

LEADERSHIP RESEARCH: WHERE IRRELEVANCE PREVAILS

Jon Aarum Andersen

Linnaeus University, School of Business and Economics
S-351 95 Växjö, Sweden
jon.andersen@lnu.se

Abstract

Is contemporary managerial leadership research relevant and helpful to managers? Arguably, managers' main task and prime concern is to contribute to the attainment of organisational goals, i.e., to enhance organizational effectiveness. On the basis of this premise of relevance, a survey of 105 research articles published in two international journals year 2011 reveals that researchers did not address this question. In these articles the term 'effectiveness' occurred about one time for every 1000 words. In the 105 articles effectiveness was seldom defined and never measured. If managers' prime concern is to contribute to organizational effectiveness, then there is no surprise that several scholars have found that managers regard leadership research irrelevant and useless.

Keywords: leadership research, effectiveness, publications, relevance

1. INTRODUCTION

In all formal organizations some individuals are given the authority and responsibility for five basic activities: planning, organizing, directing, co-ordination, and control (Fayol, 1949). These employees are often referred to as managers, while the five activities are often described as management. The employees who do not have these responsibilities are called subordinates. Management is the process undertaken by one or more individuals to coordinate the activities of others in order to achieve goals of the organization. It is imperative to distinguish between the term leadership (managerial behaviour), which is a function, and leader or manager, which refers to a position in a group or organization. In formal organizations the leaders are called managers or executives. They execute the leadership function. Leadership is part of the managerial process in which the manager guides, supports, motivates the subordinates so that they can fulfill their duties according to the plan of the manager and goal of the organisation. This article deals with managerial leadership and leadership research.

Marturano, Wren, and Harvey (2013: 1) wrote: 'We propose an understanding of leadership as an asymmetrical (albeit interactive and mutual) influence process that serves to articulate, clarify, and facilitate the accomplishment of a group's (organization's, community's, society's) objectives (including, importantly, survival). Thought of in this way, it becomes clear that leadership in some form or another exists essentially any time humans come together to accomplish things. Such a definition permits – indeed, invites – studies of the phenomena of leadership that include not only a fixed focus on 'task accomplishment' or 'member satisfaction,' but also the consideration of broader matters such as the dynamics of context, the philosophical 'meaning' and moral implications of leadership and its objectives, and the impact of leadership on people, both in groups and considered as individuals.'

For theoretical development and empirical research it is imperative to distinguish managerial leadership from political leadership. Sayer (1992: 91) has written: 'What does the existence of this object (in its present form) presuppose? Can it exist on its own as such? A key question could be: What cannot be removed without making the object cease to

exist in its present form?' If the object is managerial leadership, we may ask: What properties must exist for leadership to exist and to be what it is? The argument here is that leader, subordinates, and tasks are the properties that must exist for managerial leadership to exist and to be what it is. A formal leader (manager) is a person who is responsible both for the subordinates and for the results.

Managers appear to find leadership research irrelevant (Astley & Zamuto, 1992; Brownlie et al., 2008). Burack (1979) has noted that managers have regarded leadership research as useless to anyone in leadership positions and that much leadership research is leaderless. Ghoshal (2005: 76) was even more critical and argued that 'academic research related to the conduct of business and management has had some very significant and negative influences on the practice of management.' Additionally, House and Aditya (1997: 456) have concluded: 'A problem with the current study of leadership is that it continues to focus excessively on superior-subordinate relationships to the exclusion of several functions that leaders perform and to the exclusion of organisational and environmental variables that are crucial to effective leadership performance.'

Alvesson and Sandberg (2013) challenge contemporary research as they find that most of it is not influential or interesting. They further argue that management researchers have lost sight of what is the goal and ultimate purpose of management studies, namely to produce original knowledge that matters to organisations and society. What knowledge matters to managers? What kind of scholarly work is relevant and helpful to managers? Stewart (1989) has noted that management studies have failed to look specifically at the relationship between what managers do and what they achieve.

In management and business administration organisations are regarded as contrived entities established as vehicles for the owners so that they can achieve their goals. Goal attainment is therefore the central issue and the basic definition of effectiveness in management theory for private enterprises as well as public agencies. Leadership effectiveness and organisational effectiveness are therefore critical corollaries in management. The distinctions between effectiveness and what causes effectiveness

as well as the distinction between performance and effectiveness are essential.

The firm – as one type of organisation – is perceived clearly and undoubtedly as rationalistic in business administration and management theory (Douma & Schreuder, 2002). The firm is constituted by one or more individuals who have the common goal of generating dividends on the capital invested in it. The very goal itself motivates its establishment. Quite simply, the firm is an instrument, a means for the owners. The goal is financial dividends. The major difference between private companies and public agencies is the motive behind the establishment of these organisations. The private organisation is in operation because some individuals (or other organisations) have decided to invest their funds into the firm. The enterprise is in operation as long as the owners wish it to continue and the market allows it. In contrast, public organisations are in operation because political decisions have been made to establish these agencies. They remain in operation until decisions are made to cease their operations.

When organisations are established the owners appoint some individuals to act on their behalf who are charged with the sole task of attaining the goals decided by the owners. For the manager the goal is imperative, an order. Formal leaders (i.e., managers) are hired to be executives. Their main task is to contribute to the attainment of the goals. The goal of the organisation is not an issue for the managers. It is the reason why they hold executive positions. Maghroori and Rolland (1997) wrote: 'They [managers] do not exist for their own sake. They are to serve the organisation's goal and mission and they remain at all times subservient to it.'

It is crucial to stress that the determination of purposes, goals, strategies and visions in formal organisations is the prerogative of the owners, who decide these and direct their managers to achieve and implement them. A managerial task is to make the goals and strategies *operational* and *known* to the subordinates.

The prime beneficiaries of the business enterprise are the owners (Blau & Scott, 1962). Only by attaining their goals for the organisation can the owners benefit. A central issue is *if* or *to what degree* the organisation achieves its goal. Conse-

quently, goal attainment becomes the core issue for the owners, the managers and the other employees, as well as for researchers of organisations. Based on this premise of relevance, the question addressed here is to what degree current leadership researchers are engaged in solving problems related to leadership and organisational effectiveness. Put differently, in what ways do present-day leadership researchers help business managers to enhance the profitability of their companies?

2. LEADERSHIP

2.1 Definition of leadership

First of all, the phenomenon of leadership needs to be defined. Here leadership is defined as follows: 'Processes of leadership are involved in achieving results with and through others' (Blake & Mouton, 1985: 198). Tannenbaum et al. (1961: 24) presented a quite similar definition: 'interpersonal influence, exercised in a situation, and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals.' Their definition has been generally accepted and it embraces the key concepts (Torrington & Chapman, 1983). Additionally, Blake and Mouton (1985: 9) have stated that 'the process of achieving organisation purpose through the efforts of people results in some people attaining authority to set direction and coordinate effort; that is, to exercise the responsibility for the activities of others. The foundation for understanding leadership is in recognizing that a boss's actions are dictated by assumptions regarding how to use authority to achieve organisation purpose with and through people.'

Leadership may be regarded as the set of behaviors that one or more individuals in a group or organisation exhibit that involves systematic influences that seek to induce other people to perform tasks or to solve problems in order to attain the goals of the organisation.

2.2 What is relevant in leadership research?

Again, several researchers have argued that managers appear to find leadership research irrelevant and that managers regard leadership research as use-

less to managers. Additionally, research related to business has had some very significant and negative influences on the practice of management. Managers perceived leadership research as useless and they ignore it. What managers need to know is how to act and behave in order to enhance organisational effectiveness. Arguably, current leadership scholarship, which does not deal with the question of organisational effectiveness, is irrelevant for those in managerial positions. As Jacques (1990: 5) has written: 'The managerial role has three critical features. First, and most critical, every manager must be held accountable not only for the work of the subordinates but also for adding value to their work.' The supreme task of the formal leader (manager) is to contribute to organisational effectiveness. If leadership research neither directly nor indirectly addresses this issue, this field of research will render itself irrelevant to managers, the very group they are meant to assist.

The people, who constitute the majority of the working population in the modern world, work in order to achieve the goals of the shareholders or owners of companies or the citizens of their society. Those who are employed by business enterprises or who work for public agencies do not necessarily share the goals of their companies or agencies, though they may support the goals of the group or organisation more or less sincerely. In most cases the objects of study are private enterprises and public agencies. The key issue is leadership in organisations (Yukl, 2010), and formal leadership is management. The formal leader is the CEO, manager, chief officer, supervisor or whatever other title used. When Blake and Mouton (1985: 198) defined leadership they stressed the following: 'Whether it is called management, supervision, or administration, the underlying processes establish direction and permit coordination.'

There is a huge difference between the meaning managers ascribe to leadership or construct their leadership (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2003) and the way in which managers perceive and describe the characteristics of their everyday leadership (Holmberg & Tyrstrup, 2010) *versus* how they act and behave in managerial positions. Managerial leadership is not about whom you are, your ideas, your sentiments, your perceptions or your assumptions. It is about acting and what you do and accomplish (Andersen, 2006).

A large portion of leadership research addresses how leaders motivate, stimulate, encourage and create enthusiasm, commitment and inspiration amongst subordinates. However, these effects on subordinates are irrelevant. What, on the other hand, *are* relevant are the consequences of inspired, motivated and enthusiastic employees for the way they perform the tasks necessary to achieve organisational goals.

2.3 Defining and measuring effectiveness

Several literature reviews have concluded that there is little consistency amongst researchers when referring to the concept of organisational effectiveness (Hoy et al., 1984). Their conclusion is that achieving different goals would appear to be the dominant aspects of organisational effectiveness construct. The concept of effectiveness is a ratio that implies two entities when defining and measuring effectiveness (e.g., profitability).

It is imperative to distinguish between concepts like effectiveness, efficiency and productivity which are ratios (relation between two entities) on one hand, and performance which is a one-entity concept, on the other. Sales, profit, customer ratings, stock prices are performance and one-unit variables. Organisational effectiveness, on the other hand, is an end variable and a dependent variable. Performance variables like profit, sales, customer ratings, stock prices as well as efficiency and productivity are independent variables and thus factors that may cause organisational effectiveness. In the study of Richard et al. (2009) 49 per cent of the studies, which they reviewed, measured organisational performance with a single indicator.

Strasser et al. (1981: 323) defined organisational effectiveness as 'the degree to which organisations are attaining all the purposes they are supposed to.' Both Richard et al. (2009) and Hamann et al. (2013) have argued that organisational performance is a fundamental construct in management. Previous research suggested a framework for organisational performance that included three dimensions of accounting return, growth, and stock market performance. Hamann et al. (ibid.) found, based on an empirical study, the existence of four organisational performance dimensions as the accounting return di-

mension became decomposed into profitability and liquidity dimensions. Richard et al. (2009: 722) have argued that organisational performance encompasses three specific areas: (a) financial performance (profit, return of assets, return on investment, etc.); (b) product market performance (sale, market share etc.); and (c) shareholder return (total shareholder return, economic value added, etc.). They further argued that organisational effectiveness is a broader concept and captures organisational performance plus the plethora of internal performance outcomes like efficiency and external measures associated with economic valuation.

Hamann et al. (2013), however, presented a counter-argument as they stated that organisational effectiveness encompasses organisational performance and other performance concepts. The argument advanced here is that it may be useful to distinguish between concepts which are ratios and those which are one-unit concepts. It is worthwhile to note that Richard et al. (2009) put financial performance measures like profit, which is a one-entity concept, in the same category as return of assets, return on investment, which are ratios. Additionally, several of the concepts investigated by Hamann et al. (2013) are in fact neither ratios nor dependent variables, but rather variables which may enhance organisational effectiveness.

The lack of comparative evaluation research on organisational effectiveness models was addressed by Strasser et al. (1981). They have focused on the problems in conceptually and operationally defining evaluation models in reference to the two schools of thought on organisational effectiveness, being the goal and system models. A theme common to all goal models is the strong emphasis on the organisation which attains some predetermined objective, purpose, mission or goal. This view implies that organisations are goal-seeking entities which should therefore be evaluated by measuring the degree of goal attainment. The criteria underlying goal models are always goals or objectives implying that when goals are attained, the organisation is effective. The goal model assumes that goal attainment is a function of a sequence of activities. Consequently, a goal evaluation cannot be undertaken until organisational activities have had an opportunity to have their effects (ibid.).

The competing values framework developed by Quinn (1988) integrates a variety of organisational effectiveness criteria into four models. Only the 'rational firm model' is consistent with business administration and management theory as the model is characterized by direction, goal clarity, productivity, accomplishment, rational analysis and action taking. In other words, effectiveness is defined as goal attainment. Strasser et al. (1981) did ask: 'Which model offers the evaluated organisation' managers the most useful feedback?' The argument brought forward here is the goal model.

Arguably, the ultimate goal of a company is profitability (i.e., return on assets) (Shetty, 1979; Nash, 1983; Walton & Dawson, 2001). Profitability can be seen as the major criterion of effectiveness for private enterprises. Profitability, moreover, is the most conventional measure of current business performance (Hambrick, 1983). According to Hiller et al. (2011) leadership is a driving force to accomplish goals. Strasser et al. (1981) have argued that all managers in one way or another either implicitly or explicitly evaluate their organisation's performance periodically or even continuously.

In contemporary literature, organisational effectiveness is measured in two different ways: the subjective perception of others and objective measures. Lowe et al. (1996) have asked what might serve as valid and accurate measures of organisational effectiveness. They have suggested a dichotomy, with one group being studies that use the effectiveness criterion labeled 'subordinate perceptions of leader effectiveness,' and the other, objective measures (e.g., profitability or per cent of goals met), which they labeled 'organisational measures of leader effectiveness.' A large number of studies on transformational leadership and effectiveness is based on the subordinates' perception of the leaders' effectiveness (e.g., Dalakoura, 2010; Harms et al., 2012). Cammock et al. (1975) have acknowledged the errors such as halo, leniency and bias of subjective measures. Consequently, successive reviews have deplored the lack of attention to effectiveness in the broader management literature (ibid.).

In business administration profitability, which is an objective measure, is the major criterion of effectiveness for private enterprises. There are, how-

ever, few studies of outcomes of leadership related to objective measures of effectiveness. It is not surprising, therefore, that there have been calls for more objective measures of effectiveness (Cammock et al., 1975). Andersen (1994) has related leadership behavior and situational variables to the degree of financial goal-attainment. In addition, Henderson et al. (2006) have assessed firm performance as a ratio by three measures of profitability: (1) return of sales, (2) return on assets and (3) return on invested capital. Peterson et al. (2009) have also measured firms' effectiveness in terms of the percentage of net-income goals met per year.

Several studies have focused on the measurement of leader effectiveness, which appear to be defined and measured in many different ways. Rosch et al. (2013) measured leadership effectiveness by subjective ratings. Kulas (2013) also used the term leadership effectiveness, which was also measured subjectively. Dalakoura (2010) studied the effects of leadership development on subjective measurements of firm performance. Performance, leadership effectiveness and organisational effectiveness are, however, not the same constructs.

2.4 Leadership and organisational effectiveness

Leadership is seen as an essential element in achieving organisational effectiveness. Collins (2001: 44) wrote: 'Most organisations recognize that effective leadership is one of the most powerful competitive advantages an organisation can possess.' But, is this really the case? Three different approaches have been pursued for testing the relationship between leadership and organisational effectiveness (Andersen, 2000): (1) the leader-succession studies, (2) the leader-contribution studies and (3) the instrumental theories.

The leader-succession approach

Leader-succession studies have shown that managerial change has little impact on team performance. In general, these studies support a skeptical view of the significance of organisational leaders (Thomas, 1993). Hogan et al. (1994: 494) claim that 'some coaches can move from team to team transforming losers into winners is, for most people, evidence that leadership matters'. This

statement is not concurrent with the scientific evidence. A review article of the literature on the impact of managerial successions on team performance in professional sports assessed ten studies on the effect of managerial succession (Andersen, 2011). They cover 80 years (1920-2000), with data from four different sports and two countries. The critical finding is that whichever manager is replaced or for whatever reason, the performance of the team will most likely not improve for that reason alone. In short, a new manager does not make a better team. There is very little evidence that changes in top management in companies affect, in important ways, the magnitude of such traditional performance measures as sales, income and rates of return (Samuelson et al., 1985).

The leader-contribution approach

Studies of how much of an impact leaders have in comparison with other factors – leader contribution studies – can also throw light on this controversy. Thomas (1993) has pointed out that such studies indicate that each of the performance measures was very heavily influenced by environmental conditions and was very little influenced by leadership. Jaffee (2001) has suggested that organisational effectiveness is more likely to be influenced by organisational structure and environmental characteristics.

The instrumental approach

It is first and foremost the instrumental theories (i.e., theories on leadership behavior and its consequences) that may give us answers to the question of whether or not leadership causes organisational effectiveness. One group of theories holds that certain forms of leadership are the direct cause of organisational effectiveness (i.e., universal theories). The other group of theories includes an intermediate variable between leadership and effectiveness (i.e., contingency theories). What insight do the instrumental theories give us?

From the perspective of universal theories, Blake and Mouton (1964) claimed more than 40 years ago that there is one best leadership style ('9, 9 team management'). Fiedler (1967) is the prime advocate for the contingency theory, claiming that leadership behavior must be adjusted to the situation in order to generate organisational effective-

ness. Decades of research based on this theory shows its shortcomings. The contingency theories have been unable to pinpoint the successful combinations of leader behavior and leadership situation. Jaffee (2001: 86) states that 'a big question remains: Is there any evidence for a systematic relationship between leadership style and organisational performance?' The claim made by Hogan et al. (1994: 493) that 'there is a causal and definitional link between leadership and team performance' is contradicted by Yukl (2010). He concludes that 'several thousand empirical studies have been conducted on leadership effectiveness, but many of the results are inconsistent and inconclusive' (ibid.: 476).

Additionally, we may argue that the relationship between leadership and effectiveness is not empirically supported. As Thomas (1993: 133) wrote: 'For in the absence of compelling evidence on the significance of leadership we are forced back to a considerable degree on our convictions and beliefs, and a belief in the potency of leaders is perhaps one of the most deeply rooted of human assumptions.' Khurana (2002) reminds us that we lack any conclusive evidence that links leadership to organisational performance. Studies have shown that various internal and external constraints inhibit an executive's ability to affect a company's performance. The best anyone can say about the effect of a CEO on a company's performance is that it depends greatly on circumstances (ibid.).

3. PREVIOUS REVIEWS

Five previous studies form the basis for the present one even though they have had somewhat different objectives from the present study. The previous studies report on the occurrence of organisational performance in management research. Even though organisational performance is a different concept from organisational effectiveness, it is worthwhile to note that performance occurred in 28 per cent of the abstracts of 439 empirical articles in three journals (1993-1995) reviewed by March and Sutton (1997). In 20 per cent of the articles performance was regarded as a dependent variable. Collins (2001) assessed 54 studies of leadership development research (1984-2000) in order to determine the extent to which the intended outcomes

focused on organisational performance. Outcomes of leadership development programs were reviewed in terms of organisational performance, which was defined as 'a measure of effectiveness or efficiency.' Three studies (19 per cent) addressed financial-level performance as the outcome variable (ibid.). Richard et al. (2009) reviewed 722 articles in five journals (2005-2007) and found that 23 per cent of the articles included organisational performance as a dependent variable. The variable 'financial market' was dealt with in 17 per cent of the articles. Carey et al. (2011) performed a literature review (1996-2010) of 1,414 research titles on coaching models and leadership development. Coaching and leadership development are initiatives to enhance organisational change and effectiveness (ibid.).

The 25-year review (1985-2009) of outcomes of leadership by Hiller et al. (2011) contained a review of 1,161 articles from 11 journals. The most commonly studied outcomes were attitudes, cognitive perceptions and tangible outcomes, such as sales, customer ratings, stock prices or productivity. In this review profitability was categorized as tangible outcomes. The tangible criterion category contains 'return on sales, return on assets, and return on invested capital.' Leadership-effectiveness metrics counted for seven per cent of the criterion domain across the 25-year period (ibid). The review presented here is founded on these outcomes and investigates in detail to what extent contemporary research addresses the relationship between leadership and organisational effectiveness.

4. THE STUDY

What do we find when summing up previous research? March and Sutton (1997) reported that 20 per cent of the 439 empirical articles dealt with performance while Collins (2001) reported that organisational performance appeared in 19 per cent in 54 studies. Additionally, Richard et al. (2009) found that organisational performance appeared in 17 per cent in 722 articles. Hiller et al. (2011) reported the occurrence of leadership effectiveness in 7 per cent of 1,161 articles. None of these studies have investigated the occurrence of organisational effectiveness in particular nor have they reported whether or not the term has been defined or measured.

In the review study by Hiller et al. (2011) profitability was categorized as tangible outcomes. Their survey does not specify the number of studies which have applied return on assets and return on invested capital (profitability) as the criterion variables. As profitability is the major definition of organisational effectiveness for business enterprises, the aim of this present study is to assess to what extent contemporary leadership studies have investigated organisational effectiveness.

Consequently, in order to assess whether or not leadership research is relevant and useful, organisational effectiveness defined as the degree of goal-attainment is the sole criterion. So, leadership research on organisational effectiveness may give the answer to the question of whether or not leadership researchers are failing managers.

The purpose of the present study is to narrow down these studies, that is, *from* a search for broad concepts, *to* the occurrence of the specific concept of organisational effectiveness in leadership studies. In the present study articles, which include the term effectiveness in the abstract and or in the running text, have been scrutinised in order to assess whether the term has been defined and effectiveness measured or not.

This survey of contemporary leadership research contains all 105 research articles published in two international peer-reviewed leadership journals (one US-based and the other UK-based) during the year 2011. It is a relative small sample in regard to the number of peer-review journals on leadership, organisation and management. However, the aim has been to perform a search for studies of leadership related specifically to organisational effectiveness in order to determine the relevance of contemporary scholarship.

The method applied is the same as used by Collins (2001), Hiller et al. (2011) and Carey et al. (2011). In the computer search, all 105 articles have been scrutinized in order to find (1) the frequency of the term 'effectiveness' amongst the key words, (1) the frequency of the same term in the full article, (3) whether the term 'effectiveness' is defined or not, and finally (4) whether effectiveness has been defined and measured likewise. The words 'effectiveness,' 'effective' and 'effectively' have been searched

for. Terms like 'outcome' and 'performance' are found, but not recorded because they are one-entity concepts while effectiveness is defined as a ratio. Articles that contain the term 'leadership effectiveness' have also been recorded in the tables even if leadership effectiveness and organisational effectiveness are not necessarily the same. The term 'effectiveness' found in the list of references is not counted. Independently of each other, two persons did the frequency scorings of the terms in the articles.

5. FINDINGS

Eighty-one articles were published in *The Leadership Quarterly* (ISSN 1048-9843). The word 'effectiveness' was found in the abstract of seven articles (nine per cent) and mentioned 748 times in the articles' running text. The average article contained some 7000 words. The term 'effectiveness' counts for about .001 per cent of the words in these articles. Effectiveness, however, was defined as leadership effectiveness, as perceived leadership effectiveness, as team effectiveness or undefined. The term appeared in 11 of the articles (14 per cent). No articles and none of the 240 authors of 81 articles defined and measured organisational effectiveness.

Of the 24 articles published in journal *Leadership* (ISSN 1742-7150) year 2011, three articles had the word effectiveness in the abstract (13 per cent) while 17 articles were found with the term 'effectiveness' either undefined or as 'leadership effectiveness' or 'team effectiveness' in the text. One article included the term 'organisational effectiveness,' but the concept was not defined. None of articles de-

defined and measured the term. Additionally, none of the 42 authors who wrote these 24 articles were concerned with leadership related to organisational effectiveness. The results of the survey are shown in tables 1 and 2, and appendices A-1, A-2 and A-3.

Table 2: Journal 'Leadership'. Frequency of the term effectiveness: (1) in abstract, (2) in text, (3) defined, (4) measured

	In abstract	In text	Defined	Measured
Articles 2011 – issue 1				
Sharma & Grant	0	1	0	0
Acevedo	0	0	0	0
Koivunen & Wennes	0	0	0	0
Bryman	0	0	0	0
Grint & Holt	0	2	0	0
Articles 2011 – issue 2				
Mabey & Morrell	0	2*	0	0
Iszatt-White	0	2	0	0
Probert & Turnbull James	0	1*	0	0
Kerr & Robinson	0	0	0	0
Brookes	0	2*	0	0
Raelin	0	2*	0	0
Articles 2011 – issue 3				
Al-Ani, Horspool & Bligh	0	2**	0	0
Lian, Brown, Tanzer & Che	1	1	0	0
Brown & Fields	1	1*	0	0
Franke & Felfe	1	1	0	0
Kempster, Jackson & Conroy	0	0	0	0
Pinnington	0	5*	0	0
Tourish	0	0	0	0
Articles 2011 – issue 4				
Sveiby	0	2**	0	0
Clarke	0	1	0	0
Smollan & Parry	0	10*	0	0
Ford & Harding	0	0	0	0
Crossman & Crossman	0	3***	0	0
Winkler	0	1*	0	0
Total	3	17	0	0

Legend

** team effectiveness

* leadership effectiveness

*** organizational effectiveness

Table 1: Summary of articles in journal 'The Leadership Quarterly'

Articles year 2011	No. of articles	No. of authors	In abstract	In text	Defined	Measured
Issue 1	15	48	1	132	2	2
Issue 2	15	42	1	103	4	4
Issue 3	10	38	1	131	1	1
Issue 4	15	42	2	223	2	2
Issue 5	18	48	0	98	2	2
Issue 6	8	22	2	97	0	0
All articles	81	240	7	784	11	11

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The reviews of outcomes studied (March & Sutton, 1997; Collins, 2001; Richard et al., 2009; Hiller et al., 2011) show that management and leadership research only marginally address the question of how leadership impacts organisational outcomes. The present study on the specific relationship between leadership and effectiveness reveals that a total of 282 researchers who published 105 articles did not address the impact of leadership on organizational effectiveness.

More than 45 years ago Fiedler (1967: 11) wrote that a 'major theoretical question in the field concerns the prediction of leadership effectiveness.' Evidently, contemporary researchers do not agree and have renounced the central goal of this field. Hiller et al. (2011: 1171) have recently stated that future research would improve 'if leadership was related to more "ultimate" tangible outcomes of performance and effectiveness.' Additionally, they noted that ultimately, the effects of leaders and leadership are presumed to result in effectiveness and performance outcomes (ibid.). More than ten years ago, Collins (2001) noted that performance improvement at the organisational level is typically inferred, implied and assumed as an outcome of leadership. May be the time has come to leave inferences, implications and assumptions behind, and focus on the relationship between leadership behaviour and organisational effectiveness where effectiveness is defined as (1) the degree of goal attainment and (2) the goal is profitability and (3) the measurement of profitability is an objective one.

Managerial leadership research would be relevant if researchers were more explicit on *which* problem they address and *who* has the problem. In other words, the relevance for managers must be made explicit. What managers need to know is how to act and behave in order to enhance organisational effectiveness. In order to achieve this, the relationship between leadership behaviour and organizational effectiveness must be focused. Consequently, it is imperative that more research based on objective measurements of organisational effectiveness is produced. In that way and maybe only in that way, can managerial leadership research once again become relevant and useful to managers.

REFERENCES

- Alvesson, M., & Sveningsson, S. (2003). The great disappearing act: difficulties in doing 'leadership.' *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 359-381.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2013). Has management studies lost its way? Ideas for more imaginative and innovative research. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50, 128-152.
- Andersen, J. A. (1994). *Ledelse og effektivitet. Teori og prøving* [Leadership and effectiveness: Theory and testing]. Lund Studies in Economics and Management 23. The Institute of Economic Research. (Summary in English). Dissertation. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Andersen, J. A. (2000). Leadership and Leadership Research. In D. F. Dahiya (Ed.), *Current Issues in Business Disciplines*. Vol. (pp. 2267-2287). New Delhi: Spellbound Publications.
- Andersen, J. A. (2006). Leadership, personality and effectiveness. *The Journal of Socio- Economics*, 35, 1078-1091.
- Andersen, J. A. (2011). A new sports manager does not make a better team. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 6, 167-178.
- Astley, W. G., & Zamuto, R. F. (1992). Organization science, managers, and language games. *Organization Science*, 3, 443-460.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1985). *The managerial grid III*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Blau, P. M., & Scott, W. R. (1962). *Formal organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler.
- Brownlie, D., Hewer, P., Wagner, B., & Svensson, G. (2008). Management theory and practice: Bridging the gap through multidisciplinary lenses. *European Business Review*, 20, 461-470.
- Burack, E. (1979). Leadership findings and applications: the viewpoints of four from the real world - David Campbell, Joseph L. Moses, Paul J. Patinka & Blanchard B. Smith. In J. Hunt, & L. Larsson (Eds.), *Cross-currents in leadership* (pp. 25-46). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Cammock, P., Nilakant, V., & Dakin, S. (1995). Developing a lay model of managerial effectiveness: A social constructionist perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, 32, 443-474.
- Carey, W., Philippon, D. J., & Cummings, G. G. (2011). Coaching models for leadership development: An integrative review. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5, 51-69.
- Collins, D. B. (2001). Organizational performance: The future focus of leadership development programs. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7, 43-54.

- Dalakoura, A. (2010). Examining the effects of leadership development on firm performance. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4, 59-70.
- Douma, S., & Schreuder, H. (2002). *Economic approaches to organizations*. Harrow: Prentice Hall.
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4, 75-91.
- Hamann, P. M., Schiemann, F., Bellora, L., & Guenther, T. W. (2013). Exploring the dimensions of organizational performance: A construct validity study. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16, 67-87.
- Hambrick, D. C. (1983). Some tests of the effectiveness and functional attributes of Miles and Snow's strategic types. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 5-26.
- Harms, P. D., Han, G., & Chen, H. (2012). Recognizing leadership at a distance: A study of leader effectiveness across cultures. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 19, 164-172.
- Henderson, A. D., Miller, D., & Hambrick, D. C. (2006). How quick do CEOs become obsolete? Industry dynamism, CEO tenure, and company performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 447-460.
- Hiller, N. J., DeChurch, L. A., Murase, T., & Doty, D. (2011). Searching for outcomes of leadership: A 25-year review. *Journal of Management*, 37, 1137-1177.
- Hogan, R., Curphy G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership. Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49, 439-504.
- Holmberg, I., & Tyrstrup, M. (2010). Well then – What now? An everyday approach to managerial leadership. *Leadership*, 6, 353-372.
- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. M. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23, 409-473.
- Hoy, F., Van Fleet, D. D., & Yetley, M. J. (1984). Comparative organizational effectiveness research leading to an intervention strategy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 21, 443- 462.
- Jaffee, D. (2001). *Organization Theory. Tension and Change*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Jaques, E. (1990). In Praise of Hierarchy. *Harvard Business Review*, 68, 127-133.
- Khurana, R. (2002). The curse of the superstar CEO. *Harvard Business Review*, 80, 60-67.
- Kulas, J. T. (2013). Constructive leader behaviours, likelihood of derailment, and the cuboid personality framework: A replication and extension of Gough (1990). *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6, 6-24.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroek, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385-425.
- Maghroori, R., & Rolland, E. (1997). Strategic leadership: The art of balancing organizational mission with policy, procedures, and external environment. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 4, 62-81.
- March, J. G., & Sutton, R. I. (1997). Organizational performance as a dependent variable. *Organization Science*, 8, 698-706.
- Marturano, A., Wren, T., & Harvey, M. (2013). Editorial. The making of Leadership and the Humanities. *Leadership and the Humanities*, 1, 1-5.
- Nash, M. (1983). *Managing Organizational Performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Peterson, S. J., Walumbwa, F. O., Byron, K., & Myrowitz, J. (2009). CEO positive psychological traits, transformational leadership, and firm performance in high-technology start-up and established firms. *Journal of Management*, 35, 348-368.
- Quinn, R. E. (1988). *Beyond rational management: Mastering the paradoxes and competing demands of high performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Richard, P. J., Devinney, T. M., Yip, G. S., & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: Towards methodological best practice. *Journal of Management*, 35, 718- 804.
- Rosch, D. M., Anderson, J. C., & Jordan, S. N. (2013). Analyzing the effectiveness of multisource feedback as a leadership development tool for college students. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6, 33-46.
- Samuelson, B. A., Galbraith, C. S., & McGuire, J. W. (1985). Organizational performance and top-manager turnover. *Organizational Studies*, 6, 275-291.
- Sayer, A. (1992). *Method in social science: A realist approach*. London: Routledge.
- Shetty, Y. K. (1979). New look at corporate goals. *California Management Review*, 16, 71-79.
- Stewart, R. (1989). Studies of managerial jobs and behaviour: the ways forward. *Journal of Management Studies*, 26, 1-10.
- Strasser, S., Eveland, J. D., Cummins, G., Deniston, O. L., & Romani, J. H. (1981). Conceptualizing the goal and system models of organizational effectiveness – Implications for comparative evaluation research. *Journal of Management Studies*, 18, 321-340.
- Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I. R., & Massarik, F. (1961). *Leadership and organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thomas, A. B. (1993). *Controversies in management*. London: Routledge.
- Torrington, D., & Chapman, J. (1983). *Personnel Management*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Walton, E. J., & Dawson, S. (2001). Managers' perception of criteria of organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38, 173–199.

Yukl, G. A. (2010). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

APPENDIX

*Appendix A-1: Journal 'The Leadership Quarterly'.
Frequency of the term effectiveness: (1) in
abstract, (2) in text, (3) defined, (4) measured.*

	In abstract	In text	Defined	Mea- sured
Articles 2011– Issue 1				
Vinkenburg, van Engen, Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt	0	7	0	0
Clark & Greatbatch	0	7	0	9
Reichard & Johnson	0	3	0	0
Zacher, Rosing & Frese	0	0	0	0
Kalshoven, Den Hartog & De Hoogh	1	71	1	1*
Hunter, Cushenbery, Thoroughgood, Johnson & Scott Ligon	0	0	0	0
Wang, Tsui & Xin	0	8	1	1**
Kempster & Parry	0	9	0	0
Tims, Bakker & Xanthopoulou	0	0	0	0
Faris & Parry	0	0	0	0
DeChurch, Shawn Burke, Shuffler, Lyons, Doty & Salas	0	13	0	0
Subašić, Reynolds, Turner, Veenstra & Haslam	0	3*	0	0
Wallis, Yammarino & Feyerherm	0	6*	0	0
Lord & Shondrick	0	0	0	0
Park, Arvey & Tong	0	4*	0	0
Articles year 2011 - Issue 2				
Hunter, Tate, Dziewieczynski & Bedell-Avers	0	0	0	0
Fry, Hannah, Noel & Walumbwa	0	5	1*	1
Harris, Wheeler & Kacmar	0	0	0	0
Avey, Avolio & Luthans	0	1**	0	0
Zúquete	0	1	0	0
Shamir	0	2	0	0
Clarke	0	5**	0	0
Sydow, Lerch, Huxham & Hibbert	0	0	0	0
Nielsen & Cleal	0	0	0	0
Nahum-Shani & Somech	0	6	0	0
van Quaquebeke, van Knippenberg & Brodbeck	1	44*	0	1
Cole, Bedeian & Bruch	0	10	0	0
Carmeli, Schaubroeck & Tishler	0	9	1*	1
Taylor, Cocklin, Brown & Wilson-Evered	0	15	0	0
Sosik, Juzbasich & Uk Chun	0	5	5**	1
Total				

*Appendix A-2: Journal 'The Leadership Quarterly'.
Frequency of the term effectiveness: (1) in
abstract, (2) in text, (3) defined, (4) measured.*

	In abstract	In text	Defined	Mea- sured
Articles year - Issue 3				
Riggio & Mumford	0	2*	0	0
Murphy & Johnson	0	14*	0	0
Reichard, Riggio, Wright Guerin, Oliver, Gottfried & Eskeles Gottfried	0	9*	0	0
Wright Guerin, Oliver, Gottfried, Eskeles Gottfried, Reichard & Riggio	0	4	0	0
Harms, Spain & Hannah	0	15*	0	0
Eskeles Gottfried, Gottfried, Reichard, Wright Guerin, Oliver & Riggio	0	0	0	0
Li, Arvey & Song	0	10*	0	0
Oliver, Gottfried, Guerin, Eskeles Gottfried, Reichard & Riggio	0	0	0	0
Day & Sin	1	63*	1*	1*
Day	0	14*	0	0
Articles year - Issue 4				
Shaw, Erickson & Harvey	0	1	0	0
Hur, van den Berg & Wilderom	0	77*	1	1
Valcea, Hamdani, Buckley & Novicevic	0	8	0	0
Yang	1	2	0	0
Hadley Pittinsky, Sommer & Zhu	0	3**	0	0
Shipman & Mumford	0	15**	0	0
Kotlyar, Karakowsky & Ng	0	2	0	0
DeGroot, Aime, Johnson & Kluemper	0	95**	0	0
Rule & Ambady	0	1	0	0
Garzia	0	1	0	0
Vessey, Barrett & Mumford	0	12***	1	1
Barrett, Vessey, & Mumford	0	4	0	0
Martinko, Harvey, Sikora & Douglas	0	1***	00	
Palanski & Yammarino	1	2**	0	0
Gao, Janssen & Shi	0	0	0	0
Total				

Appendix A-3: Journal 'The Leadership Quarterly'.
Frequency of the term effectiveness: (1) in abstract, (2) in text, (3) defined, (4) measured.

	In abstract	In text	Defined	Measured
Articles year - Issue 5				
Zhu, Avolio, Riggio & Sosik	0	0	0	0
Sadri, Weber & Gentry	0	10*	1	1
Riad	0	0	0	0
Zhang, Tsui & Wang	0	3	0	0
Chua & Iyengar	1	66**	1	1
Schriesheim, Wu & Cooper	0	0	0	0
Menges, Walter, Vogel & Bruch	0	4	0	0
Nevecka, De Hoogh, Van Vianen, Beersma & McIlwain	0	1	0	0
Musteen, Liang & Barker III	0	1	0	0
Stenmark & Mumford	0	1	0	0
Rosing, Frese & Bausch	0	10*	0	0
Wright & Quick	0	0	0	0
Hannah & Avolio	0	0	0	0
Quick & Wright	0	0	0	0
Hannah & Avolio	0	0	0	0
Akrivou & Bradbury-Huang	0	1*	0	0
Harris, Harvey & Kacmar	0	1	0	0
Kramer & Crespy	0	0	0	0
Articles 2011 - Issue 6				
Yammarino & Dansereau	0	0	0	0
Bligh, Kohles, & Pillai	0	6	0	0
van Knippenberg	2	50	0	0
Waldman, Balthazard & Peterson	0	5	0	0
Rajah, Song, & Arvey	2	16	0	0
Gardner, Coglisier, Davis & Dickens	0	3	0	0
Neider & Schriesheim,	0	0	0	0
Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio & Johnson	0	23	0	0
Total				

Legend

** team effectiveness

* leadership effectiveness

*** organizational effectiveness