PART ONE

PERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL FRAMEWORKS

1 INTRODUCTION: THE CRITICAL IMPORTANCE OF LEADERSHIP, INFLUENCE, TEAMWORK, AND CHANGE MANAGEMENT

Allan R. Cohen

A lot has happened since the first edition of this book, fewer than 10 years ago. Terrorism and the reactions to it have become part of the everyday world of managers everywhere. The destruction of the World Trade Center towers on September 11, 2001, demonstrated that disaster could strike anywhere—with no warning. The Internet and World Wide Web appeared, became part of the fabric of doing business, and spawned the stunning rise and fall of the dotcoms. The U.S. economy grew at a faster pace without substantial inflation than economists had thought possible, driving stock prices to unheard of new highs, and suddenly fell into recession. The growth of the economy had created "The War for Talent," inducing companies to invent new benefits to attract and keep people with scarce, needed skills, who could and did just walk out the door to waiting jobs. Then came the recession, as it always does, and companies began to cut back on their benefits, as jobs became harder to find. People who had been the object of intense corporate courtship suddenly were viewed as a drag on earnings.

In addition, the increased pace of mergers and acquisitions aimed at major cost savings or accelerated growth, great sounding on paper but seldom as successful in practice, meant that jobs were eliminated and through no fault of their own, individuals suddenly found themselves unemployed. Even those who remained had to figure out how to adapt to the clashes between differing cultures and practices, whether or not to insist that the ways of one company in the combination were better for the new entity, or to bend as quickly as possible so as not to be seen as a "resister."

The changing treatment of employees was not confined to the lower or middle levels of organizations. Top managers were celebrated and made into larger-than-life heroes, but Wall Street became ever more demanding of instant performance, and stars found that the revolving door opened for them faster than in the past. "Chainsaw" Al Dunlap soared as a master of creating value by turning sleepy organizations around, then crashed as chairman of Sunbeam when his reforms couldn't be sustained (and apparently he cooked the books—as he had his resume—to keep up appearances.[1] Jack Welch, now retired chairman and CEO of General Electric, was named Manager of the Century by *Fortune* Magazine (probably deservedly)—and then found his grand exit strategy, to buy Honeywell, stymied by unanticipated European legal resistance. Instead of leaving on an incredible high note, his retirement fell a bit flat (though he was undoubtedly consoled by a $7 million advance for his memoirs).

And the wizards who had transformed Enron into a sophisticated engine of market making from an ordinary oil and gas company managed to suddenly blow up more than $50 billion in value and take the company into bankruptcy. Apparently the lessons about the dangers inherent in complex mathematical formulas as a driver of decisions, learned from the demise a few years earlier of a hot investment company, Long Term Capital Management, founded by two Nobel prize-winning economists, had been forgotten overnight.

There was constant pressure for innovation, and the sheer size of many companies made it difficult. Welch had dedicated most of his 20 years as CEO of General Electric to trying to leverage the advantages of size and scale with the agility of a startup company, and leaders everywhere wanted to preserve the entrepreneurial nature of their businesses (while guaranteeing that there would be no big failures that could get them into trouble). At the same time, world trade and competition accelerated, as numerous economies moved up the value chain to combat business being lost to lower cost competitor countries, and in turn to take business from formerly more developed economies. To become more competitive, even the fragmented countries of Europe managed to inch forward in their decades long attempts at integration, and as of the beginning of 2002, moved to a common currency, the Euro.

THE NEW CHALLENGES FOR LEADERSHIP

It is no exaggeration to say that organizational leadership has become more difficult and hazardous. In addition to the general rapid pace of change, the extraordinary events of 9/11 tested leaders at responding to crises they had never envisioned, bringing the need to show an unusual combination of openness about feelings and toughness about business decisions. Leaders have always needed to balance genuine concern for individuals with business imperatives, but the crises induced by terrorism have changed the requirements. Can any leader in the coming years not be more transparent in the personal dimension, more willing to reveal feelings of compassion and concern, more human and humane? At the same time, can any leader fail to be even more courageous and hard-headed at assessing the needs of the business, more willing to make tough decisions, more decisive in uncertainty? The standard by which leaders are judged has ratcheted up; simultaneous toughness and "heart" *are required,* not optional. Without this unique combination, organizational members will either be bitter at the unfeeling executive or petrified by the paralyzed one.

At times of crisis, most people want to believe that their leaders have a clue about how to respond, are not so scared that they cannot act, and can keep their cool enough not to make stupid mistakes. But in times of extraordinary and unprecedented crisis—even Hollywood hadn't dreamt up the total collapse at one time of two skyscrapers using two hijacked planes—people also expect authentic expressions of concern. The head of Cantor Fitzgerald was celebrated for his tears in the face of losing so many people, including his brother, and lauded for his commitment to the families of those killed. No one faulted him for showing such raw emotions, yet he couldn't let his grief overwhelm the need to figure out how to get back in business, how to keep the remaining employees inspired and willing to work, and how to earn enough to be able to keep his promises.

More than ever, leaders need both to be authentic and to put on a brave face, to appear confident that there is a way out of difficult situations, yet not be seen as faking it. At all levels of the organization, this rather contradictory combination of toughness and tenderness will be expected. The forces of change will continue to make greater demands on the analytical and profit-centered skills of leaders.

Leadership was never easy; it will be even more challenging in the next 10 years. There is nothing like whirlwind change to get the attention of managers, who no longer find it easy to pretend that just having considerable experience and a big title guarantees wisdom. Managers no longer are very confident about their ability to make large investment bets, determine winners among new products and services, judge the desirability of expansion into numerous other countries, or gain cooperation and commitment from employees.

The rapid acceleration of technology, from computers to (increasingly wireless) handheld devices, through the Internet and on into biotech and gene mapping and manipulation, is another force driving the need for changed practices. When electronic products, for example, can barely be brought to market before they are superseded by the next generation of products—and then capital expenditure cycles suddenly accelerate or dry up—managerial responses geared to stable product lifecycles are too sluggish. Information cannot slowly travel its way up and down the hierarchy, while layers of managers study and polish their responses. People at all levels of the organization may acquire information using their electronic resources before the top managers who are supposedly "in charge." Decisions cannot be made well by those who do not understand the rapidly shifting marketplace and technologies that require dramatic decentralization or delayering. One of the "dirty little secrets" of modern business life is that bosses no longer know the answers. It is not because they are dumb and lazy—if they are they don't stay bosses for long—but because they *cannot* know.[2]

In some cases, even the traditional boundaries between industries are crumbling. The increased fear of travel resulting from terrorist attacks and threats gave a boost to other ways of "getting together" that do not involve physical movement. Video (and phone) conferencing, instant messaging, collaborative tools for virtual meetings, and distance learning products all have benefited, and all can be considered competitors for travel dollars. Many forms of entertainment are also competing with leisure travel, including local movies, home theater systems utilizing satellite or cable delivery, DVDs, and electronic games. Little did the once heavily regulated airlines dream of these industries and technologies as competition. This is another set of forces making it impossible for bosses to know all the answers.

Changing regulations have a profound impact on what managers must deal with. The breakup of the phone monopoly and relative deregulation of banks were more dramatic than some other regulatory changes, but everything from environmental impact statements to accounting rules for pensions has an ongoing effect on companies. And who knows what new regulations will arise in the wake of suits against several major accounting companies for missing or not reporting on questionable balance sheet and income statement practices of companies such as Enron? Politicians oscillate between wanting to reduce the constraints of government regulation to encourage the kind of entrepreneurial behavior that generates innovation and wanting to regulate corporate practices to protect the citizenry, employees, retirees, or the environment. Politics makes predictability more difficult.

Customers, too, have become a source of unpredictability and change. No longer are they content to take what is offered and be grateful to the organization for providing the product or service; instead, customers are demanding better quality from the whole process: from the place of purchase through repairs when needed. Customers are more educated than ever, utilizing the Internet for information even when they prefer to purchase at an actual location; they vote with their final purchases and are not automatically loyal to established brands. As more companies figure out how to make the entire sales-purchase cycle more convenient and reliable for the consumer, competitive pressures increase with rising expectations. Just consider the shift over the years to the use of answering machines, which at first were seen as an insult and now are minimal expectations, on to the use of voice systems that require punching numerous numbers, evoking the resentment of many, causing the addition of yet another option to get a live operator at any time, and so on. Weary managers cannot rest on their laurels (if they have any in the first place).

Another wave of change that makes it difficult for managers to have the answers involves employee attitudes and beliefs. Not only has the population in general become less willing to take orders than it once was, but the recent sudden shift from high demand and low unemployment to layoffs and cutting back on perks have made employees increasingly cynical, suspicious, and unwilling to invest themselves wholeheartedly in organizational change efforts. Few companies have or promise lifetime employment for loyal and steady performance; General Electric, for example, which used to have such an unwritten agreement, now celebrates its annual process of getting rid of "C" players who have not improved from their forced curve rankings. Recently retired CEO Jack Welch declared in the General Electric annual report that loyalty was no longer relevant, and that General Electric owed its employees no more than challenging and exciting jobs, but only so long as they performed at top level. Although some companies that tried to adopt such draconian standards have been forced to back off due to very negative reaction from needed employees, the shock has spread everywhere, and it is harder to generate the kind of employee commitment and initiative needed to transcend competitive pressure and the fast pace of change I have discussed. Is it any wonder that when the dotcoms were thriving, employees were in constant motion, leaving their employers for the next great set of benefits and the chance to get rich on stock options? The sudden halt in availability of jobs to move to will hardly engender more internalized loyalty, only wariness.

Commitment and initiative have become more important when the world is moving too fast for bosses to have all the answers. Increasing numbers of companies are more dependent than ever on their smart, well-educated employees, since only they have the technical know-how, the imagination, and the close touch with the market to keep companies competitive. In a period when expenses have to be kept low, yet the pressures to compete and innovate are constant, companies are highly dependent on tapping the talents of all who are employed (including contract employees or allied suppliers and customers—even competitors) in order to spread costs, risks, and talent.

The picture is not a pretty one, though it is challenging and exciting. Managerial jobs were never easy, but they are far more loaded and complex than ever before. Managers used to be able to think of themselves and act heroically, taking responsibility for everything, having the answers, making bold decisions when needed, but spending most of their time keeping the corporate ship on an even keel. Now they must find a way to go beyond heroism and make everyone else heroes and heroines. They have to mobilize scarce resources and get employees to invent how to do more with less. They must generate the willingness for employees to take responsibility, even when that is risky; for employees to speak out when they know what the manager needs to know; and to seek new and better ways of doing everything.

Perhaps entrepreneurs in start-up companies can still act as if they know more than everyone else and maintain a command system of heroic decision making. Even if they do know more, as their companies grow, they rapidly find that they must build a team of subordinates (or partners) who are as committed to the company's success as they are. Such entrepreneurs either learn to share responsibility or get edged out by their financiers, who recognize that new, more collaborative leadership is needed.

MANAGEMENT OR LEADERSHIP? HEROISM LIVES

In recent years, a distinction has been made between management and leadership.[3] Managers are supposed to carry out the organization's plans—do the careful laying out of objectives, milestones, assignments, then closely monitor progress to see that objectives are met. Leaders are supposed to look further into the future, determine what has to change, articulate a vision, and then inspire the troops to carry it out. These are two aspects of managerial and executive jobs in organizations, and there may have been a time when only a few leaders were needed at the top, while managers carried out their directions, but the forces described earlier, the rapid pace of change, mean that few jobs can be so neatly divided.

Designated managers have to be leaders, too; doing more than seeing to it that the trains run on time, they must also be alert to the way that the environment is changing and figure out what the new activities are that will be needed to stay competitive. Almost no one gets to do pure managerial (execution-only) jobs anymore, because skills and imagination are needed at every level of the organization, and in every job—including those traditionally not even considered "management." Employees at every level have to use their judgment, since things often move too fast for high-level managers to know what to do, or even to know what is going on. Even the lowliest employees have to be willing to speak out, to make suggestions for improvements, and sometimes to act without waiting for instructions or orders. We used to say that when the building is on fire, the one who notices shouldn't wait to start action, but now there are daily equivalents of fires springing up, as customers make demands, employees move, technology morphs (and requires tech-savvy responses that many top managers do not possess), and emergencies become the norm.

Despite the by-now common recognition that heroic leadership no longer works well, except in those rare conditions where the person in charge really knows much more than all those reporting to him or her about almost everything related to the work, it refuses to die. Leaders agree that they should not be responsible for everything, should not make all the important decisions, should be tapping the talents of everyone, and then they slide into taking over, or acting as if they are soliciting full participation from their direct reports, but in fact reserving the important decisions for themselves. Often they go through the motions of allowing or desiring input, but they keep the discussion going until the group finally discovers the solution that the leader wanted all along. This seldom fools the members of the direct report group, but they go along with it because they believe that the boss is entitled to have things his or her way, and to fight back too vigorously is to risk a career-limiting move. Not many issues are worth that risk, or perhaps more correctly, the risk that on this one the boss really is entrenched and would react with some form of retaliation, despite overt claims of receptivity.

I have spent a great deal of time trying to determine why the heroic style hangs on, Dracula-like, despite the many attempts to put a stake in its heart.

Originally, David Bradford and I thought that it was because leaders raised on heroic ideas were unwilling to let go of control, but that is not sufficient as an explanation. I now believe that the problem stems from a hard fact of leadership and organizational life: There are times when, despite all the uncertainty as to what is the correct action, and despite the sincere attempt to generate full and open discussion, the leader must override the wishes, expressed or implicit, of team members, no matter how strongly they resist. Leaders are occasionally faced with decisions that go against the grain of many who report to them. Team members may not recognize changed competitive conditions, or recognize that to respond, they will have to work from weakness, lack of expertise, or lack of experience that would allow good judgment. Subordinates sometimes recognize what a good decision would be, but fear that there will no longer be a place for them if the organization moves in that direction. Andy Grove, until recently CEO and chairman of Intel, talks about "strategic inflection points," when there is a fundamental shift in the environment rendering former truths useless, and making it impossible for committed organizational members to respond appropriately. In those situations, he argues, leaders have to forge ahead, despite opposition, and that is where they earn their spurs.

Genuine strategic inflection points are relatively rare, but there are other decision points where subordinates may not have the experience to make good judgments, or understand the leader's intuitive reasoning. The reasons behind the decision may not be provable or perhaps not even logically explainable. All important decisions in business are about *future outcomes,* and the more important the decision, the longer into the future it will be before anyone can be shown to be correct or incorrect. Future bets are inherently uncertain; experienced managers sometimes have a better feel for the future than they can explain. (For simplicity's sake, we will not even discuss all the times when the leader who has these kinds of hunches is wrong; that is certainly not altogether rare, but if it happens too often, then the leader loses all credibility anyway.) And sometimes, even when the leader has worked diligently to encourage everyone to honestly express their views, including their personal concerns, either the subject is too threatening to get it all on the table, or too ambiguous to lead to a clear consensus about the "right" decision. The leader may not be able to delay further, despite his or her own uncertainty about the best course of action; the situation demands action.

But here's the rub: Followers in organizations, even many of those who are ambitious and want responsibility, also were raised on heroic leadership beliefs, in which the leader has both the right and obligation to make decisions. As a result, especially after the leader has overridden their views, they all too easily fall back into acceptance of the leader's decisions, even the next time they are sure that the leader is wrong. If they are conscientious, they may say what they think, but they don't push as hard as they could; they watch the leader for any signs of disagreement, then express their views, if at all, with care. Unless the leader is really tuned in to this "code," he or she will move ahead, believing that there is agreement or consensus, and then be surprised when there seems to be less than full commitment.

Followers have a number of ways in which they can let themselves off the hook, with such organizational clichés as, "that's why they pay the boss the big bucks," "after all, the boss is entitled to the final decision," or, "I had my say, which is all I can expect." Beliefs about the rights of formally designated managers or leaders run deep, and it doesn't take many overrides from the boss to bring them to the surface. In fact, the smarter and more often correct the boss, the more difficult it will be for caring subordinates to push back, which is what we call *the curse of the strong:* Even when you are wrong or misinformed, subordinates let you win. It is one of the oldest organizational games going to blame the boss for being unwilling to listen to disagreements (which, of course, makes it impossible to test it by open disagreement), thereby passing responsibility upward. "If it weren't for that tyrant [or some other nasty epithet], I could be doing great things."

This kind of subordinate passivity, dependence—or sometimes cynicism—plays into the fear of leaders that they are alone, the only one who really cares or feels full responsibility for outcomes of the whole unit. That makes them take even more responsibility, hold on more tightly to the reins, and give the impression that they are control freaks rather than concerned leaders who do not realize that their own sometimes necessary determination helps create the very avoidance of responsibility in subordinates that the leaders dislike. We believe that it is this paradoxical pattern that creates less than desirable leadership behavior, not defective personalities.[4]

If, as is often the case, the leader and followers are not skilled at raising and resolving conflict, confronting one another in supportive ways, engaging in joint problem solving, building and sustaining team effort, creating interpersonal trust, balancing individual growth opportunities with decisions made only by experts, and so on, then the organization cannot achieve the collective efforts needed to compete in the rapidly changing world just described. We have argued that a new kind of leadership, called *post-heroic* or *shared responsibility leadership,* is needed.[5] Its components include the articulation and commitment to tangible vision at the organizational, unit, and personal level; the building of shared responsibility teams that make the important decisions by consensus, and balancing power between leader and team members through mutual influence.

Outstanding leadership is not just about being nice so that subordinates will want to cooperate. In a fiercely competitive world, initiative is required of all employees, whose knowledge is not easily duplicated or passed upward for others to act on. Employee initiative, however, can also cause its own problems, even when it works. Highly creative employees can be competitive looking out for their own interests as they perceive them. In pursuing their ideas, they can trample over the interests and ideas of their colleagues, who inevitably will have differing perspectives on issues, differing bits of information, and differing goals that reflect their own responsibilities. Leadership requires much more than setting people free to follow their own stars. Establishing sufficient autonomy to allow the full use of each person's talents, yet inspiring all to work together toward the overall objectives of the organization, is the core human challenge of running a company. By definition, an organization consists of more than one smart person sitting alone and doing all the work; finding the means to get the most from a cooperative endeavor requires careful thought, application of concepts and theories from many disciplines, extraordinary interpersonal skills, support of flexible organizational design, ongoing commitment to change, and the ability to learn and continue learning from experiences. That is why management is an extremely challenging but thrilling profession.

HOW THIS BOOK ADDRESSES THE CHALLENGES OF LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Many authors, academics, and practitioners have filled many pages with advice about how to lead, organize, control, develop, and otherwise manage people. Some of what has been written is even useful. But it is rare to find material that is not too academic and sterile at one extreme or not too restricted to one person's experience at the other. Even courses in these subjects offered by many of the best MBA programs do not always find a way to combine the conceptual with the practical, to mix analysis with skills practice. Nor do they create balanced learning experiences that can carry forward into the work world and both guide behavior in new situations and provide a framework that enables continued learning.

Everything is not yet known about the subtle art and science of leading and managing, so continuous learning is necessary. This can be very frustrating when faced with a work group that is sabotaging rather than problem solving, when challenged by an old-timer who refuses to change, or when puzzled by two subordinates who insist on attacking each other rather than working together. However, the managerial world is too complex to have been fully dissected and turned into a series of formulas. Even if a great deal of what managers need to know is codifiable, it still has to be carried out by you—a wonderful, intelligent, and caring person, no doubt, but an involved player with your own style and idiosyncrasies, which some louts have trouble with despite your best intentions. That's the nature of managerial work; it isn't scientific manipulation by remote control, but the handiwork of living, breathing, and all-too-human individuals who are part of the action. A very wise professor once noted, "When a manager is pointing his or her finger at a subordinate who just won't do what the manager wants, it is as important to note the person to whom the pointing finger is attached as it is to analyze the one pointed at![6]

While no book can provide the classroom experience that allows for the practice of the human skills needed to lead effectively, this one presents a rare combination of the conceptual and the practical. Contributors were found among those faculty members known to do an exceptional job teaching elective courses at top schools, so that all have a base of solid experience from which to write. The chapters are not, however, written in the stifling jargon of the academic world; each is down-to-earth and loaded with advice based on research, classroom experience, and observations from consulting. Nevertheless, unlike most of the popular literature on management, these chapters, all revised for this second edition, have an underlying rigor based on the best current academic research. The results are all too rare: forefront knowledge delivered in an accessible, fun-to-read style.

THE CHAPTERS AND THEIR GOALS

The old notion of a manager as hero with all the answers no longer works. If the manager can't know, then the essence of leadership requires the sharing of responsibility with subordinates who collectively work to develop the answers. But sharing responsibility does not automatically get everyone on board, pulling toward the same goals. Thus, a key task for leaders is the articulation and selling of a transforming vision of what it is that the organization (or subunit) does that is special, unique, and exciting. A well-formulated vision can induce people to cooperate and can inspire their best work. In addition, leaders need to articulate their own personal vision about leadership, so that organization members will know what is expected of them as subordinates and what they can expect from their boss. Peter B. Vaill (with Allan Cohen helping due to Vaill's unexpected serious illness) explores the ways of using vision, its potency, and limitations, in Chapter 2, entitled "Visionary Leadership."

Part of what an effective vision makes possible is the building of a team that genuinely shares responsibility for the unit's success with the nominal leader. Teamwork, as opposed to working as a group, is much easier said than done. In Chapter 3, "The Challenge of a Team," David L. Bradford discusses when groups can get the work done, when the power of an effective managerial team is needed and what it is like, and shows how to develop the kind of team that achieves high performance.

To have an effective team, every subordinate needs to be working at full potential and willing to collaborate with peers. Unfortunately, not all subordinates come ready to fit the bill. Stephen L. Fink shows in Chapter 4, "Managing Individual Behavior: Bringing Out the Best in People," how to diagnose and deal with diverse and difficult subordinates and colleagues.

In complex, rapidly changing organizations, managers must be effective not only with subordinates, but with peers and superiors. Managing is as much an activity aimed laterally and upward as downward. The cooperation of people who have their own tasks, goals, and agendas is far from automatic. Thus, it is critical to understand how to use influence and power to accomplish organizational ends, as revealed by Anne Donnellon in Chapter 5, "Power, Politics, and Influence: Savvy and Substance in Organizations." She looks carefully at the ways, cooperative and otherwise, that people actually get things done in organizations. Another way of thinking about influence and power is found by examining the everyday negotiations of organizational life. These transactions are not always called negotiations, but they involve getting others to agree to do something when they have their own ideas of desirable outcomes in mind. Like Donnellon, Roy J. Lewicki, in a tough-minded but fair way, reveals useful insights from his course on negotiations in Chapter 6, "Negotiating Strategically."

Managing others is hard enough; managing oneself is particularly difficult—and critical. How can you build a career without becoming so preoccupied with your own success that you lose sight of the needs of others and of the organization in which you work? How can you continue to reinvent yourself as organizational needs change? In Chapter 7, "'Brand You': Building Your Protean Career," Douglas T. Hall presents the latest thinking on managing your own career.

Management and leadership involve more than personal and interpersonal dealings. It is necessary to make many arrangements of people and policies to create the organizational framework that enables cooperative work to be done. Employees do what is needed for their own personal reasons, but they also respond to the kind of organization they are in—its rules, structure, and mores. Part Two of this book, "Organizational Frameworks," addresses these issues. Danna Greenberg spells out in Chapter 8, "Designing Effective Organizations," the complex elements needed to design organizations that match tasks and structures to imperatives derived from the competitive environment yet are flexible enough to change when the environment does. Looking at how organizations change over time, she introduces the concept of culture and shows how to help direct its impact on behavior.

In Chapter 9, "Managing Human Resources Strategically: The Challenge," Charles J. Fombrun explores in detail the human resources systems that are part of an organization's design, which are needed to ensure that the right people are hired and developed. He shows the difference between human resource systems that support the newer demands on organizations and those that are designed for previous conditions.

From a different perspective, R. Roosevelt Thomas Jr., explains in Chapter 10, "Building a Diversity Management Capability," the critical need for ways to utilize the skills and knowledge of increasingly diverse employees, and the slow progress being made by most organizations. It is no longer effective to limit the kinds of people who can make vital contributions to success. He argues that just having a diverse mixture of representatives of various groups is not as effective as true understanding and then utilization of the contributions possible. He provides advice for both organizations and individuals on how to overcome the limits from being "diversity challenged."

No matter how carefully an organization is designed to create the right atmosphere, structures, procedures, mix of people, and managerial behavior, the nature of the rapidly changing environment means that major changes will be needed more and more frequently. The art of managing the process of change is conveyed by Todd D. Jick in Chapter 11, "Managing Change." Hopefully, you will not recognize yourself in his list of "44 Excuses for Not Making Change."

The last chapter reminds us just how complex and interdependent the managerial world has become. In Chapter 12, "Future Leaders Must Be Global Managers," Rosabeth Moss Kanter describes the impact of the new world order—or disorder—on contemporary organizations and managers. She convinces us that global managers must use all the ideas, concepts, and insights given in the other chapters to deal with the challenges arising from the highly permeable national boundaries that used to insulate managements. And she brings us full circle as she emphasizes the centrality in complex global economic life of soft skills—managerial qualities of the heart—requiring the creation of trusting relationships with people from other cultures who may seldom be available for face-to-face meetings or even speak English. Soft skills make hard challenges, especially since they must be wedded to tough business decisions in a tough environment.

By bringing together the best of current leadership and management theory and practice, the interested reader will be able to build on existing skills and insight and will immediately begin to add greater value to current (and future) employers. The intense competitiveness of today's economic world makes outstanding leadership a basic necessity, not a luxury. The ability and willingness to plunge forward and make things happen when you lack all the desirable facts or support, and then to step back and learn from the outcomes so that the next plunge does not carry you into deeper trouble, are critical talents for any manager's career. Personal and organizational survival depends on these capacities to make every experience count.

The authors wish you success in your managerial efforts and even more success in continuing to learn from your experiences. No less will suffice.

NOTES

1. Joann S. Lublin, "Managers and Managing: U.S. Search Firms Have Red Faces in Dunlap Flap—Research Failed to Reveal Official Had Been Fired Twice," *Wall Street Journal,* Europe (July 18, 2001). "Dunlap Settles Sunbeam Suit for $15 Million—Shareholders Accused Ex-CEO of Manipulating Stock Price," *Wall Street Journal* (January 15, 2002).

2. David L. Bradford and Allan R. Cohen, *Managing for Excellence* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984).

3. John Kotter, "What Managers Really Do," *Harvard Business Review,* May–June, 1990.

4. Allan R. Cohen and David L. Bradford, "Power and Influence in the 21st Century," in *Organizations 21C,* Subir Chowdhury, ed. (London: Financial Times Prentice Hall, in press).

5. David L. Bradford and Allan R. Cohen, *Power Up; Transforming Organizations Through Shared Leadership* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1998).

6. The wise professor referred to, Fritz Roethlisberger, wrote about the pointed finger in Chapter 9 of *The Elusive Phenomena* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1977).