table 1.) He classified only one of these forms as leadership.

These distinctions result in various behavioral styles used by an individual or a “position holder” within a group—be it at the level of the organization, division, department, bureau, shop, and so forth. With this understanding, however, not all forms of influence should be defined as “leadership” as we discuss that behavior here. Identifying various forms of influence helps us make a clear distinction between the conventional wisdom of leadership as “positionship” (regardless of the form of influence) and leadership as just one process of interpersonal interaction.

Although this perspective is new, it helps us more accurately frame the discussion by being more precise about what we mean when we talk about leadership effectiveness—especially within the context of employee-based organizations in a democratic, free-market society. With this perspective, we clearly reject German Nazi leader Adolf Hitler, Soviet leader Joseph Stalin, and Cambodian leader Pol Pot as leaders, although surely they were tyrants and dictators. Influential? Yes. However, their influence was largely based on threat, coercion, intimidation, and mass murder. We must also reject Albert Dunlap (CEO, Sunbeam) and Joseph Nacchio (CEO, Qwest) as failed, if not criminal, CEOs for maintaining their position of power through the economic equivalents of mass murder (layoffs) and rape (asset stripping). They are not considered to be leaders in the sense of that term as it is used here, even though, of

course, they had followers—a necessary but not sufficient requirement to be a leader.

Table 1.—Forms of Personal Influence in Organizations

Forms of Influence	Unimpeded Personal Will/Force	Based on Property Rights	Formal, Legalistic, Bureaucratic	Managerial	Leadership	Consensus Building
Position Reference	Dictator	Owner/boss	Supervisor, administrator	Manager (transactional)	Leader (transformation)	Partner
Description	Imposes will on organization; abuses others; sees human resources as instrumental to his or her own ends	Exudes a sense of ownership and the prerogatives that accompany it	Administrative savvy; narrow vision	Manager (transactional)	Leader (transformational)	Partner
Example (Business)	Al Dunlap, Scott Paper and Sunbeam	Henry Ford, Ford Motor Company	Robert Stempel, General Motors	Michael Eisner, Disney	Herb Kelleher, Southwest Airlines	Jack Stack Springfield, Remanufacturing
Example (Public Figure)	Mao Zedong, premier of the People's Republic of China	Lee Kuan Yew, prime minister, Singapore	Herbert Hoover, U.S. president	John Major, prime minister, United Kingdom	F. D. Roosevelt, U.S. president	Nelson Mandela, president, South Africa
Values Orientation	Completely egocentric, narcissistic	Organization as self	Organization as a machine	Bureaucrat entrusted with the organization	Problem solving, communicative, open	Community builder
Power Usage	Coercive, totalitarian	Coercive, authoritarian, legitimate	Legitimate, coercive, reward	Legitimate, reward, coercive	Expertise, vision	Relationship expertise, identification
Outcomes	Obedience	Obedience, compliance	Reluctant compliance	Willing compliance	Enthusiastic consent of followers	Shared ownership of process and results
Enrichment	Dictator and cronies	Owner/boss	Company	Company, manager, some followers	Company leader and some followers	Everyone
Preferred or Most Compatible Employee	Fearful, feelings of hopelessness or sociopathic	Feelings of powerlessness and unworthiness	Duty, obligation, or work for economic necessity,	Careerists	Creative, achievers	Responsible, integrated peer behavior

	nature		conventional			
Effectiveness	Possibly in short term	Possibly in stable environment	Likely only in stable environment	Most likely in stable environment	Likely in most knowledge-based environments Partner	Highly likely in most environments

Source:
Nirenberg
(2002, 14).

Note:
Although oversimplified, this table attempts to indicate the nature and variety of influence styles and their outcomes. Of course, the individuals mentioned here are chosen as representative of a dominant impression of them drawn in the news and popular culture media. It is not the intention to say that every influence attempt in their lives can be fairly described by this categorization or that these individuals haven't used other influence styles in a significant way.

In the case of business organizations, for example, the CEO represents a point of contact to the external world of investors, regulators, and the local (perhaps even international) community. His or her role is to facilitate the creation of a vision and a mission plus a strategy to achieve them. People naturally turn to the CEO for "leadership of an organization." That CEO in exercising leadership—as the successful exercise of personal influence by one or more people that results in accomplishing shared objectives in a way that is personally satisfying to those involved—engages in a direct or representational process of mutual interaction. However,

the act of leadership will also be a functional part of the job of everyone who works with other people within an organization. Thus, it is important for leadership skills to be dispersed throughout the organization in order to craft the ability of a diverse workforce to live the vision and achieve the mission of the organization. Leadership is most effective when it results in an organization (unit, department, school, etc.) implementing its strategy and reaching its goals while the experience of work in the organization is satisfying to its employees. In this situation the individual seeks to change the status quo and mobilize effort through an inspired vision of what could be that grabs the imagination of people whom he or she is attempting to influence.

BEST PRACTICES IN LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

In order to identify best leadership effectiveness practices, people need to decide which intended outcomes will be sought in utilizing the leadership form of influence. Remember that the use of leadership as a form of influence doesn't preclude the use of other influence styles such as boss, manager, partner, or supervisor. The distinction keeps our discussion focused when using these concepts. When we are being a boss, or a manager, or a dictator, or a partner, we should recognize it as such and not simply claim that whatever behavior a person with power exercises is "leadership."

A "leadership" influence style focuses on the mobilization of colleagues in a consensual, collective effort to achieve the organization's vision. This mobilization may also involve some real managerial constraints. For example, organizations must be not only effective in implementing their strategy, but also efficient. A profit must also accompany management's mobilization of resources, and the organization must be adaptable to both external demands for change and internal processes to meet customer and employee needs.

Leadership effectiveness is fundamentally the practice of the following principles:

1. Build a collective vision, mission, and set of values that help people focus on their contributions and bring out their best.
2. Establish a fearless communication environment that encourages accurate and honest feedback and self-disclosure.
3. Make information readily available.
4. Establish trust, respect, and peer-based behavior as the norm.
5. Be inclusive and patient, show concern for each person.
6. Demonstrate resourcefulness and the willingness to learn.
7. Create an environment that stimulates extraordinary performance.

An example of leadership effectiveness using these principles was described by journalist Fara Warner in *Fast Company* magazine. In 1998, Hyundai Motor America was in disarray, and its cars were common targets of ridicule. Only ninety thousand cars were sold that year. Finbarr O'Neill, the company's general counsel, was acting CEO and meeting with Hyundai dealers at their annual retreat. According to Warner, O'Neill got up and asked the dealers where they thought the company should be going. "They started throwing out suggestions, yelling out advice. Fin called time-out, left the room, came back with an easel with lots of paper on it, and started writing a bunch of things down" (Warner 2002, 84).

"By the meeting's end, O'Neill had recorded 100 suggestions—and was facing a decidedly less angry mob of dealers. Fin said, 'I can't work on all of these at once, so let's pick the top 10, and that's where I'll start'" (Warner 2002, 84). The dealers remember that as Hyundai's defining moment. "It was the day that somebody took charge. It's when we got leadership" (Warner 2002, 84). Apparently O'Neill's influence in stimulating the group's development of a set of shared objectives and helping it move toward those objectives got immediate results. His action provided momentum for desired change in a consultative fashion involving all the dealers wanting to participate.

As O'Neill began to organize the company to solve the issues raised at that meeting, the turnaround began, and the disarray ended. The board, seeing progress being made and still not having chosen a new CEO, appointed O'Neill to the position—a person who is self-described as "not a car guy." However, he knew what was needed and exercised effective leadership as defined here.

EVALUATING LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS (PERSONAL)

If being effective is important, it should be measured. How do we know we are effective leaders? We have many ways to ascertain performance. We cannot always easily know that our followers are satisfied and that objectives are being met. Regular, observable feedback is more likely at the small-group level than at the institutional level. Where it is not observable, feedback from colleagues, subordinates (followers), and other stakeholders can be obtained through 360-degree feedback instruments. The concept of 360-degree feedback is to offer individuals the opportunity to solicit meaningful performance feedback from those whom they attempt to influence and those who are related to their achieving organizational goals at all levels.

One of the ironies of determining leadership effectiveness in this way is that it points out one of the differences between organizationally based leadership and leadership achieved, say, through the political process in the case of public office or through direct competition for other official or informal positions of power. The use of a 360-degree instrument is most useful in focusing on an individual's style, facility with leadership skills, achievements, and relationships with stakeholders (or the lack thereof). The individual, until removed by superiors, retains his or her powers conferred by the organization. Because of the concepts of chain of command and unity of command, the position holder's actions, especially when they are a problem to his or her subordinates, are less

likely to be known by the person who must act to improve them. Thus, one of the major contradictions of organizational leadership (at least in a business context) is that leaders are not accountable to followers. Rather, they are appointed by their superiors to lead their subordinates as followers. If they please their superiors, no matter how ineffective they are as leaders in their subordinates' eyes, they remain in power.

In the political world, after Election Day constituents—through correspondence, lobbyists, issue-oriented campaigns, and the media—let public officials know where they stand. Polls undertaken by an officeholder enable the officeholder to gather performance feedback similar to using 360-degree instruments in the business world.

LEADERSHIP SKILLS

Leadership effectiveness requires paying attention to a four-dimensional field of behavior. In addition to paying attention to direct reports, according to Bowers and Seashore (1966), a leader needs to pay attention to three other dimensions: (1) maintaining managerial goal emphasis and clarity; (2) having the ability to provide the necessary support for individuals to do their work and achieve their objectives; and (3) facilitating followers' (subordinates') interaction with one another to create efficiencies, good feelings, and teamwork. These dimensions are recognized as part of the leadership section of the Baldrige Criteria, 2003 award, which is a national business award given to the organizations that best exemplify quality business performance.

To succeed in addressing these four dimensions, individuals must have the following skills and attributes:

Personal

- Identifying and living up to one's and one's organization's values
- Developing self-confidence/esteem
- Being committed to keeping agreements
- Being authentic
- Communicating truthfully
- Being able to use creative, holistic (and interdisciplinary) thinking
- Giving and receiving feedback (positive and negative)
- Being able to be self-disclosing
- Being able to actively listen/empathize
- Having a capacity for self-reflection about behavior in interpersonal contexts
- Honoring and knowing how to stimulate inquiry and dialogue
- Keeping everyone informed
- Reducing stress, anxiety, and fear

Interpersonal

- Meeting facilitation
- Being resourceful, creative, adaptable
- Offering dispute resolution through mediation
- Offering peer supervision and coaching
- Maintaining process observation
- Using role clarification and self-assessment
- Suspending judgments
- Using team building (including the use of survey feedback and action research techniques)
- Maintaining creative problem identification and problem solving
- Using consensus-building methods
- Mastering half-day or full-day retreats

GLOBALIZATION, DIVERSITY, AND LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Increasingly, successful organizations create the demand for leadership, and the successful act of leadership requires people to become more open to their whole experience of interpersonal interaction in the workplace. In effect, each person will need to see more, hear more, and understand more—in order to help the organization to see and meet the changing needs of customers and employees, and to focus the collective productive intent of their part of the organization on achieving effective results. Leadership is about intelligence—about pushing back personal limitations and being open to new possibilities for creating a better, more enjoyable, more successful organization. As Lee Kun-Hee, chairman of Samsung Electronics, South Korea, said, "To effectuate change within groups, we must initiate change within ourselves. You need to know yourself well, your habits, strengths and shortcomings. Questioning yourself thoroughly is the beginning of change" (Rosen 2000, 46–48). With the emergence of a global economy and a diverse workforce, this questioning is essential.

Most of all, perhaps, the act of leadership is about building strong positive relationships. The result of leadership effectiveness is ultimately the creation of a seamless partnership between customer, employee, and organizational purpose in order to succeed in the

market.

THE LEADERSHIP-VERSUSMANAGEMENT CONTROVERSY

People have an all-pervasive assumption in most of the business leadership literature that just because you are a boss (supervisor, manager, department head, etc.), you are also the leader—or should be. This assumption gives rise to the question, “How does leadership differ from management?” A host of other questions soon follow. Which is more important to an effective organization: leadership or management? If an organization accomplishes its goals, isn't that good enough, wouldn't its members or employees be satisfied? Stephen Covey best summarizes the differences and what is at stake. “Management is a bottom line focus: How can I best accomplish certain things? Leadership deals with the top line: What are the things I want to accomplish? In the words of both Peter Drucker and Warren Bennis, ‘Management is doing things right; leadership is doing the right things.’ Management is efficiency in climbing the ladder of success; leadership determines whether the ladder is leaning against the right wall” (Covey 1989, 101). At this point in the evolution of the leadership literature—especially as it pertains to the business world and all non-elective offices—what is important is not either leadership or management but rather when to exercise each. However, as a strategy to achieve effectiveness at the personal and organizational levels, what may be most important for building effectiveness is the day-to-day climate in which people work.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENT OF LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

The purpose of leadership effectiveness is organizational effectiveness. However, at times the organization, when focusing on the leader, becomes dependent rather than more able to achieve its goals. Coca-Cola has been struggling ever since its highly effective and charismatic CEO Roberto C. Goizueta died in 1997. Similarly, after Edwin Land died in 1991, Polaroid, the company he founded, entered a period of decline resulting in its bankruptcy in 2001 (from which it has since emerged with a successful new product). To avoid the consequence of becoming overly dependent on a heroic leader, some companies are striving to institutionalize leadership. According to Pasternack and associates, at Sony, Fuji Xerox, Corning, and Continental Airlines, “Key leadership tasks are institutionalized in organizational systems, practices and cultures... People at all levels take initiative to solve problems, and even to start new businesses” (Pasternack, Williams, and Anderson 2001, 71). The idea of creating organizations of leaders or a culture of leadership shifts the responsibility of effectiveness to more and more people. The culture of leadership is required to move companies to a level of effectiveness not even possible under a single “great man” or charismatic leader.

Each year, *Fortune* magazine, in partnership with the Great Place to Work Institute, surveys U.S. businesses and determines the best places to work as described by their employees (among other factors). One typical comment found on the Great Place to Work Institute website regarding a winning culture was, “Everyone's contribution is important. Accomplishments are shared across the board. No one stands alone. Our tasks are accomplished as a result of a genuine collective effort” (www.greatplacetowork.com/great/index.php). In effect, then, the culture itself acts as what Kerr and Jermier (1978) first identified as a substitute for leadership.

Managing culture has received much attention since Peters and Waterman published *In Search of Excellence* in 1982. Since then many researchers have identified culture as a key factor in organizational longevity (De Geus, 2002), economic performance, and employee satisfaction, productivity, and commitment. Likert (1961) is considered to be the father of the concept of culture, and Collins (2001) is the latest to demonstrate that culture is the single most powerful means to creating great organizations. Culture is the collective interpersonal feel of the organization as determined by its values, norms, policies, and structure.

For a positive culture to be sustained year after year, leadership is required—emanating not from an individual but rather from everyone in the organization. To that end Noel Tichy and Eli Cohen said organizations “need to become teaching organizations ... everyone pass[ing] their learning on to others.” In winning organizations, “leaders exist at all levels and leaders actively develop the next generation of leaders. Once this ‘engine’ gets running, it is hard for competitors to stop” (Tichy and Cohen 1997).

EVALUATING LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS (ORGANIZATIONAL)

How well organizations create the right environment can be determined by surveys as well as by structured action research techniques that involve all employees in developing and assessing the criteria for the culture they will find most satisfying and productive. For Fred Fiedler (1967), a leading researcher in the field of leadership effectiveness, key goals are high employee satisfaction and low stress accompanied by high performance.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

As we have seen, leadership effectiveness is the successful exercise of personal influence by one or more people that results in accomplishing shared objectives in a way that is personally satisfying to those involved. Because of the changing nature of organizations the definition of leadership effectiveness will also change. Organizations are becoming more dependent on creativity, innovation, and knowledge acquisition and development. This dependence requires an intelligent, professional workforce capable of independent judgment. As individuals increase their responsibilities and work in a knowledge-based environment, they are less in need of an effective leader than an effective organizational environment. To that end, organizations would leverage their human

resources by creating productive norms, building structures that support learning and the expression of leadership qualities by each employee or member. Thus, the definition of leadership effectiveness will move from a focus on the individual influencer to a widespread acceptance of responsibility to ensure organizational effectiveness by each person.

—James Fenimore. Cooper

—John Nirenberg

Leadership Effectiveness as Viewed by James Fenimore Cooper

This extract from The Pathfinder (1840) by James Fenimore Cooper indicates that leadership effectiveness often has to do with how a leader or potential leader is perceived by others.

Notwithstanding his humble rank, there was something in the mien and character of Sergeant Dunham that commanded respect. Of a tall, imposing figure, grave and saturnine disposition, and accurate and precise in his acts and manner of thinking, even Cap, dogmatical and supercilious as he usually was with landsmen, did not presume to take the same liberties with the old soldier as he did with his other friends. It was often remarked that Sergeant Dunham received more true respect from Duncan of Lundie, the Scotch laird who commanded the post, than most of the subalterns; for experience and tried services were of quite as much value in the eyes of a veteran major as birth and money. While the sergeant never even hoped to rise any higher, he so far respected himself and his present station as always to act in a way to command attention; and the habit of mixing so much with inferiors, whose passions and dispositions he felt it necessary to restrain by distance and dignity, had so far colored his whole deportment that few were altogether free from its influence. While the captains treated him kindly and as an old comrade, the lieutenants seldom ventured to dissent from his military opinions; and the ensigns, it was remarked, actually manifested a species of respect that amounted to something very like deference. It is no wonder then that the announcement of Mabel put a sudden termination to the singular dialogue we have just related, though it had been often observed that the Pathfinder was the only man on that frontier, beneath the condition of a gentleman, who presumed to treat the sergeant at all as an equal, or even with the cordial familiarity of a friend.

“Good morrow, brother Cap,” said the sergeant, giving the military salute, as he walked in a grave, stately manner on the bastion. “My morning duty has made me seem forgetful of you and Mabel, but we have now an hour or two to spare and to get acquainted. Do you not perceive, brother, a strong likeliness in the girl to her we have so long lost?”

“Mabel is the image of her mother, Sergeant, as I have always said, with a little of your firmer figure; though for that matter the Caps were never wanting in spring and activity.”

Cooper, James Fenimore. (1961). *The Pathfinder or The Inland Sea*. New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., pp. 111–112. (Originally published 1840)

Further Reading

Baldrige National Quality Program. (2003). *Criteria for excellence performance*. Retrieved June 20, 2003, from http://www.quality.nist.gov/PDF_files/2003_Business_Criteria.pdf

Bass, B. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership revised*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B., & Stogdill, R. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory research and managerial applications*. New York: Free Press.

Bowers, D. and Seashore, S. *Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor model of leadership*. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly* vol. 11 (1966) pp. 238–263

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Chemers, M. M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap ... and others don't*. New York: Harper Business.

Collins, J., & Porras, J. I. (1994). *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. New York: Harper Business.

Conger, J., & Benjamin, B. (1999). *Building leaders: How successful companies develop the next generation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Covey, S. R. (1989). *The 7 habits of highly effective people*. New York: Fireside.

- De Geus, A. (2002). *The living company*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goleman, D. (Ed.). (2002). *Business: The ultimate resource*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: HBS Press.
- Hickman, G. R. (Ed.). (1998). *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kerr, S. and Jermier J. *Substitutes for leadership: The meaning and measurement*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* vol. 22 (1978) pp. 375–403 New York Academic Press.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns in management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2001). *Leadership: Theory application, skill development*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.
- Nirenberg, J. (2002). *Global leadership*. New York: Capstone/Wiley.
- Pasternack, B. A., Williams, T. D., & Anderson, P. F. (2001). Beyond the cult of the CEO: Building institutional leadership. *Strategy and business* (pp. 69–79). New York: Booz, Allen, and Hamilton.
- Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies*. New York: Harper.
- Rosen, R. H. (2000, April). What makes a globally literate leader? *Chief Executive* (pp. 46–48).
- Rost, J. C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Ryan, K. D., & Oestreich, D. K. (1998). *Driving fear out of the workplace: Creating the high-trust high-performance organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stogdill, R. (1974). *Handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Tichy, N., & Cohen, E. (1997). *The leadership engine: How winning companies build leaders at every level*. New York: Harper.
- Warner, F. (2002, November). *Finbarr O'Neill is not a car guy*. *Fast Company*, 84.

Entry Citation:

Cooper, James Fenimore., and John Nirenberg. "Leadership Effectiveness." *Encyclopedia of Leadership*. Ed. . Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2004. 845-54. *SAGE Reference Online*. Web. 30 Jan. 2012.



© SAGE Publications, Inc.

Brought to you by: SAGE

