Each year thousands of college graduates enter the business world armed with skills accumulated as student leaders, but how applicable are these skills to the business world? While there are many studies on learnable behaviors associated with effective student leadership and many studies on behaviors associated with effective business leadership, much less is known about how leadership effectiveness in these contexts compare. In this study I compare one comprehensive study of effective student leader behaviors to five articles on behaviors associated with effective business leadership in order to better understand how leadership in these contexts compare. Results suggest important similarities and critical differences. I conclude with observations and suggestions for student leaders making the transition to the business world.
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Introduction

Studying leadership is important due to its impact on society over the course of history (Devine, 2008). In fact, interest in leadership has captured the attention of scholars for centuries from the writings of the Old and New Testament in the Bible to ancient Chinese philosophers (Kanji & Moura E Sa', 2001). Scholarly work on the topic has continued during recent times with the publication of thousands of books and articles each year from the dawn of the 20th century into the beginning of the 21st century (DuBrin, 2004). Despite its long history of study it is important to study leadership as it is always a “work in progress” (Klein & Diket, 1999). Moreover, the study of leadership is often confused with the study of management. Based on the close relationship between these two terms and the absence of consensus from researchers on how they are different, leadership and management will be paired together in this study (DuBrin, 2004). With the attention the topic of leadership has received, one might assume that it would be easily defined. However, with the number of individuals who have studied leadership comes a variety of definitions. The following are definitions of leadership stated by reputable scholars:

“A process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal”

-Peter G. Northouse (American College Personnel Association)

“Leadership is the ability to inspire confidence and support among the people who are needed to achieve organizational goals”

-Andrew J. DuBrin (DuBrin, 2004)
“Leadership implies movement, taking the organization or some part of it in a new
direction, solving problems, being creative, initiating new programs, building
organizational structures, and improving quality”

-James R. Davis (Eddy & VanDerLinden, 2006)

"The art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations."

-James Kouzes and Barry Posner (Eddy & VanDerLinden, 2006)

From this small sampling of definitions one common aspect of leadership is influencing
others to reach a vision. This broad definition will be sufficient and the one used for the
purposes of this study. While leadership is practiced in many contexts, this study focuses
on two unique contexts of leading in a higher education and business context.

**Methodology**

To determine how effective student leadership behaviors compare to effective business
leadership behaviors, a literature review was conducted using two separate academic
journals. The choice to only use two journals is based on two reasons: 1) a study of all
journals and published work on leadership is an unrealistic goal for the scope of this
project due to the thousands of studies that exist on leadership, and 2) this study
concentrates on the quality of the source used in regards to rigor and relevance* and not
necessarily the quantity. The quality of the articles is explained below.

The *Journal of College Student Development* (JCSD) was chosen as the primary resource
for obtaining information regarding effective student leadership behaviors. The JCSD
was founded in 1959 and is regarded as a top tier journal in the field of higher education,
and is also associated with American College Personnel Association (American College
Personnel Association). *A Leadership Development Instrument for Students: Updated (Posner, 2004)*, was chosen from that database to use as the major article focusing on behaviors associated with student leaders.

Posner’s (2004) article is a comprehensive study that provided a relevant and well studied list of behaviors associated with effective student leadership. The choice to use a single article was supported by the credibility of the author and the close alignment the article had with behaviors and effective leadership. The author, Barry Posner, is widely regarded for his research in leadership and is the current dean of Santa Clara University's Leavey School of Business. He is credited with teaming with Jim Kouzes to develop “The Leadership Challenge”, which is a series of teachings labeled as the “most trusted source for becoming a better leader” (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2000-2009). The article itself connected very well with the concept of behaviors and effective student leadership as it surveyed 1,200 students from a variety of universities who were associated with *Leadership America*; defined as “a nationally prominent leadership development experience for college students” (Posner, July/August 2004). More information on this article can be found in Appendix A. As a primary source for research for experts in this selected field, this study deemed this journal and this article high in relevance and quality to be used as the student leadership behavior sample source.

The second journal used was the *Leadership Quarterly* (LQ) and was the source for articles related to effective leadership behaviors in a business context. The LQ is an international journal of political, social and behavioral science and is published in
accordance with the International Leadership Association. The LQ was chosen based on its primary focus on leadership and associated behaviors along with its reputation as a respected academic journal (Elsievier). As a top ranked journal by The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, this study deemed it high in relevance and quality to be used as the business leader behavior sample source.

**Search Process**

The 5 *Leadership Quarterly* articles were determined by the search criteria shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Leadership Quarterly Search Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Phrase</th>
<th>Search Limitations</th>
<th>Number of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JN “Leadership Quarterly”</td>
<td>“All Fields”</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Leadership Effectiveness”</td>
<td>“TI Title”</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All business context articles were *Leadership Quarterly* publications to ensure samples were from the same source. The search term “leadership effectiveness” was used with the “TI Title” search option in order to narrow search results pertaining to only articles with “leadership effectiveness” in the title. This specific search criterion was used compared to the JCSD search because the results of the LQ search when searching for “leadership effectiveness” in “All Fields” came back with many quality results. Using these same search criteria in the JCSD search was not used because the Posner article revealed itself as a highly credible sample that would not have benefitted significantly from using additional articles from the Journal of College Student Development.

Results were sorted by date since a more specific search criterion was used and relevance was not as large a concern. Additional reasoning for sorting by date is that the original
LQ search showed “most relevant” results that were as old as 1996. In order to maintain a study based on recent publications (defined as published in the last 10 years) it was concluded that the LQ search would be most accurate if the results were sorted by date.

In order to add additional value to this study search results that were published outside of the last decade were not considered in order to provide results based on more recent research.
Key Findings

The following 6 charts display a quick description of the 6 articles reviewed; the articles are reviewed in Appendix A and B. The first article by Posner from the *Journal of College Student Development* and the second 5 are from *Leadership Quarterly*. The purpose of these charts is to clearly show the original language from the articles as far as what the dependent and independent variables were, and an overview of the sample used. The use of these charts is important in providing transparency to this study. The list of derived behaviors (when derivation was needed) in each chart is properly defended through literature review provided in Appendix A and B.

The charts below list pertinent information from the article including the independent variables used verbatim. Due to the nature of some independent variables used, derivation was needed to describe them as behaviors applicable in a broader context. When the independent variables clearly described behaviors associated with leadership effectiveness no derivation was needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>A Leadership Development Instrument for Students: Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Barry Z. Posner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size Summary</td>
<td>1,200 U.S. college students nominated for the Leadership America program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>“Leadership Effectiveness”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Independent Variables | “Modeling the Way”  
“Inspiring a shared vision”  
“Challenging the process”  
“Enabling others to act” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derivation Used?</th>
<th>“Encouraging the heart”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td><em>Collective enactment of leadership roles and team effectiveness: A field study</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author</strong></td>
<td>Nathan J. Hiller, David V. Day, Robert Vance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Size Summary</strong></td>
<td>277 individuals from road teams in six counties of a state department of transportation at the end of the winter season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td>“Team Performance”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Independent Variables** | “Planning and Organizing”  
“Problem solving”  
“Support and consideration”  
“Development and Mentoring” |
| **Derivation Used?** | Yes |
| **Derived Behaviors** | Utilize Teamwork |

| **Title** | *Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader’s social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates’ optimism: A multi-method study.* |
| **Author** | Annebel H.B. De Hoogh and Deanne N. Den Hartog |
| **Sample Size Summary** | CEOs from 73 small and medium-sized organizations (minimum of 50 employees and maximum of 250 employees) in the Netherlands. Organizations were both for profit and non-profit. |
| **Dependent Variable** | “Team Effectiveness” |
| **Independent Variables** | “Moral–legal standards of conduct”  
“Inner obligation”  
“Concern for others”  
“Concern for negative consequences”  
“Self Judgment” |
| **Derivation Used?** | Yes |
| **Derived Behaviors** | Define roles clearly  
Be moral, ethical and fair |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Leader group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of need for cognitive closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Antonio Pierro, Lavinia Cicero, Marino Bonaiuto, Daan van Knippenberg and Arie W. Kruglanski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size Summary</td>
<td>242 of three Italian companies: 81 of a big petrochemical company, 95 of a medium size manufacturing company, and 66 of a big electronic company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>“Group Prototypicality”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Independent Variable | “Need for closure”  
“Subordinate perceptions of leadership effectiveness”  
“Job satisfaction”  
“Self-rated performance”  
“Turnover intentions” |
| Derived Behaviors | Lead prototypically |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Laura Reave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size Summary</td>
<td>Literature review of literature on spiritual values/leadership effectiveness and author anecdotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>“Leadership Effectiveness”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Independent Variables | “Showing respect for others”  
“Demonstrating fair treatment”  
“Expressing caring and concern”  
“Listening responsively”  
“Appreciating the contributions”  
“Reflective practice” |
| Derived Behaviors | Not needed |
Title: Which Leadership roles matter to whom? An examination of rater effects on perceptions of effectiveness

Author: Robert Hooijberg and Jaepil Choi

Sample Size Summary: 252 middle managers who had participated in the executive education program at the University of Michigan Business School who worked in the public utility industry

Dependent Variable: “Perception of Leadership Effectiveness”

Independent Variables:
- “Overall managerial success”
- “Overall leadership effectiveness”
- “The extent to which the manager met managerial performance standards”
- “How well he or she did compared with his or her managerial peers”
- “How well he or she performed as a role model”

Derivation Used?: Yes

Derived Behaviors:
- Practice strong listening skills
- Act adaptively
- Practice innovation
- Facilitate group processes

Analysis:
When reviewing the 6 articles there were a total of 30 independent variables that were found to be associated with the dependent variable leadership effectiveness. Two of the six articles had a dependent variable of “leadership effectiveness” verbatim with the rest having slight variations, but closely tied to leadership effectiveness.

In order to organize the 30 independent variables in the articles, interpretations by the author were used to derive common behavioral themes. The chart listing the behaviors associated with the respected article it came from have an asterisk (*) to state when an interpretation was used; those without asterisks (*) were stated verbatim as behaviors associated with leadership effectiveness in their respected article(s). All of the derivations made are supported by Appendix A or Appendix B accordingly.
Results

A total of 14 broad behavioral themes associated with leadership effectiveness were found. When reviewing the results of the study it is thought provoking to notice some significant comparisons between the two literature sources. The first noticeable comparison is that LQ had instances of every one of the five behaviors listed in Posner’s work except two. The two behaviors that LQ did not note as being associated with effective leadership were determining vision/goals and modeling the way. Does this mean that the Leadership Quarterly does not value these listed behaviors as important when leading effectively? Perhaps it may be argued that some of these behaviors are implied from the very nature of leadership defined by this study; this can be seen with the behavior of determining vision/goals for example. It may also not be fair to assume that the entire catalog of LQ publications over the years are absent of these exclusive behaviors found in the Posner article. However, regardless of the reason it is clear through this study’s findings that these behaviors received more emphasis in the Journal of College Student Development through the Posner article than the Leadership Quarterly. Therefore, remaining loyal to the opening statements of this study, these findings show that these behaviors are being more prominently focused on in a student leadership context than in a business leadership context.

Moving on it is important to note the behaviors exclusively associated with LQ that were not found in the Posner article. The list of behaviors associated with leadership effectiveness in the business context suggest that leaders should develop interpersonal relationships, practice strong communication, utilize teamwork, be adaptive, define roles clearly, act moral, ethical and fair, leading prototypically, practice self reflection and
recognizing the contributions of others (see table 2). Much like the argument for LQ, it would be inaccurate to assume that the entire range of JCSD publications does not address these behaviors since this study is basing all behaviors associated with effective leadership on one publication. However, due to the nature of this study it can be stated that the behaviors exclusive to LQ seem to receive more emphasis in a business oriented publication versus the Posner article that focused on effective leadership behaviors in students.

However, at this point it is encouraging to note that there are mutual behaviors associated with leading effectively in both a student and business leadership context (see Table 3). The three behaviors that overlap the two areas of study suggest leaders in both arenas challenge the process/innovate, enable others to act and encourage the heart (motivate).

Table 2. Business Leadership Behaviors Associated With Leadership Effectiveness

| • Develop Interpersonal Relationships |
| • Practice Strong Communication |
| • Be adaptive |
| • Utilize Teamwork |
| • Challenge the process/innovate |
| • Enable others to act |
| • Define roles clearly |
| • Encourage the heart (motivate) |
| • Be moral, ethical and fair |
| • Practice self reflection |
| • Recognize contributions of others |
| • Lead prototypically |

Table 3. Student Leadership Behaviors Associated With Leadership Effectiveness

| • Challenge the process/innovate |
| • Enable others to act |
| • Encourage the heart (motivate) |
| • Model the Way |
| • Determine Vision/Goals |
Reflection on Results

As a student leader, I find the results of this study very beneficial as I progress into a business environment. Looking back at my opportunities to lead in various capacities (student advocacy groups, managing a highly trafficked recreational center, managing projects to presiding over a fraternity) I cannot help but reflect on my own experiences as it relates to these behaviors.

Enable Others to Act

I often overlooked practicing the behavior of enabling others, and I now clearly see its importance. As President of my fraternity, I was very ambitious and hoped for a number of improvements including Chapter scholastic performance, adherence to our values and
nurturing alumni support. In an attempt to do, I usually took on the majority of the responsibilities because I felt this was the only way tasks would be done correctly. Doing so left me exhausted towards the end of my term. I also wound up isolating myself from the rest of my executive team because I did not include them in carrying out responsibilities.

**Encourage the Heart (Motivate)**

As a Center Manager at the University’s Recreational Center I was in charge of opening up the facility for two years and leading a staff of up to 5 of my peers. This responsibility included arriving at 5:30 am in order to have the facility operational for opening by 6:00 am. For anyone who is familiar with what it is like being a college student, waking up this early on a consistent basis to go to work is very atypical. As this was the case, I often had employees arrive to work with obvious signs of fatigue from lack of sleep and signs of anxiety for what lay ahead during their day. As their leader, I would do all that I could to show care for them and try to encourage them in their situation. I did this by discussing what was bothering them, listening and trying to understand their situation, and offering challenging assignments to stimulate their minds. Sometimes it could be as simple as changing their attitude by telling a funny joke. Other times, sending them home was the best solution. Regardless of which tactic was used, the important part was maintaining a behavior of encouragement and motivation to allow them to fulfill their duties and help us reach our goal of providing quality service to our participants.
**Challenge the Process/Innovate**

Upon becoming President of my fraternity I had many chances to challenge the process and innovate in my Chapter. One such example was our scholarship program that had been mediocre at best and gave very little incentive for potential members to join the organization based on scholarship. There was no process of granting scholarships to non-members, which I believe was a huge missed opportunity to recruit highly qualified candidates. To provide innovation for our scholarship program I helped create the “*Linus Pauling Humanitarian Scholarship*” and the “*4 Founding Principles Scholarship*”, which accomplished three key objectives. The first was to provide a reduced cost of living for members who joined; the second was to publicly promote a highly respected alumnus of our Chapter and our founding principles; and the third was to provide scholarships to candidates who were not required to join. Offering scholarships to people who may not join was slightly controversial, but would help those highly qualified students who have never thought of joining a fraternity consider it since there would be no commitment when applying. By challenging the existing program that was present when I became President, the Chapter is making progress at effectively making scholarship a higher priority.
Conclusion

Shortcomings of Study

Though this study has provided useful results important shortcomings should be noted. The most important is the limited number of articles used. For instance, five articles from *Leadership Quarterly* were exclusively used for information regarding behaviors associated with business leadership/management. Although this is a credible source, it is difficult to assume that this is the only source to derive these behaviors from. The same shortcoming lies in the use of the *Journal of College Student Development*, which was used to study behaviors associated with student leadership effectiveness. This shortcoming was more pronounced however as I only used a single article (Posner) from this journal. Despite its’ credibility in regards to student leadership it cannot be expected to entail all research concerning the subject of student leadership.

The interpretation of the reviews can also be seen as a shortcoming. Since the results from this study were based on a literature review, many of the conclusions were formulated based on the author’s interpretation on how to rename concepts in each of the articles into relatable behaviors using a shared language. It should be noted that each interpretation was well explained and backed by adequate reasoning, but the findings of this study would be more credible if they were supported by original quantitative and qualitative research.

Future Study

With the final results of this study concluded there are further avenues of research that could be explored. As noted in the shortcomings section, a wider array of sources could
be used to add more credibility to this study or a similar future study along with conducting independent research. Due to the noted discrepancy between the behaviors in a student context and business context, it would be valuable to study these differences. A focus on the differences in behaviors practiced could provide insight on:

- Revision of leadership curriculum taught in business schools to better match behaviors that are effective in the business world.

- Revision of leadership training in the business world in order to offer a more effective transition of a student leader into a business leader.

- Does student leadership in a specific setting affect behaviors that are deemed effective? In other words does a student leader at a private university lead effectively based on different behaviors than an effective leader at a public institution?

- Does the specific industry of business affect the behaviors that are deemed effective? Does leading effectively in the manufacturing business look differently than leading effectively in an agriculture based business?

- Does gender/race/origin play a role in determining what behaviors are effective in leading?
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Literature Review
A Leadership Development Instrument for Students: Updated

Barry Z. Posner

Introduction

Recent research has shown that leadership is integral to all those seeking to make a meaningful difference in their lives. As this quality in humanity shows great value, it is important to develop it in young men and women as they progress into positions of influence and authority. However, most development programs for students have been modeled after “managers in business and public-sector organizations”. Posner argues that leadership development in a student context needs to be founded in those origins, and not from an environment that those being developed have yet to experience.

Continuing this argument, Posner goes on to explain the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI), which in his point of view is a reputable tool to measure leadership effectiveness based in a collegiate environment. By noticing specific behaviors when students believed they were at “their personal best”, the Student LPI produced five practices that align with leadership effectiveness: Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart.

Summary of Methodology

The Student LPI resembles its predecessor the Leadership Practices Inventory that measured leadership effectiveness based on behaviors from case studies of over 1,200 managers. To put it in a student context, managers were replaced by students who were nominated to Leadership America, “a nationally prominent leadership development experience for college students”. They were asked what behaviors they exhibited when they felt they were “at their best”. Research collected helped form a survey based on 30 questions where each leadership practice had 6 questions pertaining to it (6 X 5 = 30). The survey is given to two test subjects. The first is the Self, or in other words the person being rated performs a self evaluation of their behavior in relationship to their leadership effectiveness. The second test subject is the Observer, which includes those in a position to witness the behaviors and relation to leadership effectiveness of the person being rated.
Posner facilitated this survey across a broad array of student groups. These groups included fraternity chapters (Self: Fraternity President/Observer: Executive Council), sorority chapters (Self: Sorority President/Observer: Executive Council), residence halls (Self: Resident Advisors/Observer: Residents and Hall Director), and Orientation Programs (Self: Orientation Advisors/Observer: Incoming Students). The results from these surveys allows Posner to conclude that leaders in these groups (i.e. test subject Self) showed more leadership effectiveness when consistently exhibiting the five leadership behaviors previously stated than those who did not practice the five behaviors.

Key Findings

Students who were perceived as effective leaders through self and peer evaluation tended to practice the 5 leadership behaviors more than their counterparts who did not. *This was independent of demographic factors of gender, ethnicity, year in school, age, GPA, academic major, work outside the home, full or part-time student status, or semester in school.*

Effective leaders who were compensated for their services did not differ significantly in their behaviors from effective leaders who were not compensated.

“Student leaders working with peers in a non-hierarchical relationship did not engage in these leadership practices more or less significantly than those students who were elected by their peers into official positions of leadership, or hold a hierarchical position such as president of a student organization.”

Fraternity Chapter Presidents were considered less effective than their sorority counterparts.

| Leadership Practices Variances: | Fraternity Presidents 65% | Sorority Presidents 80% |

Fraternity Chapter Presidents exhibited the five leadership practices more than the members on their Executive Councils. Evidence shows an increase in leadership effectiveness after participation in a leadership development program compared to someone who did not participate in a leadership development program.
The type of organization a student is involved in as a leader affects their self efficacy (realization of capabilities) toward the five leadership behaviors in the Student LPI.

- Activist Organization: Higher self efficacies in Modeling, Inspiring and Challenging

Little evidence exists that shows a particular personality correlates to leadership effectiveness.

**Conclusion**

Through careful empirical research Posner makes a strong case for the accuracy of the five leadership practices in the Student LPI and their association with leadership effectiveness. By revising the survey based on preliminary testing the survey was distributed in its most updated and mature form to the assorted student groups previously stated. By surveying a broad array of demographics his argument is made stronger that these five practices are applicable for any student leader in exhibiting leadership effectiveness.

Despite its valid claims Posner leaves unanswered questions in its broad application on all student groups. In his research he did not survey athletic teams that may contribute differently to the results. Additionally, surveying universities in different regions may alter the accuracy of his argument (e.g. do effective leaders at a public University in Oregon behave differently than effective leaders at a private institution in Florida?). Another assertion Posner makes is the ineffectiveness of using business and public sector leadership models in a student environment. The use of the Student LPI is one of the few models that exist he believes is suitable for the college environment. The fact of the matter is that the Student LPI was derived from the original Leadership Practices Inventory that was focused on managers in the business and public sector, which he helped create. For this reason the idea that business and public sector leadership models should not be used in the college context is contestable at the very least.

Overall the research conducted by Posner offers a highly plausible answer on what behaviors by student leaders are associated with leadership effectiveness. A further question is whether these five leadership behaviors align with what behaviors in the business world are associated with leadership effectiveness.
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Collective enactment of leadership roles and team effectiveness: A field study

Nathan J. Hiller, David V. Day, Robert Vance

Introduction

According to Hiller, Day, and Vance in an ever changing world there has been more attention whether an individual leadership model is correct for the future, while the theory of collective leadership has been marginally studied. There is an agreement in the article that traits, skills and behaviors contribute to leadership skills, but the shift in focus is that these same qualities can be connected to collective leadership.

Hypothesis 1
Based on established research and the logic that “shared enactment of leadership roles provides an increased capacity for getting things done, regardless of the task” the first hypothesis is established:

*More extensive collective leadership within a team will be associated with higher levels of team performance.*

Hypothesis 2
In creating the second hypotheses the definition of collectivism and individualism require clarification. Collectivism is “characterized by interdependence, personal relationships, security, duty, and in-group harmony”, while individualism is “characterized by personal freedom, autonomy, high individual achievement, and perhaps most importantly, independence from referent groups. The second hypothesis is:

*Teams whose members endorse more collectivistic views will exhibit higher levels of collective leadership.*

Hypothesis 3
Studies have shown that levels of power distance can aid in determining the level of collectivism in a group. This study stated that “individuals measuring high on power distance readily accepted hierarchy and accepted their social status as followers”. The third hypothesis intends to show that low power distance in a group corresponds to high levels of collectivism. The third hypothesis is:

*Teams whose members endorse unequal distribution of power (power distance) will exhibit lower levels of collective leadership.*
Summary of Methodology

In order to measure the effectiveness of collective leadership a sample of 277 individuals from road teams in six counties of a state department of transportation at the end of the winter season were tested. There were a total of 52 teams that responded whereas every team was required to have at least half of their team respond to the survey; a total of 74% of the total teams responded. The mean team size was 5.5 while the average tenure of the workers was 14.3 years. Specific interdependent tasks that the teams worked on were “emergency snow clearing, spreading gravel, salt, and anti skid; and general road maintenance”.

In order to compare the effectiveness of individual leadership and collective leadership styles, two criteria were used; the first is task oriented behavior and the second is relationship oriented behavior. The reasoning to use this for the individual leadership style is that “meta-analytic support that both task and relationship behaviors at the individual level are important for leadership outcomes”. These two criteria also are relevant for collective leadership since “these two broad behavioral components have also been found in the context of co-acting teams”.

Using task oriented behavior and relationship oriented behavior as dependent behavior and testing individual and collective styles against them, the hope is to find which leadership style is more effective. The study used a variation of the Managerial Practices Survey (MPS) where individual aspects such as formal rewards and performance evaluation were removed to use the same scale to measure the two styles. The final survey was split up in four broad areas of Planning and Organizing (task), Problem solving (task), Support and consideration (relationship), and Development and Mentoring (relationship).

After a review by a Psychology Ph.D. program it was concluded that 6 questions would be asked for each category with the problem solving section having 7 for a total of 25 questions. Those surveyed were asked how often they performed they shared in (a) planning and organizing, (b) problem solving, (c) support and consideration, and (d) development and mentoring on a scale of 1 (never) to 7 (always).

Key Findings

- **Hypothesis 1**
  - “Generally supported”
• **Hypothesis 2**
  o “Collective leadership dimensions were related significantly and positively to collectivism”

• **Hypothesis 3**
  o Failed

• High levels of team effectiveness in teams were also associated with high supervisor ratings of team effectiveness.

• **The relationship-oriented leadership dimensions were more consistent to team effectiveness than the task-oriented dimensions.**

**Conclusion**

This research on leadership encourages the question whether leadership is focused on the individual or is it spread among the team. Though some of the objectives of the study were not met, there are some key takeaways from this study. One of the more beneficial findings is that collective leadership is effective in terms of supporting and considering, and development and mentoring. These findings point to the fact that using team leadership methods in these scenarios would be effective while scenarios based on task-oriented dimensions (i.e. planning and organizing, and problem solving) should be lead by the more traditional individual style of leadership.

The study’s authors acknowledge the small sample size and the narrow focus of the demographic in the study as shortcomings of the study. The study only significantly proved one of the original hypotheses, but the implications of the one hypothesis (Hypothesis 2) is beneficial for the reader. Applying this article on the focus of behavior and leadership effectiveness it does not concentrate on a list of behaviors per se, but is still important. The importance is found in its overarching exercise of leadership behavior as a team and not only an individual.
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*Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study.*

Annebel H.B. De Hoogh and Deanne N. Den Hartog

According to the work of De Hoogh and Hartog the exercise of ethical leadership leads an organization's members to goals, objectives and benefits the overall organization and society; with this they believe ethical leadership corresponds to effective leadership. Ethical leadership has been seen to develop a sense of loyalty in an organization where members are more willing to stay and contribute to the success of the organization.

Considering ethical leadership is tied closely with leadership effects, the definition of ethical leadership should be better explained. With a strong influence from the work of M.E. Brown, L.K. Trevino and D.A. Harrison, De Hoogh and Hartog are careful to base their definition of ethical leadership on a set of three characteristics: morality and fairness, role clarification, and power sharing.

**Morality and Fairness as defined from article:** “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision making”.

**Role Clarification:** “…focus on leader's transparency, engagement in open communication with followers and clarification of expectations and responsibilities so that employees are clear on what is expected from them.”

**Power Sharing:** “…ethical leaders provide followers with voice. In line with this, we argue that allowing followers a say in decision making and listening to their ideas and concerns can be seen as a component of ethical leadership and we label this component power sharing.”

In order to test the practice of these characteristics De Hoogh and Hartog believed that they needed to make a connection from ethical leadership to social responsibility in order to translate test subjects responses on social responsibility to levels of ethical leadership and thus leadership effectiveness.
De Hoogh and Hartog also address two other subjects in their research. The first is to identify the relationship between despotic leadership and social responsibility and by doing so how it relates to leadership effectiveness. Despotic leadership is defined as being “based on personal dominance and authoritarian behavior that serves the self-interest of the leader, is self-aggrandizing and exploitative of others”. They also touch on the relationship on the connection between optimism and ethical leadership. Optimism in this article’s context is defined as “a human virtue driving behavior and feelings at work”. Considering the intentions of this study the specifics of the methodology can be reviewed.

**Summary of Methodology**

In their research De Hoogh and Hartog set out to test the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1**
Leader’s social responsibility (moral–legal standard of conduct, internal obligation, concern for others, concern about consequences, and self-judgment) is positively related to ethical leadership (morality and fairness, role clarification, and power sharing).

**Hypothesis 2**
Leader's social responsibility (moral–legal standard of conduct, internal obligation, concern for others, concern about consequences, and self-judgment) is negatively related to despotic leadership.

**Hypothesis 3**
Ethical leadership (morality and fairness, role clarification and power sharing) is positively related to top management team effectiveness and follower's optimism about their future.

**Hypothesis 4**
Despotic leadership is negatively related to top management team effectiveness and follower's optimism about their future.
The sample for this test was 73 small and medium-sized organizations (minimum of 50 employees and maximum of 250 employees) in the Netherlands. To establish sufficient variance these 73 organizations were chosen from two databases. One included 300 profit organizations (Elvsvier’s Company Information) and the other included 40 voluntary sector/non-profit organizations (SvM Voluntary Organization Database). All 340 CEO’s were invited to take part with the chance to receive feedback on their leadership performance. 50 for profit organizations and 21 voluntary sector/non-profit organizations agreed to take part in the test (22% response rate as a whole).

The participating CEO’s participated in an extensive interview process structured for them to elaborately describe their “dominant concerns, beliefs, values, opinions, and their philosophy of management”. These interviews lasted 45-60 minutes and the CEO’s were not informed that their responses would be coded for social responsibility in order to measure ethical leadership present. The questions were coded in the five social responsibility categories of moral–legal standards of conduct, inner obligation, concern for others, concern for negative consequences and self-judgment. The CEO’s were then asked to handout the survey to six “key figures in the organization” that they interacted with regularly. These “observer surveys” had a 58% response rate.

The surveys handed out to their subordinates were a combination of two questionnaires. Questionnaire type 1 measured leadership ratings and questionnaire type 2 measured outcomes. “Per questionnaire we received a total number of 130 surveys for questionnaire type 1 (at least one survey for 90% of the CEOs; a mean of 1.97 per CEO) and 119 valid surveys for type 2 (at least one survey for 89% of the CEOs; a mean of 1.83 per CEO) respectively”. Through these methods De Hoogh and Hartog delivered a number of key findings.

**Key Findings**

- Ethical leadership positively corresponds with effective leadership.
- **Hypotheses 1**
  - Social responsibility is significantly related to ethical leadership.
    - Leaders considered socially responsible scored significantly higher in the ethical leadership sub scales of morality and fairness and role clarification.
    - CEO’s in non-profit organizations exemplified higher levels of social responsibility.
- **Hypotheses 2**
  - Social responsibility is significantly negatively related to despotic leadership.
- **Hypotheses 3**
Ethical leadership was significant related to both top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism about their future.

- Despotic leadership seemed to be more apparent in the for profit sampling compared to the non-profit sector sampling.
- Ethical leadership, morality and fairness, and role clarification were both found to be positively correlated with optimism about the future and perceived top management team effectiveness. Morality and fairness was, however, found to be the most important in relation to these outcomes.

- The ethical leadership sub scale of power sharing did not have a direct connection with effectiveness when the two variables were compared by themselves.

- Hypotheses 4
  - Not enough evidence to support.
    - “In crisis situations requiring direct and forceful response autocratic leaders may be wanted and respected… Future research seems necessary on the contingent nature of despotic leadership as it relates to different follower attitudes and behaviors”.
  - Many of the key findings point toward questions of the influence of context and type of organization when considering effective leadership behavior.

Conclusion
Through this ambitious study a number of valued claims have been made. One of the primary claims made was the connection between ethical leadership and leadership effectiveness. Along with admiring the findings it is important to be respectfully critical of this work. According to De Hoogh and Hartog a large shortcoming of their study was the lack of size in their sampling due to a relatively small response rate. Factoring in the sample size came from the Netherlands a note of caution must be made on the generality of their findings. Along with this is the fact that CEO’s were allowed to choose the employees that filled out the surveys on them. Though this is common in this type of study it provides the opportunity of bias. Another point of caution is the fact that ethical leadership is subjective as it is based on values. Therefore, a person acting “ethically” based on their values may be blinded by the reality of the situation.

Despite these points of caution there are key takeaways from this study. One is the unanswered question of what effect the type of organization has on determining effective leadership behavior; the answer to this requires further study. However, considering the thoroughness of explaining their methodology, De Hoogh and Hartog provide confidence in their significant findings. With a focus on behaviors and leadership effectiveness, it is encouraging to see strong evidence that socially responsible leaders that act morally and fair, who define roles clearly, tend to be more effective leaders.
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Leader group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of need for cognitive closure

Antonio Pierro, Lavinia Cicero, Marino Bonaiuto, Daan van Knippenberg and Arie W. Kruglanski

Introduction

Based on the social identity approach it has been shown that a person’s self definition is largely influenced by the group or organization they are part of. This implies that it is possible that the leader of a group models their behavior after group norms more so than other leaders. A leader who is prototypical is defined as one who exemplifies “group normative behavior and reflect(s) what members of the group have in common and what sets them apart from other groups”. Naturally those who are less group-centered in their leadership are defined as non-prototypical. This study lead by Antonio Pierro seeks to show that prototypical leaders are more effective based on surveying members on need for closure, subordinate perceptions of leadership effectiveness, job satisfaction, self-rated performance, and turnover intentions.

Summary of Methodology

Participants in the study were asked to complete the Need for Cognitive Closure Scale, a 35 item self report instrument intended to measure the differences in need for closure. A participant would be asked a question defining the need for closure (the desire for a definite answer to a question and the eschewal of ambiguity) and answer on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). In addition other individual indicators to leadership effectiveness were tested which were subordinate perceptions of leadership effectiveness, job satisfaction, self-rated performance, and turnover intentions that were rated in the same fashion with a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) reflecting a statement that defined each respected attribute. The following is the description of the sample size used:

“Participants were 242 employees (81% response) of three Italian companies: 81 of a big petrochemical company, 95 of a medium size manufacturing company, and 66 of a big electronic company. The average age of the total sample was about 39 years (SD = 8.27); 59.9% of the sample were men and 40.1% were women. On average respondents were with their company for 13 years (SD = 8.41). Respondents occupied different job positions: 33.5% were managers/professionals, 26.8% were employees, 39.7% were manual workers. 19% of the participants had a university degree, 65.3% had a high school degree and 15.7% had a middle school degree. Participants belonged to different
units within each company: specifically, in the first company participants belonged to one of 7 teams (composed by a minimum of 5 members to a maximum of 21 members each); in the second company participants belonged to one of 6 teams (with a range going from 6 to 42 members each); in the third company participants belonged to 7 teams (ranging from 4 to 26 members each). The instruction of the questionnaire asked to refer always to the work team/unit and to the leader of the same unit.”

Key Findings

- A high need for closure is related to a member's desire for knowledge accumulation and desire for consensus.
  - Due to this those who seek closure are more often to follow prototypical leaders in favor of their alignment with group norms.
- “The relationship between perception of leader prototypicality and leadership effectiveness… were significant even if the effect is stronger for participants relatively high in need for closure”.
- In times of uncertainty and crisis group members turn to prototypical leaders to reduce or eliminate this uncertainty.
  - An inference can be made that those who have a high desire for closure are more susceptible to be affected by charismatic leadership
- Findings show that practicing prototypical leadership correlated positively with perceived leadership effectiveness, job satisfaction and performance, while it correlated negatively with turnover intentions.

Conclusion

Looking strictly at this study from a statistical credibility standpoint, it stands on a strong empirical foundation. Data was well documented and questions were asked in a simple format with the response rate reaching a high enough level to make this study reliable. The researchers admit that the study may be subject to common bias in concern to method and source, but are confident in their findings. However, based on their suggestions further questions on the subject of prototypical leadership and leadership effectiveness should be tested with more objective behavioral methods to increase the reliability of their findings.

When reviewing this study for implications on behavior and leadership effectiveness, takeaways are marginal. There were no specific behaviors identified that were associated with leadership effectiveness besides acting prototypically. It is my conclusion that in order to lead prototypically a leader needs to behave consistently with a focus on collectivism in order to continue the member’s perception of their alignment with the group’s norms. This behavior however leaves out one very important aspect. Though prototypical leaders were seen as effective leaders in this study, this consistent behavior of following the established norms is counter intuitive for leaders who seek change in
their organization. This is based on the logic that a leader who seeks change in an organization would be attempting to alter current group norms or objectives in one way or another. However, the question in this review is only behaviors of effective leadership, not the definition of what norms and values are considered “correct”. That question needs to be addressed from further research and is outside the scope of this study.
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_Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness_

Laura Reave

**Introduction**

In an attempt to compare spiritual values and practices with leadership effectiveness, Reave attempts to connect a widely considered subjective field of spirituality with the more scientific based idea of leadership effectiveness. Before beginning this comparison, the distinction between spirituality and religion was defined to allow the reader to disconnect the two as Reave moves forward in her study of spirituality and leadership effectiveness. Through a recent meta analysis, the following was stated: “religion was predominantly associated with formal/organizational religion, while spirituality was more often associated with closeness with God and feelings of interconnectedness with the world and living things.” Along with further analysis, Reave clarifies that spirituality is more broad based and is not tied to a single religion.

Reave defends that behaviors associated with leadership effectiveness are also commonly found in spiritual practices and values. Despite critics on the practicality of spirituality in the business world for instance, Reave sets out to determine that a connection between these two variables exists.

**Summary of Methodology**

In beginning, a brief background of common theories of leadership effectiveness is given. Following this is the attempt at connecting aspects of spirituality with already existing theories of leadership effectiveness. By level of importance, specific spiritual practices and values will be looked at and how they relate to those already established leadership practices.

In this study certain theories are not considered for a number of reasons. The first being transformational leadership theories that include the aspect of charismatic leadership. Indecisive results from studying charismatic leadership as a whole shows a need to break down charisma leadership into a number of behaviors. Despite this breakdown, charisma is still excluded based on the fact that charisma does not often factor in the ethical dimension of personal motivation (e.g. cults have had very charismatic leaders, but have had questionable personal motivations).

Additionally, transformational theory that includes inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation has also been left out. Inspirational motivation is excluded for the
reason that inspirational motivation does not imply action, which is a key part in the definition of character by the author (i.e. “walk the talk”). Intellectual motivation was not considered based on the author’s opinion that it was inconsistent with a spiritual practice.

Despite the omission of the previous three aspects of transformational theory, the aspect described as individualized consideration was. Individualized consideration is defined as “a leader's response to the individual needs of followers through such behaviors as talking to them as friends, demonstrating patience with mistakes, including others in decisions, showing sensitivity to follower feelings, etc.”.

- **Spirituality Defined**: “The values, attitudes, and behaviors necessary to intrinsically motivate one's self and others so that they have a sense of spiritual survival through *calling and membership*”.
  - **Calling Defined**: “the experience of transcendence or how one makes a difference through service to others and, in doing so, derives meaning and purpose in life”.
  - **Membership Defined**: “establishing a social/organizational culture based on altruistic love whereby leaders and followers have genuine care, concern, and appreciation for both self and others, thereby producing a sense of membership and [feeling] understood and appreciated”.

**Key Findings**

- Leaders in spiritual organizations have been shown to score higher on measures of leadership effectiveness.
- **Various spiritual factors relating to traditional measures of leader success:**
  - **Motivation**
    - Work as a calling
      - “Workers express their spiritual values through their work are also likely to be more effective in achieving worker job satisfaction”.
      - Research has shown that spirituality incorporated at work has a negative correlation with stress caused absenteeism, which estimates place as a multi-billion dollar business cost due to insurance claims and lost productivity.
  - **Values**
    - Integrity
      - Despite not being a behavior, the argument is made that behaviors that are not founded on integrity are “hollow” and threaten a leader’s authenticity.
Integrity has been seen as “essential to leadership success” while lack of integrity has been seen to be associated with leadership failure.

- **Honesty**
  - Considered a trait, honesty was seen as an important aspect in communicating and closely related to having integrity.

- **Humility**
  - Leaders who rated themselves lowest were rated highest by their followers, while managers who overrated themselves were perceived by followers to be less effective.
  - The opposite characteristic of high self-esteem was seen to limit the ethical, diplomatic, and interpersonal skills of leaders.
  - High levels of self-esteem have been seen in gang leaders, terrorists, and ethnocentrist.

**Behaviors**

- **Showing respect for others**
  - Organizations whose values align closer to individuals values tend to be successful in the long term.
  - Inclusion of others in decision making prevents a leader from falling into the negative aspects of charismatic leadership and high self-esteem previously stated.

- **Demonstrating fair treatment**
  - “Employees' sense of a leader's fairness has an empirically proven relationship with employee trust, which in turn creates positive working relationships and positive business outcomes”.
  - The fairness factor in the workplace has been considered the number one issue for dissatisfaction at work.

- **Expressing caring and concern**
  - “Consideration toward others (showing concern, empathy, warmth) has been correlated in empirical studies with high worker job satisfaction, low turnover, group cohesion, group performance, project quality, and group efficiency”.
  - “Demonstrating concern for subordinates is particularly important for lower-level managers who work more closely with employees.”

- **Listening responsively**
  - A positive relationship exists between listening behavior and observed leadership behavior.
- Studies show organizations have improved innovation and overall performance when focusing on listening to their employees.
  - Appreciating the contributions
    - Kouzes & Posner found that 98% of their respondents felt that encouragement helped them to perform at a higher level.
    - “Lack of praise or recognition has also been correlated with managerial failure”.
    - “Hollander & Kelly Found that ‘rewardingness’ (praise) was one of four consistent differentiators between good and bad leadership”.
  - Reflective practice
    - Taking part in reflective practices (meditating, journaling, spiritual reading and/or self examination) has shown to decrease stress and grant a sense of control in one’s life.
    - Studies have shown self reflection to help find discipline in life and aid in resiliency.
    - Self reflection has shown to reduce the amount of hospital visits and surgeries.

**Conclusion**

In Reave’s analysis she concludes that behaviors associated with spirituality are closely tied with effective leadership behaviors. Though she develops her answer carefully through a number of sources there are some shortcomings to point out. In many areas of her work she draws from anecdotal evidence rather than significant empirical research. To her credit she lists this herself as a drawback of her study as she claims this area of study is still in the beginning stages of research. This is shown furthermore in that she did not conduct original research herself, but rather drew strictly from others research. Although she makes a compelling case for the connection between behaviors associated with spirituality and effective leadership behaviors, I believe her conclusions are not significantly supported by quantitative data.

Looking at this article with a focus on leadership behaviors and effective leadership, the identified behaviors are showing respect for others, demonstrating fair treatment, expressing caring and concern, listening responsively, recognizing the contributions of others, and engaging in reflective practice.
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Which Leadership roles matter to whom? An examination of rater effects on perceptions of effectiveness

Robert Hooijberg and Jaepil Choi

Introduction

In measuring leadership effectiveness many studies have been modeled after how the agreement between self and the rater are similar and different. Hooijberg and Choi attempt to look at the impact the role of the rater has on the rating of leadership effectiveness of the leader being reviewed. The intent is to see how the perception of leadership effectiveness differs among groups of subordinates, peers and superiors of a leader. In doing so the hope is also to show the importance of the 360 degree feedback tool that emphasizes the important of performance ratings for oneself from subordinates, peers and superiors.

The following are the intended hypotheses that Hooijberg and Choi intend to test followed by more details in the methodology summary section.

**Hypothesis 1** A manager's subordinates will positively associate the coordinator, monitor, mentor, facilitator, and broker leadership roles with effectiveness.

**Hypothesis 2** A managers’ peers will positively associate the producer, director, coordinator, monitor, and facilitator leadership roles with effectiveness.

**Hypothesis 3** A managers’ superiors will positively associate the innovator, broker, producer, and director roles with effectiveness.

**Hypothesis 4a** Managers will associate the frequent performance of all eight leadership roles with effectiveness.

**Hypothesis 4b** Managers will have a leadership effectiveness model similar to their superiors.

**Hypothesis 4c** Managers will have a leadership effectiveness model similar to their subordinates.
Summary of Methodology

To test the author’s hypotheses 252 middle managers who had participated in the executive education program at the University of Michigan Business School who worked in the public utility industry were chosen. Middle managers were chosen because “their effectiveness depends to a large extent on their ability to exercise leadership in all directions and to meet the multiple demands”. The public utility industry was chosen because studies show middle managers in this industry have low ability and would be able to better understand the needs of their superiors and subordinates. The added fact that the sample all underwent the same executive education program adds another constant to add reliability to the study.

The middle managers were asked to distribute 9 questionnaire packets to their subordinates, peers and superiors with questions on their leadership performance. With the promise of confidentiality there was an average response of four subordinates, two peers and between one and two superiors who completed surveys. The description of the demographics states:

“The 252 managers came from 132 different U.S. public utility companies. The participants were predominantly white (93%) and male (90%); 79% were between 36 and 50 years of age and had been in their current position for an average of 3 years. Thirty-six percent of the participants had a bachelor's degree, 35% had a master's degree, and 7% had a doctorate degree. “

The effectiveness of the managers was determined by the following method:

“The effectiveness of the participating managers was assessed through five items that asked about overall performance: (1) overall managerial success, (2) overall leadership effectiveness, (3) the extent to which the manager met managerial performance standards, (4) how well he or she did compared with his or her managerial peers, and (5) how well he or she performed as a role model. These five items were measured on a 5-point scale, with high scores indicating higher levels of effectiveness. The measures of effectiveness thus indicate how effective managers were perceived to be, by themselves and by their constituents.”

In order to determine what roles were being performed at a given time Hooijberg and Choi used the Competing Values Framework (CVF). The CVF breaks managers roles into 8 categories organized in two quadrants. The task quadrant contains the producer and controller roles, the stability quadrant contain the coordinator and monitor roles, the people quadrant contains the facilitator and mentor roles, and the adaptive quadrant, which contains the innovator and broker roles. Once a role was identified through the
CVF, aggregate data from the leadership effectiveness tool described above was used to determine effectiveness. Aggregate data was used since the focus was on the organization’s perception of the manager’s effectiveness rather than specific individual perceptions.

**Key Findings**

- **Hypothesis 1**  
  - Partial support

- **Hypothesis 2**  
  - Partial Support

- **Hypothesis 3**  
  - Partial Support

- **Hypothesis 4a**  
  - No Support

- **Hypothesis 4b**  
  - Partial Support

- **Hypothesis 4c**  
  - No Support

- The study showed that subordinates, peers and superiors significantly agreed on the importance of “goal achievement role, indicating that assuring attainment of goals, setting clear goals and coordinating work have a strong relationship with perceptions of leadership effectiveness”.

- Peers and subordinates saw facilitating group processes as the “most important criterion for effective leadership” while superiors did not see this as necessary for leading effectively.

- Peers and superiors saw being innovative and trying new ideas as important in being effective while the managers did not see it as extremely necessary to be an effective leader.

- Due to different expectations of leadership effectiveness from middle manager’s subordinates, peers and superiors conflicting expectations can be expected for middle managers.
  - Middle managers tend to follow their superior’s expectations of leadership effectiveness more than their subordinates or peers.
A useful tool for middle managers to collect input for leadership effectiveness from different sources who have different expectations is the 360 degree feedback method.

- Factors such as strategic planning, visioning, networking, and broader social skills were not evaluated.

**Conclusion**

The stated limitations and weaknesses of this study are in the survey distribution, the sample composition, measuring flaws and concern using the CVF. When distributing the survey managers were asked to distribute it to people who would have good insight on the manager’s performance. The study did not implement any way to stop managers from only distributing the study to subordinates, peers and superiors that the manager believed would give positive feedback to inflate their performance results. The sample composition was primarily made up of white males, which makes it difficult to apply the results of these findings to female or minority managers. The measuring flaw is seen in using the same measure for leadership behavior and effectiveness which could cause method bias in the data set. Worries exist over using the CVF model because findings show that there were six key roles that managers participated in and not eight. Due to the importance of the CVF in this study when its reliability is in question, the results may also be under question until the CVF can be made more reliable with future research. Recommendations for future research included actions take place to mitigate these stated limitations.

When considering how this study reflects on specific behaviors and leadership behaviors a few specific behaviors can be derived. Due to the fact that leaders in this survey were exposed to different sources of expectations in regards to effectiveness it is important to understand these differing expectations. In order to understand these differing expectations a leader would benefit from listening in order to collect information from the different expectations (i.e. subordinates v. peers v. superiors). Due to these differing expectations it is also important to behave adaptively since a leader’s response to a situation may vary depending on whose expectation of leadership effectiveness is relevant at the time. Despite the lack of consensus by subordinates, peers and superiors being innovative and facilitating group processes were also given support for behaviors relating to leading effectively.
### Appendix C
Behaviors found in the Journal of College Student Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Posner</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine Vision/Goals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be adaptive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model the way</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the process/innovate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable others to act</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the heart (motivate)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D
Behaviors found in the Leadership Quarterly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>De Hoogh and Den Hartog</th>
<th>Pierro, Cicero, Bonaiuto, Knippenberg and Kruglanski</th>
<th>Reave</th>
<th>Hooijberg and Choi</th>
<th>Hiller, Day and Vance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Strong Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be adaptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the process/innovate</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable others to act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the heart (motivate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define roles clearly</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be moral, ethical and fair</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead prototypically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice self reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize contributions of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>