

# THE CCL GUIDE *to* LEADERSHIP *in* ACTION

How Managers  
and Organizations  
Can Improve the  
Practice of Leadership



Martin Wilcox | Stephen Rush  
Editors

CENTER FOR CREATIVE LEADERSHIP  
Ranked #1 in Leadership Education in *BusinessWeek*

## **Preface: Ideas into Action**

Welcome to *The CCL Guide to Leadership in Action*. It is the aim of this book to help you, as a manager, improve your leadership and your organization, and we believe the quality of the articles offered here speaks for itself. We thought you might be interested, though, in what's behind the articles.

They were originally published in *Leadership in Action*, a bi-monthly magazine that draws on the work of the Center for Creative Leadership. As an international educational institution, CCL has the mission of advancing the understanding, practice, and development of leadership for the benefit of society worldwide. Its faculty, numbering more than one hundred, carries out a range of activities including extensive research, open-enrollment programs, custom interventions, instrument development and application, and coaching.

Since CCL's founding in 1970 this work has followed a simple principle: ideas into action. That principle informs many aspects of this book, but two deserve special mention. First, the content of the articles is a product of CCL's practice as a knowledge community, a practice that takes a systematic approach to transforming ideas into action. Second, the presentation of the articles reflects what we believe is necessary for you to put the ideas contained there into your practice.

## **Practical Content**

The ideas-into-action process at CCL is driven by the CCL faculty. In essence, the faculty takes promising ideas about leadership, tests them through research with managers and

executives in a variety of organizations, puts the ideas that prove out into the most practical terms, and then disseminates them in various formats.

The ideas come from a number of sources. Most originate in CCL's research and educational activities, but many (as the interviews in this book suggest) are generated outside CCL, as the faculty draws on the work of other experts in the fields of leadership and organizational thinking. Whatever their source, however, the ideas are put through this action-oriented process.

Over the years CCL has thus produced a great deal of practical knowledge, and it continues to do so today. But just as important as the amount of knowledge produced is the fact that the knowledge is shared. Unlike the typical university department, professional association, or consultant organization, the CCL faculty is not essentially a collection of individual experts, although the individual credentials of the faculty are impressive; rather, as a knowledge community, its members hold a common philosophy of how leadership can be developed. They work together to understand and generate practical responses to today's leadership and organizational challenges.

What is this philosophy? It begins with the recognition that every person is capable of improving his or her leadership effectiveness. Further, we believe that an organization or community as a whole can enhance its leadership capability by developing the ways in which people throughout the organization or community connect to address their collective challenges.

Thus, in its educational work with individuals, CCL pays particular attention to the development of self-understanding and interpersonal competency. Feedback-rich experiences in a supportive learning environment are an effective way to promote self-understanding and

motivate personal development. Among the learning formats that CCL provides are numerous vehicles for feedback, including 360-degree assessments, psychological instruments, and experiential exercises and simulations. CCL demonstrates a supportive learning environment by allowing people to decide with whom they will share their feedback and learning and by encouraging them to identify how their own hopes and dreams can be aligned with those of others to build effective organizations and communities.

The educational work of CCL also recognizes that effective leadership requires continual learning and development from a wide range of work and life experiences. Although individuals are ultimately responsible for their own learning, organizations and communities can enhance leader development by providing and encouraging participation in a variety of work and life experiences that offer assessment, challenge, and support.

CCL's work with groups and organizations focuses on leadership as a collective or shared process. Leadership processes can be improved not just through the development of individual members of a group or organization but also through collective learning and community development. Experiences that promote dialogue among group and organization members and that facilitate new ways of working together are effective approaches for enhancing leadership in organizations and addressing complex organizational and community challenges.

CCL also acknowledges that the understanding, practice, and development of leadership are subject to cultural influences. Thus the faculty is working to better understand how beliefs and practices need to be augmented to work effectively in various cultural contexts.

# **Straightforward Presentation**

The articles offered here, because they are a product of the CCL knowledge community, are an expression of this philosophy. In order to disseminate this content in a way that is true to the ideas-into-action principle, a systematic effort has been made to ensure that the articles are straightforward and usable in their presentation.

Each article considers an organizational situation that leaders face today and helps you deal with this challenge in two ways. First, it offers an overview that orients you to the situation, and, second, it provides guidelines for action. Not only do these guidelines supply suggestions for taking immediate action, but they also lay the groundwork for future action because they have been chosen to contribute to your ability to learn from your experience as you apply them. We believe that the consistent approach to the presentation of the articles will help you incorporate the ideas contained in them into your practice.

In addition to their focus on specific organizational situations, the articles offered here have a general practical goal. They aim to expand your leadership resources.

It is sometimes overlooked that how you understand leadership has a profound effect on how you practice it—and how you develop. If you view leadership in the conventional way, as a set of characteristics—or behaviors—that you need in order to influence people to follow you, then you will probably focus on your own individual resources when confronted with an organizational challenge.

If, however, you think of leadership as a collective process, one that individuals with particular skills can facilitate but that must fundamentally involve many members of the organization, then you may well be able to access far

greater resources. Many of the things you do will be the same, but you will have some additional, perhaps crucial, options.

## **Conclusion**

We believe this book offers a distinct value: the benefit of CCL's efforts as a unique knowledge community with a well-defined educational philosophy that guides the development of products to help people learn from their own experience about how to improve leadership.

You can learn more about the authors who represent this community in the contributors list that follows this preface. For those who would like to learn more about CCL's educational philosophy and methods, we recommend taking a look at another recently published book—the second edition of *The Center for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development*.

*Greensboro, North Carolina  
February 2004*

Martin Wilcox  
Director of Publications, CCL  
Editor, *Leadership in Action*  
Stephen Rush  
Managing Editor, *Leadership in Action*

# Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all the people who have contributed articles to *Leadership in Action* over the years, both those whom we were able to include in this book and those who provided the many other fine pieces we weren't able to include. They are too numerous to list here but they are the soul of this book.

We would also like to thank the people who have provided guidance and support in the production of *LiA*: Wilfred Drath, Joanne Ferguson, Mary Garrett, Phyllis Hawkins, Jennifer Hines, Marcia Horowitz, Ross Horowitz, Lily Kelly-Radford, Sara King, Susan Lewis, Kelly Lombardino, Elspeth MacHattie, Karen Mayworth, Tom McCarthy, Cynthia McCauley, Sarah Miller, Marianne Moorhead, Deborah Nasitka, Alice Rowan, Marian Ruderman, Byron Schneider, Pete Scisco, Kathe Sweeney, Ellen Van Velsor, JoAnn Wasserman, and Frank Welsch. Your help has always been appreciated.

## List of Contributors

**John Alexander** is president of the Center for Creative Leadership.

**Paige Bader**, a doctoral student at George Mason University, was an intern at CCL during 2002. She holds an M.A. degree from George Mason University.

**Vidula Bal**, a senior research associate at CCL in San Diego, holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of Texas at Austin.

**David Baldwin**, a senior program associate at CCL in San Diego, holds an M.S. degree from Illinois State University.

**Katherine Beatty**, a program manager at CCL in Colorado Springs, holds a Ph.D. degree from Saint Louis University.

**David Berke**, a senior program associate at CCL in San Diego, holds an M.B.A. degree from the University of Southern California and an M.A. degree from the State University of New York at Stony Brook.

**Raoul J. Buron**, formerly the director of feedback and coaching at CCL, is vice president, chief learning officer, with Prudential Financial in Newark, New Jersey. He holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of Southern California.

**Allan Calarco**, a program manager at CCL in Brussels, Belgium, holds an M.S. degree from Shippensburg University.

**David Campbell**, the H. Smith Richardson Senior Fellow at CCL in Colorado Springs, holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of Minnesota.

**Keith A. Caver**, formerly group director of custom solutions for North America, at CCL in Greensboro, holds



an M.S. degree from the Air Force Institute of Technology.

**Craig Chappelow**, senior manager, assessment and development resources, at CCL in Greensboro, holds an M.Ed. degree from the University of Vermont.

**Jay A. Conger**, a professor of organizational behavior at the London Business School and senior research scientist at the Center for Effective Organizations at the University of Southern California, was CCL's H. Smith Richardson Jr. Visiting Fellow for 2000.

**Wilfred H. Drath**, a senior fellow and an R&D director for leadership systems and strategies at CCL in Greensboro, holds a B.A. degree from the University of Georgia.

**Christopher Ernst**, a senior associate at CCL in Greensboro, holds a Ph.D. degree from North Carolina State University.

**Robert C. Ginnett**, a senior fellow at CCL in Colorado Springs, holds a Ph.D. degree from Yale University.

**Kelly Hannum**, a research associate at CCL in Greensboro, holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

**Wayne Hart**, a feedback and coaching manager at CCL in San Diego, holds a Ph.D. degree from the Fielding Institute in Santa Barbara, California.

**Michael H. Hoppe**, a senior program and research associate at CCL in Greensboro, holds an M.S. degree from the University of Munich, Germany, and a Ph.D. degree from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

**Kim Kanaga**, director of CCL's Greensboro campus, holds a Ph.D. degree from Michigan State University.

**Karen Kirkland**, a senior program associate at CCL in San Diego, holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of

Missouri.

**Gene Klann**, a senior program associate at CCL in Greensboro, holds a Ph.D. degree from the Free University of Brussels.

**Michael E. Kossler**, a senior enterprise associate in the custom solutions group at CCL in Greensboro, holds an M.A. degree from the University of Akron and an M.M. degree from Aquinas College.

**Jean Brittain Leslie**, senior manager, assessment and development, at CCL in Greensboro, holds an M.A. degree from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

**Ancella B. Livers**, a program manager at CCL in Greensboro, holds a Ph.D. degree from Carnegie Mellon University.

**Dana McDonald-Mann**, formerly senior program associate at CCL, is a vice president in leadership development at Wachovia Corporation in Charlotte, North Carolina. She holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of Maryland, College Park.

**Sharon McDowell-Larsen**, a program associate at CCL in Colorado Springs, holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

**Patricia J. Ohlott**, a senior associate at CCL in Greensboro, holds a B.A. degree from Yale University and has completed graduate work at Duke University.

**Sonya Prestridge**, formerly a senior program associate in the custom solutions group at CCL in Greensboro, is retired and living in Durham, North Carolina. She holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

**Don W. Prince**, open enrollment manager for CCL in Brussels, Belgium, holds degrees from the University of

North Texas and Southwestern Seminary.

**Laura Quinn**, formerly a senior program and research associate at CCL in Colorado Springs, is an associate professor in the communications department at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. She holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of Texas at Austin.

**Marian N. Ruderman**, an R&D Director for context of difference, at CCL in Greensboro, holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of Michigan.

**Stephen Rush** is the managing editor of *Leadership in Action*.

**Valerie I. Sessa**, formerly a research scientist at CCL in Greensboro, is an assistant professor of industrial and organizational psychology at Montclair State University in Upper Montclair, New Jersey. She holds a Ph.D. degree from New York University.

**David Sharpe**, an enterprise design associate, is based in Nashville, Tennessee. She holds an M.S. degree from North Carolina A&T State University.

**Judith L. Steed**, a research associate at CCL in Colorado Springs, holds an M.S. degree from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

**Jodi J. Taylor**, formerly a vice president of CCL, is managing partner for US Leadership Services, Whitehead Mann LLC. She holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of Texas at Austin.

**Stephanie Trovas**, marketing strategy manager with CCL in Colorado Springs, holds an M.B.A. degree from the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs.

**Sloan R. Weitzel**, formerly a product manager for online digital services at CCL in Greensboro, holds an M.B.A. degree from Duke University.

**Part I**  
***Creating Healthy Leaders***

# ***Chapter One***

## **Skills for Leaders**

Probably the most discussed and thoroughly researched question among people concerned with leadership is this: What skills (or behaviors or personal attributes) are necessary for a leader to be effective? Thousands of skill lists have been assembled, frequently as part of a definition of leadership, and this continues to be a fundamental question. What is significant, as this chapter illustrates, is how these lists increasingly focus on skills that allow leaders to enhance the effectiveness of others.

## **Making the Connection: Leadership Skills and Emotional Intelligence**

*Marian N. Ruderman, Kelly Hannum, Jean Brittain Leslie, and Judith L. Steed*

Stuart is a senior manager at a well-known pharmaceutical company. He is brilliant, and everyone who knows him believes he has the potential to achieve great things. His primary strength is strategic thinking; colleagues say he has an uncanny ability to predict and plan for the future. As Stuart has advanced in the organization, however, his dark side has become increasingly apparent: he often lashes out at people, and he is unable to build relationships based on trust. Stuart knows he is intelligent and tends to use that knowledge to belittle or demean his co-workers. Realizing that Stuart has extraordinary skills and much to offer the company in terms of vision and strategy, some of his colleagues have tried to help him work past his flaws. But they're beginning to conclude that it's a hopeless cause;

Stuart stubbornly refuses to change his style, and his arrogant *modus operandi* has offended so many people that Stuart's career may no longer be salvageable.

Every company probably has someone like Stuart—a senior manager whose IQ approaches the genius level but who seems clueless when it comes to dealing with other people. These types of managers may be prone to getting angry easily and verbally attacking co-workers, often come across as lacking compassion and empathy, and usually find it difficult to get others to cooperate with them and their agendas. The Stuarts of the world make you wonder how people so smart can be so incapable of understanding themselves and others.

What Stuart is lacking is *emotional intelligence*. There may be little hope of salvaging Stuart's career, but there is good news for managers who are similarly deficient in emotional intelligence capacities but willing to try to change their ways: emotional intelligence can be developed and enhanced.

## **Dealing with Emotions**

In articles published in 1990, psychologists Jack Mayer of the University of New Hampshire and Peter Salovey of Yale University coined the term *emotional intelligence*, referring to the constellation of abilities through which people deal with their own emotions and those of others. Mayer and Salovey later went on to define emotional intelligence as the ability to perceive emotional information and use it to guide thought and actions; they distinguished it from cognitive intelligence, which is what determines whether people will be successful in school and is measured through IQ tests.

The concept of emotional intelligence was popularized by psychologist Daniel Goleman in his books *Emotional*

*Intelligence and Working with Emotional Intelligence*, among other writings. Goleman broadened the notion of emotional intelligence to include an array of noncognitive abilities that help people adapt to all aspects of life. He focused on four basic competencies—self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, and social skills—that influence the way people handle themselves and their relationships with others. He argued that these human competencies play a bigger role than cognitive intelligence in determining success in life and in the workplace.

Mayer, Salovey, and Goleman were not the first to recognize the significance of the attributes now collectively called emotional intelligence. For years before, managers, educators, human resource professionals, and others had seen evidence that these attributes—known then by more generic, colloquial terms such as *people skills*—seemed to play an important role in separating the average from the first-rate performers. Like Goleman, many of these observers believed these skills were more important than intellect or technical skills in determining success.

Throughout CCL's more than thirty-year history, one of its primary approaches to leadership development has been to help managers and executives to understand themselves and others better, to increase their self-awareness, self-management, and interpersonal skills—in other words, to expand their emotional intelligence, although CCL has not used that term. CCL has done this through a range of programs, simulations, publications, and tools—including Benchmarks, a 360-degree assessment instrument that measures leaders' strengths and development needs as compared with those of other leaders. Although CCL and others have long believed that people's levels of emotional competency are related to their effectiveness as leaders, little had been done to scientifically examine and document whether specific elements of emotional intelligence are

linked to specific behaviors associated with leadership effectiveness and ineffectiveness—and if they are, how they are linked. With this goal, CCL designed and conducted a study that correlated Benchmarks results with scores from an assessment instrument through which people gauge their own emotional intelligence abilities. Although the findings are not sufficient to state conclusively that leaders with high levels of emotional intelligence are better leaders, they do show that there are clear and basic connections between the higher ranges of emotional intelligence and the possession of skills and abilities associated with leadership excellence. Knowing and understanding these connections can give managers and executives additional ammunition in their efforts to enhance their leadership performance.



## **Note**

To explore whether specific behaviors associated with leadership effectiveness are connected to particular elements of emotional intelligence, CCL designed and conducted a study in which 302 managers took part. The managers, who were participants in CCL's Leadership Development Program, were assessed through Benchmarks, a 360-degree feedback instrument that gives managers insights into how their bosses, peers, direct reports, and they themselves perceive their leadership strengths and development needs. The managers also completed the BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i), with which people assess themselves on fifteen components of emotional intelligence. The BarOn EQ-i was developed through nineteen years of research conducted around the world by clinical psychologist Reuven Bar-On and is published by Multi-Health Systems of North Tonawanda, New York. The results from Benchmarks and the BarOn EQ-i were correlated to reveal associations between leadership skills, perspectives, and derailment factors and aspects of emotional intelligence.

The senior-level managers in the study averaged just under forty-three years old. Seventy-three percent were male, 81 percent were white, and 90 percent had a minimum of a bachelor's degree.

## **Strongest Links**

The study comparing Benchmarks results with scores from the BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory, an assessment of emotional intelligence, found that ten of the sixteen skills and perspectives assessed by Benchmarks were strongly

associated with one or more emotional intelligence measures. In other words, higher levels of certain emotional intelligence components appear to be connected to better performance in those ten areas. Benchmarks is also designed to identify potential problem areas that can contribute to derailment, which occurs when a manager who has previously been seen as successful and full of potential for continued advancement is instead fired, demoted, or held on a career plateau. Associations were also found between two of these career-threatening flaws and certain aspects of emotional intelligence.

Let's look first at the connections between emotional intelligence and leadership skills and perspectives:

*Participative management.* Of all the skills and perspectives measured by Benchmarks, participative management had the highest number of meaningful correlations with measures of emotional intelligence. The essence of participative management is getting buy-in from colleagues at the beginning of an initiative by involving them, engaging them through listening and communicating, influencing them in the decision-making process, and building consensus. It is an important relationship-building skill, especially in today's management environment, in which organizations value interdependency within and between groups. Depending on the Benchmarks rater (boss, peer, or direct report), scores in participative management were related to the emotional intelligence abilities of social responsibility (being a cooperative, contributing, and constructive member of one's social group), happiness (feeling satisfied with and deriving pleasure from life), interpersonal relationship (establishing and maintaining mutually satisfying relationships), impulse control (resisting impulsive behavior), emotional self-awareness (being in touch with one's own feelings), and empathy (understanding and appreciating the feelings of

others). These correlations suggest that managers who are perceived as being skilled at listening to others and gaining their input before implementing change are likely also to see themselves as satisfied with life and good at cooperating, fostering relationships, controlling impulses, and understanding their own and others' emotions.

*Putting people at ease.* People who are warm and have a good sense of humor are often able to make others feel at ease, relaxed, and comfortable in their presence. The connections between this skill and emotional intelligence qualities also varied according to who did the rating. The assessments by managers' direct reports indicated that the ability to put people at ease was related to impulse control, which suggests that not overreacting in difficult situations and avoiding knee-jerk responses such as quick anger go a long way toward making people feel relaxed. The assessments by bosses indicated that managers' ability to put others at ease was tied to the managers' own sense of happiness, suggesting that a manager's disposition is a determinant of how comfortable people feel in his or her presence.

*Self-awareness.* Managers who were seen by their bosses, peers, and direct reports as having an accurate picture of their strengths and weaknesses and as being willing to improve gave themselves high ratings on the emotional intelligence abilities of impulse control and stress tolerance (withstanding adverse events and stressful situations without falling apart). This suggests that managers who are aware that they may easily explode into anger or become anxious in the face of difficult situations are likely to be perceived as lacking in self-awareness. The assessments by managers' direct reports indicated that self-awareness is also related to social responsibility.

*Balance between personal life and work.* Managers who had demonstrated to their bosses that they were adept at balancing their work priorities with their personal lives so that neither was neglected gave themselves high ratings in the emotional intelligence abilities of social responsibility, impulse control, and empathy. This suggests that if you give your boss the impression that you are a whole person with a well-rounded life, you're more likely to believe in your abilities to contribute to a group, resist impulsive actions, and understand the emotions of others. Ratings on work-life balance from direct reports were also associated with impulse control.

*Straightforwardness and composure.* From all rater perspectives, the leadership skills of remaining steadfast and calm during crises, relying on facts, and being able to recover from mistakes were related to impulse control. Direct reports' ratings of their managers' straightforwardness and composure were also associated with stress tolerance, social responsibility, and optimism (the ability to maintain a positive attitude even in the face of adversity), and bosses' ratings of managers' resolve and poise were related to managers' own sense of happiness.

*Building and mending relationships.* Bosses' assessments of managers' abilities to develop and maintain solid working relationships with people inside and outside their organizations and to negotiate work-related problems without alienating people were linked to impulse control, and direct reports' ratings were associated with stress tolerance. These connections make sense: managers who are prone to explosive outbursts and an inability to control hostility don't do much to help their relationships with their bosses, and problematic relationships with direct reports often cause stress for managers, or conversely, managers' inability to cope with stress and adversity often results in poor relationships with the people they supervise.

*Doing whatever it takes.* The leadership abilities of being perseverant and staying focused in the face of obstacles, of being action oriented and taking charge, and of taking a stand on one's own if required and at the same time being open to learning from others were associated by managers' bosses and direct reports with the emotional intelligence component of independence. People who rate themselves highly on independence see themselves as being self-directed and self-controlled in their thinking and actions and as being free of emotional dependency. Additionally, bosses' assessments of managers' ability to do whatever it takes were connected with assertiveness—expressing feelings, beliefs, and thoughts in a constructive way—and direct reports' ratings on this leadership skill were connected with optimism. So it appears that managers who are good at doing whatever it takes are more likely to be self-reliant, autonomous, and persistent and positive, even when they encounter adversity.

*Decisiveness.* Managers said by their direct reports to prefer quick, unhesitating, and approximate actions over slow and precise moves gave themselves high marks on the emotional intelligence quality of independence. This indicates that managers who characterize themselves as independent thinkers and as being self-directed and self-controlled in their actions are more likely to be seen as decisive by the people who work for them.

*Confronting problem employees.* Peers' assessments of the degree to which managers were able to deal with difficult workers decisively and fairly were tied to the emotional intelligence measure of assertiveness. This indicates that being able to express one's feelings, beliefs, and thoughts in a constructive way is helpful in handling employees whose performance isn't up to par.

*Change management.* Direct reports' ratings of their managers' effectiveness at implementing strategies to facilitate organizational change initiatives and overcome resistance to change were connected with the emotional intelligence ability of social responsibility. Peers' assessments of managers' change management skills were linked to the emotional intelligence measure of interpersonal relationship. Thus it appears that managers who are cooperative members of their social groups and who are adept at building and sustaining working relationships characterized by intimacy and affection are likely to also be good at leading change by example, involving others in change initiatives, and adjusting to changing situations.

## **Fast Track to Nowhere**

The second section of Benchmarks is designed to identify potential problem areas that can contribute to career derailment. The study found associations between two of these career-threatening flaws and certain aspects of emotional intelligence.

*Problems with interpersonal relationships.* The connections between managers' difficulties in developing good working relations with others and managers' self-assessments of their emotional intelligence abilities were some of the most striking found in the study. From all three rater perspectives, managers who were seen as having problems with interpersonal relationships—a career flaw characterized by insensitivity, arrogance, impatience, authoritarianism, volatility, and other negative traits and behaviors—scored low on the emotional intelligence ability of impulse control. Interpersonal relationship ratings from direct reports and peers were related to stress tolerance, ratings from direct reports were associated with social responsibility, and bosses' assessments were connected

with empathy. These results suggest that no matter how strong their intellectual or technical skills, managers who care little about being cooperative and contributing members of their groups, who can't handle pressure, who easily explode and take their frustrations out on others, and who don't understand or appreciate the feelings of others may be setting themselves up for derailment.

*Difficulty changing or adapting.* Direct reports' ratings of their managers' resistance to change and ability to learn from mistakes were related to the emotional intelligence measures of stress tolerance and impulse control. A possible explanation for this connection is that managers who have a hard time with change often have a limited comfort zone. When they are forced outside that zone, it sets off anger and resentment, which in turn produces stress.

## **Points to Ponder**

Four principal themes stand out from the relationships found between leadership abilities and emotional intelligence and between derailment characteristics and emotional intelligence:

- As organizations realize that the command-and-control, hierarchical model of leadership is no longer effective, they are increasingly moving toward a more participative management style. It appears that managers can more easily embrace this change and adapt to this style when they have certain emotional intelligence abilities—forming good working relationships, being cooperative and constructive members of a group, controlling anger and other impulses, and in general being pleasant to be around. Co-workers view managers with these characteristics as being effective in the participative style.

- Being centered and grounded is a valuable quality for managers. It's important for managers to give the impression that they are in control of themselves, understand themselves, and know their own strengths and weaknesses. The degree to which managers are perceived as being self-aware, straightforward, and composed and as having balance between their personal and work lives is based largely on how they react under pressure and in difficult situations. If they fall apart or flare up with anger, their leadership abilities are liable to be questioned; if they are imperturbable and resist flying off the handle, their managerial skills are likely to be confirmed.
- A willingness and ability to take action is key to effective leadership. Decisiveness and doing whatever it takes to achieve a goal are associated with independence in thought and actions. Managers who are independent do not ignore the opinions of others but are also not dependent on such input. This self-reliance helps them think strategically, make good decisions, and persevere in the face of obstacles.
- Organizations are placing increased value on interpersonal relationships, and managers who don't handle their emotions well, who lack understanding of themselves and others, and who are abrasive or abusive make others feel uncomfortable. That increases their chances of derailing.

## **What You Can Do**

Emotional intelligence can be developed and enhanced, although doing so takes a lot of effort. Managers who are in danger of derailing because of poor interpersonal relationships are particularly good candidates for working on their emotional intelligence. In general, assessment and



feedback instruments such as Benchmarks are good ways to begin improving emotional intelligence, followed by goal setting and a developmental experience that may take the form of classroom training, job assignments, simulations, coaching, or learning from a role model. Managers should identify and address any obstacles to their goals, practice new behaviors in a supportive environment, and review and reassess their behavioral changes to help lock in what they have learned.

More specifically, organizations today value managers who can put the needs of the group ahead of their personal needs—in other words, who have the emotional intelligence capacity of social responsibility. One way to develop this ability may be to involve yourself in the community through charities, nonprofit organizations, and other worthy causes. Devoting time and energy to such groups can help you see beyond your own concerns and improve your ability to be a valued member of a group. Another way to develop social responsibility is to review your individual work goals, then consider them from the perspectives of your team and organization. Ask yourself whether your individual goals facilitate and are aligned with the group and organizational goals, and what you can do to contribute positively to the larger goals.

The ability to handle stress is related to a range of leadership skills and derailment factors. Managers who are lacking in these related characteristics may want to consider stress management training. Be careful, however, to choose a program or workshop that is well designed and has a record of good results. Some of the better programs include assessment, feedback, modeling and practice of new skills, and ongoing support to keep people from lapsing back to their old ways.

Finally, the emotional intelligence ability of impulse control was related to ratings on eight Benchmarks scales. The manifestations of poor impulse control—such as aggression, hostility, irresponsibility, and frustration—are highly conspicuous to colleagues, so learning to restrain impulsive behavior can do a lot to improve a manager’s interactions at work. If you have problems with impulse control, you might want to consider coaching as a way to develop composure, patience, self-awareness, adaptability, and coolness under fire. A coach can help you pinpoint your hot buttons and learn how to respond more effectively in situations of conflict or adversity.

## **Through a New Lens: A Talk with Margaret J. Wheatley**

*John Alexander*

Margaret J. Wheatley writes, teaches, and speaks about radically new ideas for organizing and leading in chaotic times. She is president of the Berkana Institute, a global leadership foundation supporting life-affirming leaders around the world. Wheatley works to create organizations, communities, and systems that are worthy of human habitation and in which people are seen as the blessing, not the problem. She has written two award-winning books: *Leadership and the New Science* and *A Simpler Way* (with Myron Kellner-Rogers). Her latest book is the just-published *Turning to One Another: Simple Conversations to Restore Hope to the Future*. Her articles and work can be accessed at [www.margaretwheatley.com](http://www.margaretwheatley.com).

I met with her during the third annual Friends of the Center Leadership Conference in Kansas City, Missouri, at midyear of 2001. Here are excerpts from the interview:

*JA: I would like to focus on the understanding of leadership and the role of the leader in organizations. You have talked about the importance of trust in the leader, so let's start there.*

MW: What's interesting to me about this question of trust is that it is a very reciprocal relationship. People need to trust their leader and need to feel that their leader trusts them. One of the biggest stumbling blocks in moving toward more participation and dealing with more diversity is that leaders have not been taught to trust people. Leaders always think about the people in their organization who are untrustworthy. These people kind of mesmerize the leaders with their presence.

*JA: Still, you can reach a tipping point at which these people can have an influence on everybody else and a kind of malaise develops.*

MW: For me this is always an indication that the organization or part of the organization is not walking its talk. In a strongly cohesive, principle-centered work organization, rumors can't spread, because people won't believe them. How do people evaluate whether what they hear is true? It's based on their experience with the organization and with its leaders. So trust is the solution to stopping the incessant flow of rumors and gossip. I have been saying for years that we don't appreciate how much order we can get from good values.

*JA: If you had to give a leader of an organization one bit of advice, would it be to look not only at his or her own values but also the values of the organization?*

MW: I would say that the leader should spend a lot of time creating the identity of the organization—what its values are, what its mission is, what its purpose is, and how is everyone in the organization going to act together as one.

These are agreements on how people are going to work together.

*JA: So part of that philosophy would be living the values, not only in the positive sense but also in the sense that if the values are violated then disciplinary action is taken. People who violate the values are spoken to, and if there is a repetition of the behavior they are asked to leave.*

MW: That's right. You can get a whole team or a whole group to hold one another accountable. It isn't the sole responsibility of the leader to notice who is breaking the values and who needs to be fired. In fact, a team can regulate itself in a much more immediate way than a leader can. A leader does sometimes have to step in in cases of true deviants or people who are out to sabotage the organization. Otherwise, I am seeing teams that call each other to account for their behavior. So even that responsibility moves off the shoulders of the leader.

*JA: You have talked about how the leader can no longer be seen as a lone player in an organization.*

MW: The World Wide Web, which is the best example of a self-organized network, has shown us that it is impossible to see or know all that you think you are supposed to know. So we need to realize that we need many more eyes and ears interpreting the information we receive. But people can do that only in a cohesive organization, and the only way to form a cohesive organization is to pay attention to the identity first.

*JA: You have also talked about passion and creativity coming from within the individual in a spontaneous way and your belief that individuals will give true support only to that which they have created. With costs what they are today, almost anything creative that people do seems to have an expensive technology component attached to it.*

*When it comes to creativity and the funding of technology to enable creativity, how do you balance the desire to let a hundred flowers bloom with the need to prioritize and pick only certain flowers?*

MW: In the old model, leaders said they were going to reward creativity, took everyone's suggestions, then paid bonuses to the people who came up with the solutions that the leaders thought were best. In my experience, when you get people together as a unit or team to figure out the most effective response to the question of balancing creativity and funding, they are far more realistic. I find that people in groups are more capable of making intelligent decisions and putting intelligent restrictions on their creativity. When you get a team together to figure out a solution to a problem and you say it can't cost more than this and it can't take longer than this, people get creative within those parameters. They also make much more holistic decisions that account for many more factors. What I do see as a problem is that every time organizations and leaders spend a lot of money creating a solution and then trying to impose it, they spend even more money trying to get people to accept the structure that was imposed. They spend not only money but also an enormous amount of time trying to mop up from the consequences.

*JA: How do you organize around the work without people saying, "I don't know what I'm being held accountable for; I don't know where to go to get a decision made"?*

MW: For me, one of the big questions is, "How do you lead in that work?" Let's assume that the work will be networked, because that's the natural form of organizing. I accept that that is our future. I also accept that for many hundreds if not thousands of years we have been struggling under a form of power relationships and hierarchy that has not prepared us to deal with a networked world. But how

do you create very effective localized units that have great levels of autonomy yet are connected to the whole through their identity? What is the information that people should report to each other across the local unit? I don't know the answers to these questions yet.

*JA: What does one say to a leader of a publicly held company whose stock price and quarterly numbers are scrutinized on a daily or even hourly basis?*

MW: There are no solutions for effective leadership within this current insanity of playing companies as if they were poker chips. What has to change is the whole game.

I am looking at companies that are buying themselves back; that is a small but significant trend. Some leaders are just trying to get back the space in which they can think long-term. I'm waiting for the time when a group of powerful CEOs will get together and start to push back against this ridiculous way of life.

*JA: HR professionals with whom we work at CCL are being pressed to figure out how to develop people faster to get them to a higher level of performance. Do you have any advice for them?*

MW: It is an impossibility. If you look at any good company's approach to development, it is long-term; it includes a real focus on the values of the company and developing real business capacity. You cannot fool employees that you are actually developing them if you are only thinking, "OK, here's the next thing you have to learn, but we are not really thinking about you as a long-term resource for the company."

Many companies need to understand that if they are not in development for the long term, they should not even be thinking about it. We are experiencing a vast implosion of all kinds of highly structured organizations. Look at what is