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The existing literature suggests that numerous variables affect a leader’s effectiveness. In this study, the authors examine behaviors associated with leadership effectiveness in driving change. Results indicate that specific leader behaviors—the ability to motivate, communicate, and build teams—are predictors of successful implementation of organizational change.
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Competent management is one source of sustainable competitive advantage in contemporary, rapidly changing organizations (Nohria, Joyce, & Roberson, 2003; Waldman, Ramirez, House, & Puranam, 2001). The behaviors of organizational leaders directly influence actions in the work environment that enable change (Drucker, 1999; Gilley, 2005; Howkins, 2001). Leaders and managers are responsible for change strategy, implementation, and monitoring, thus they function as change agents (Kanter, Stein, & Jick, 1992). As a result, the challenge of managing change is one of the most fundamental and enduring roles of leaders (Ahn, Adamson, & Dornbusch, 2004), whereas the rapidly accelerating pace of organizational change has made effective leadership imperative.

Organizations that support and implement continuous and transformational change remain competitive (Cohen, 1999). Research has attempted to explain the fundamentals of change, explain why change is so difficult to achieve, and develop models to manage the change process. Despite the proliferation of numerous theories, models, and multistep approaches, leaders continue to lack a clear understanding of change, its antecedents, effective processes, or the ability to successfully engage organizational members in change initiatives (Armenakis & Harris, 2002).

Recent research indicates that change programs rarely achieve desired results. A growing body of evidence reveals that change programs often fail or make the situation worse (Beer, Eisenstat, & Spector, 1990). In a recent study of 40 major change initiatives, 58% failed and 20% realized a third or less of the value expected (LaClair & Rao, 2002). Other studies of change efforts have reported failure rates of one third to two thirds (Beer & Nohria, 2000; Bibler, 1989) and as high as 80% to 90% (Cope, 2003). Gill (2003) suggests that these results are due to a lack of effective leadership.

We extend previous research on organizational change by investigating the interrelationship of leader behaviors and change. The purpose of this study was to explore leaders’ effectiveness in implementing change and the variables (skills/abilities) that influence that effectiveness. Our reference to leaders implies all leaders and managers within an organization. The literature review that follows explores change and the leadership behaviors positively associated with successful change.

**Change**

A large and cumulative literature explores the roles, responsibilities, and attributes of leaders with respect to change. An increasing emphasis on change as a critical driver of organizational success has fueled organizational and academic investigation of
change practices, methodologies, and results (Drucker, 1999; Ford & Gioia, 2000; Friedman, 2005; IBM, 2008; Johansson, 2004). Recent studies have also explored change as a variable in creating organizational competitive advantage (Florida, 2005; Friedman, 2005; Howkins, 2001). The research has been primarily descriptive and based on observations of managers, subordinates, or peers with regard to leaders’ knowledge, skills, abilities, and effectiveness.

The complexity of organizational change warrants broad examination. According to Miles (2001), any change, regardless of its size, has a cascading effect on an organization. Organizational change at the corporate or macro level focuses on strategy and business models (IBM, 2006), structure, processes, culture, technology, products, and services (Lewis, 1994), often affecting multiple leadership or reporting lines, incorporation of new technologies, acquisitions or expansion, or downsizing. More than ever, managing the complexities of change confronts leaders at all organizational levels (Biech, 2007), whether the manager is frontline/administrative, middle, or senior/executive (Katz & Kahn, 1966). The pyramidal shape of organizations reflects the largest numbers of employees in frontline ranks, with the fewest at the top. Top management develops the organization’s vision, mission, and strategic long-term plans and corporatewide change initiatives. Middle management further executive strategies and plans by developing shorter term operational plans that give life to top management directives. Frontline managers actually implement operational plans and engage in the daily work, processes, and changes required to satisfy middle and upper management proposals (Lussier, 2009). As a consequence, frontline supervisors and their employees engage in significant change, bearing the brunt of its implementation.

Inherent in organizational change is uncertainty with regard to how individuals should act and the outcomes to be expected (Rousseau, 1995). Changes that modify existing authority or role structures generate ambiguity and confusion with regard to appropriate, effective action and in-role behavior (Wheatley, 1992). Structural changes challenge organizational goals and desired outcomes, ultimately affecting quality of work life as employees struggle to align business changes with their own interests (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Successful implementation of change ultimately results in modified employee behavior.

An evolutionary perspective views change as transitional, transformational, or developmental. Transitional change represents small, gradual, even incremental changes in people, policies, procedures, technology, culture, or structures. These common changes are driven and orchestrated by management for units, departments, divisions, or the entire organization.

Radical shifts in underlying assumptions, deep-seated mindsets, culture, strategy, or other significant organizational paradigms involve transformational change (Kuhn, 1970). Although extreme and sometimes revolutionary, successful transformational change has been positively linked to increased competitiveness when firms are able to clearly differentiate themselves in the market (Denning, 2005). To the contrary, a host of corporate results and research highlight the rarity with which organizations successfully achieve transformational change (Beer & Nohria, 2000; Cope, 2003; IBM, 2008).

Developmental change flows from an organization-wide philosophy of continuous growth and development that leads to increasing competitive advantage through dynamic stability—a culture of continuous dynamic yet manageable change (Abrahamson, 2000). Developmental change occurs when firms continually scan their internal and external environments to create work settings that encourage and reward individual innovation, growth, and development, while avoiding radical, infrequent yet disruptive large-scale change (Gilley & Maycunich, 2000).

Weick and Quinn (1999) described organizational change as either episodic or continuous. Episodic change is infrequent, sometimes radical, and more likely to be experienced intensely (Matlin & Stang, 1978). Continuous change, conversely, may be incremental, emergent, and without end. Negative events often indicate maladaptation or a threat to survival and trigger the need to change, whereas positive, more common events are less intense and invoke a more subdued response (Cameron, 2008). Whether continuous or radical, researchers agree that change is a nonlinear process (Coughlan, 2000; Doyle, Claydon, & Buchanan, 2000) and that the pace of change is increasing (Quinn, 2004; Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001).

Numerous change models have been developed in an effort to understand change and its phases, individual and organizational rates of acceptance, and processes through which leaders may guide their organizations through the process. For example, in his research on adoption of innovations, Rogers (2003) explains individual acceptance rates of change along with the varied ways and rates in which individuals undertake change. In his studies, an innovation
represents any large or small action, idea, object, or procedure an individual views as new. One’s response to a change depends on one’s opinion of the extent of newness associated with the change. How and when the change is accepted relies largely on the methods of communication used and their perceived appropriateness by the individual.

Rogers (2003) explains that acceptance of change occurs in the stages of awareness, interest, trial, the decision to continue or quit, and adoption. Individuals have been categorized based on their overall acceptance of change as (a) innovators, (b) early adopters, (c) early majority, (d) late majority, and (e) laggards. Those who desire change are called innovators; individuals who like change and challenges are early adopters; those who prefer to observe the effect of change on others prior to engaging in change themselves are the early majority; the skeptical, suspicious, and resistant to change are the late majority; and individuals who resist or completely reject change are called laggards or nonadopters.

Early researchers developed relatively simple change models that emphasized initial evaluation of an organization, preparation for change, change actions, and securing change into daily organizational operations and culture. Lewin (1951), for example, created a classic three-step change model of unfreezing and readying workers and organizations for change, movement and active engagement in change activities and processes, and refreezing new behaviors and procedures into routine organizational practices and culture.

More recent, researchers have created multistep models of change that involve varied organizational dimensions such as culture, leadership, communications, motivation, employee engagement, structure, rewards, and teamwork, to name a few. Models by Burke and Litwin (1992), Nadler and Tushman (1980), and Tichy (1983) indicate the importance of internal and external influences such as culture, structure, individual needs and values, goal setting, and feedback, among others. Conceptualizations by Kotter (1996) and Ulrich (1998) include leadership, shared need, guiding coalitions, commitment, communicating, changing structures, empowering others, and making change last.

These models have been criticized for their linear supposition and rigid steps, inability to account for the complexities of change, discounting of the human factor, and failure to prepare for resistance to change (Gilley, 2005). Doyle et al. (2000) reported that change agents find the numerous models to be too “prepackaged” while failing to address the linkages and contradictions in change. According to Nadler (1998), “the reality of change in the organizational trenches defies rigid academic models as well as superficial management fads” (p. 3). As a consequence, the importance of the leader’s ability to implement change is clear.

Leaders’ Skills and Abilities

Organizational change does not occur unless member groups and individuals change (Coghlan, 2000; Katz & Kahn, 1966; Sullivan, Sullivan, & Buffton, 2002) by adopting different behaviors, processes, frameworks, routines, values, or goals. As a result, understanding the individual, group, and organizational processes that must occur to drive positive change proves critical for leaders.

The change models previously examined suggest a relationship between change process actions and outcomes, hence the need to review associated leader skills that underlie their behaviors and actions. A 1990s study of Fortune 1000 companies revealed that nearly half regarded their leadership capacity as “fair to poor” (Csoka, 1997); a follow-up study indicated that leadership capacity was “good” or “excellent” in only about one third of firms (Barrett & Beeson, 2002).

Leaders’ thoughts and skills are manifested in actions, structures, and processes that enhance or impede change, further strengthening the linkage between leader behaviors and effectiveness in implementing change. For example, change management skills have been positively linked to successful organizational change. Conversely, lack of change management skills or understanding of change implementation techniques, the inability to alter one’s management style, and failure to modify organizational systems or structures have been identified as barriers to success (Bossidy & Charan, 2002; Gilley, 2005). Research has revealed that additional barriers to change include the lack of or poor communication skills, the inability to induce others to change, and management’s failure to reward workers who try to change (Burke, 1992; Kotter, 1996; Patterson, 1997; Ulrich, 1998).

Related leadership theories include trait, behavioral, and multiple contemporary views. Although leadership trait theory suggests that successful leaders rely on a set of psychological traits (Ilies, Scott, & Judge, 2006), more than 300 studies have failed to produce a definitive list of agreed-on traits common to all effective leaders (Bass, 1990). However, several traits have been identified as significant, including supervisory ability, intelligence, the need for achievement, decisiveness,
self-assurance, and initiative (Ghiselli, 1971). Behavioral theorists explore the relationship between distinctive leadership styles and results, such as McGregor's (1966) Theory X and Y, and behaviors that are autocratic, democratic, or laissez-faire (Lussier & Achua, 2007). Varied contemporary views of leadership posit leaders as being charismatic, transformational, transactional, learning, servant, or developmental (Collins, 2001; Gilley & Maycunich, 2000; Greenleaf & Spears, 2002; Senge, 1990).

Our research explored leadership behaviors and their effect on organizational change, with the understanding that behaviors are grounded in one's traits and skills (Lewin, Lippert, & White, 1939). The variables explored in the study were distilled from research on leadership skills and behaviors related to change by Burke (1992), Conner (1992), Gill (2003), Gilley (2005), Kotter (1996), Sims (2002), and Ulrich (1998). Comparison of these research streams and models led to a manageable set of common variables: coaching, communicating, involving others, motivating, rewarding, and building teams. It is within this complex myriad of variables that we approached our study of leaders and organizational change. Our primary questions were as follows: (a) How effective are leaders in implementing change within their organizations? and (b) What specific leader behaviors are most significantly associated with one's ability to successfully implement change initiatives?

Method

A host of research reveals that success in change implementation is uncommon (Beer et al., 1990; Cope, 2003; LaClair & Rao, 2002), despite abundant models and theories for successful change facilitation (Burke & Litwin, 1992; Kotter, 1996; Lewin, 1951; Ulrich, 1998). For example, a recent survey of CEOs revealed that only 55% of them believe their recent change efforts were "quite" or "very" successful, whereas 13% admitted that such efforts were "unsuccessful" or "a little successful" (IBM, 2006, p. 45). Figures such as these support a negative outlook on change success. Our study explored leaders' efforts and effectiveness in implementing change from their subordinates' perspectives.

Research Questions

To determine whether behaviors do predict leader effectiveness in implementing change, we designed a study with a twofold purpose. First, we explored whether leaders effectively implement change in their organizations from the perspective of employees. Second, we investigated the frequency with which leaders exhibit skills and behaviors associated with successful organizational change. We chose to use subordinate ratings of behavior to predict overall leader effectiveness; subordinates are thought to provide the most accurate ratings of typical leader performance (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Separate sources eliminated common method bias.

Survey Design

Existing literature on leader effectiveness was compared with the results of three focus group discussions of change and managerial behaviors to create an initial survey instrument comprised of perceptual-based questions. Members of the three 10- to 15-person focus groups were business practitioners. The resulting instrument was tested on 59 senior-level undergraduate volunteer students in a business capstone course. These individuals provided information with regard to question ambiguity or clarity, appropriateness, and survey design. Their comments led to a revised instrument given to 14 volunteer working professionals in leadership roles who were also business PhD students. This experienced group was challenged to give feedback concerning question face validity. Feedback was incorporated, surveys were revised, and the next survey draft was made available to subject matter experts at an academic international research conference. Of the 407 conference attendees, 53 (13%) voluntarily reviewed the instrument and gave input on survey design. Ninety-four percent of respondents identified themselves as academics whereas the remainder identified themselves as practitioners. The final survey instrument contains 36 content questions (19 organization specific and 17 manager specific) and 8 demographic questions.

Data Collection

The survey instrument was given to students in MBA and organizational development (OD) master's and PhD programs at three 4-year universities (two public and one private) over 3 years (six semesters). Master's and PhD students were chosen to maximize industry and position diversity. The voluntary survey was given to 507 potential respondents; 470 responded, for a response rate of 92.7%.
Measures

The dependent variable in the study was perceptual. Respondents were asked to specify, in their opinion, how well “My manager effectively implements change,” without regard to type of change. Responses were collected using a 5-point scale ranging from never (1) to always (5).

The independent variables examined in this study were derived from research on leadership skills and behaviors previously associated with change (Burke, 1992; Conner, 1992; Gill, 2003; Gilley, 2005; Kotter, 1996; Sims, 2002; Ulrich, 1998). Using the same 5-point scale, respondents were asked the frequency with which their managers

1. coached employees.
2. effectively rewarded/recognized employees.
3. communicated appropriately with employees.
4. motivated employees.
5. involved employees in decision making.
6. encouraged teamwork and collaboration.

Results

The sample size for the survey population was 470, with 46.3% of the respondents male, 53.5% female, and no indication of gender by 0.2% of respondents. With regard to age, 59.7% of respondents were younger than 35, 31.4% were between the ages of 36 and 55, and 8.9% were older than 55. With regard to position, 38.2% of respondents classified themselves as frontline employees, 21.2% as supervisors or team leaders, 22.5% as mid-level managers, and 12.3% as senior executives. With regard to organizational tenure, 20.7% of respondents had been employed with their firm for less than 1 year, 44.0% 1 to 5 years, 24.6% 6 to 10 years, and 10.8% greater than 10 years. With regard to supervisor gender, 58.8% of respondents indicated that their supervisor was male, and 40.4% were female. In addition, 36.1% of men and 30.8% of women indicated that their supervisor was of the same gender.

The survey sought employer information such as industry and size. By industry, 10.2% were manufacturing, 49.5% service, 16.3% education, 15.1% professional, 7.4% government, and 1.4% other. With regard to organizational size, 53.3% of organizations had fewer than 500 employees, 19.7% had 500 to 2,500 employees, 15.2% employed 2,500 to 10,000 workers, and 11.8% had more than 10,000 employees.

Table 1 reports leader effectiveness in implementing change. Respondents indicated that their leaders were “never” or “rarely” effective in implementing change 36.1% of the time, as compared with 25.6% for “usually” or “always” effective.

Table 2 reflects descriptive statistics and between-subject correlations for all variables (e.g., effectiveness, coaching, rewarding, communications, motivation, involvement, and team building). All variables showed moderately high to high positive intercorrelations (Cohen, 1988); motivating, communicating, and team building reflected the greatest positive correlations with change effectiveness at .71, .69, and .63, respectively.

Table 3 reveals the results of multiple regression analysis using a stepwise method of independent variable inclusion, which is appropriate for determining significant influences of multiple dependent variables on a single dependent variable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Vogt, 2005). The stepwise criteria used on the F scores for variable inclusion were p ≤ .05 for inclusion and p ≥ .10 for exclusion. The original six independent variables were reduced to four, all significant at a minimum of p < .05, with three of the variables significant at p ≤ .001. The selected variables explained 59.0% ($R^2_{adj} = 58.7\%$) of the variance in managerial change effectiveness. No evidence of collinearity was present (all VIF factors < 3.0).

Discussion

The research and literature of the past few decades reveal that organizations and their leaders struggle with change in spite of the increased rates of change being experienced by local, regional, national, and global firms (Quinn, 2004; Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001). In addition, certain leader skills and behaviors positively influence execution of change initiatives when they are successful.

This study contributes to the research on leadership and organizational change in three areas. First, as Table 1 reports, approximately 74% of respondents reported that their leaders never, rarely, or only sometimes are effective in implementing change. Leadership is often
perceived to be a considerable barrier to or source of resistance to change (Ford, Ford, & D’Amelio, 2008; Schiemann, 1992), despite their reports to the contrary (IBM, 2006).

Second, certain leader skills and abilities have been positively associated with successfully implementing change, including the abilities to coach, communicate, involve others, motivate, reward, and build teams (Burke, 1992; Conner, 1992; Gill, 2003; Gilley, 2005; Sims, 2002; Ulrich, 1998). This study corroborates previous research by confirming positive relationships between specific skills and leadership effectiveness with change. The skills noted by our respondents highlight the importance of understanding the complexity of change and its interpersonal (human) context, whereas the inability to appropriately respond to individual needs contributes to leaders’ failures to be effective in change implementation (Shook, Priem, & McGee, 2003). Although this study supports previous research that exposes disappointing organizational attempts at change, it also highlights insufficient change skills possessed by leaders.

Finally, perhaps the most important contribution of this study lies in the positive relationships identified between certain leader behaviors and rates of success with change. Although previous studies explored the relationships between leader behaviors and change implementation, they failed to prioritize the importance or effectiveness of each independent variable.

Our study proposes the importance, in order, of specific leader behaviors and suggests that a considerable percentage of variance (59%) in effectively leading change may be predicted by the leader’s ability to motivate others, communicate effectively, and build teams. Skills of lesser significance are, in descending order, the abilities to coach, involve others, and reward appropriately.

### Implications for Theory and Practice

Findings from this study have theoretical and practical implications with regard to leadership and organizational change. We suggest that an interpersonal skills-based model that draws on leaders’ abilities to motivate, communicate, and build teams will increase leaders’ success with change. Organizational leaders strongly influence the work environment through routine interpersonal interactions (Drucker, 1999; Howkins, 2001), thus their opportunities to enhance skills and, ultimately, success with change are abundant.

Motivating employees, communicating effectively, and creating environments in which teams thrive are each positively and significantly associated with effectively leading change. Motivating others, for example, requires skilled managers who can develop and sustain a motivating environment (Carlisle & Murphy, 1996). A recent study of highly creative technical professionals revealed that how they were managed was a significant motivating factor (Hebda, Vojak, Griffin, & Price, 2007). Specifically, 23% of respondents indicated that freedom, flexibility, and resources were viewed as significant motivators; 25% stated that the most important motivator was the time provided by managers to focus on solving complex problems (Hebda et al., 2007). In other words, motivation is either positively or negatively affected by the experience an employee has within a given work environment and with his or her leaders.
Until recently, leadership development was not seen as essential to organizational survival; talent was readily available or could be purchased from the outside (Sessa & Campbell, 1997). Furthermore, nearly half of Fortune 1000 companies have reported that their management development and training programs are outdated (Csoka, 1997). Given Kark and Van Dijk’s (2007) findings that leadership is deeply tied to individuals’ internal motivation systems, a leader’s ability to create a work environment that enhances employee motivation proves critical (Carlisle & Murphy, 1996; Hebda et al., 2007). Similarly, effective communications are necessary to cultivate individual motivation and can be an effective tool for motivating employees involved in change (Luecke, 2003). It is unfortunate that research by Argenti, Howell, and Beck (2005) reveals that organizations and their leaders neglect communication skills and strategies. Concurrently, building teams requires leaders who clearly communicate team goals, roles and responsibilities, decision making, and so on, inspire confidence in leadership direction and resources, and motivate team members to resolve issues and deliver results (LaFesto & Larson, 2001). It is clear that motivation, communication, and teambuilding skills are interrelated and complementary, which emphasizes the need for leadership development in these areas.

This study suggests that leaders who effectively implement change possess a multidimensional set of interpersonal skills, including the abilities to motivate, communicate, build teams, coach, involve others, and reward appropriately. With failure rates of organizational change initiatives of nearly two-thirds (Beer & Nohria, 2000) to 90% (Cope, 2003) amid a challenging economic and competitive landscape, the need is clear for leaders to (a) understand the relationship between skills and effective change implementation and (b) proactively enhance their change skills. Knowledge of change and its related skill set will enable leaders at all levels to more effectively design change initiatives; enhance their change talents, behaviors, and competence; and ultimately lead more successful change efforts.

Limitations of the Study

This research is subject to several limitations. The convenience sampling methodology drew on MBA and OD master’s and PhD students at three universities, which may limit the potential for generalization. Due to the nature of their studies, these respondents may be more sensitive to leadership and change issues and, thus, may be acutely critical of their leaders. In addition, the self-selection by respondents may yield results that are skewed (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), which we attempted to mitigate through the use of multiple groups over time (3 years).

The use of self-rated measures invites concern about methods variance and attribution bias. This study used quantified perceptual, highly subjective data. For example, leaders derive influence from their employees’ perceptions and opinions of their leaders’ behaviors and actions, even though their perceptions may be wrong or based on inaccurate or incomplete information (Bandura, 1989). Respondents’ degree of involvement in change implementation, the effect of change on them personally, or type of change initiative may have influenced their ratings, in spite of their attempts to objectively assess matters from a larger organizational perspective. Quantifiable organizational results such as revenue, profit, market share, and customer satisfaction, rather than employee perceptions, may provide a more dependable basis for change effectiveness and success. Additional research might also explore the type, size, and scope of change faced within the organization.

Other considerations with this study involve respondents’ rank or level within the firm and perceptions of leader effectiveness at a single point in time. Further research could investigate whether one’s rank within the organization influences perceptions of leader effectiveness with change. Is any particular level of leadership better or worse than others? How are leaders’ change efforts perceived prior to, during, or after a change? Data collection at multiple points throughout the change process could be facilitated via a longitudinal design, whereas pre- and post-measures may allow for causal conclusions. Points of change effectiveness or failure could be isolated and analyzed to enhance understanding of change barriers, required leader skills, and change effectiveness.

Recommendations for Further Research

Our findings reveal associations between leaders’ interpersonal behaviors and their effectiveness in implementing change, which have valuable implications for organizations. Further research may enhance our understanding of variables that positively affect organizational change. Larger, more heterogeneous samples should be tested and cross-validated with the results presented in this study. Additional research should compare and contrast employees’ opinions of
their direct managers or organizational leaders’ skills and effectiveness with change with quantifiable organizational results such as new product development, productivity, revenues, and profitability.

As this study reveals employees’ perceptions of leaders’ skills and change implementation effectiveness, further research that examines which levels of management are most in need of improvement, in which skill/ability areas, and for which type of change would prove valuable. Which types of change are most challenging for leaders? Are any particular skills critical for certain types of change? How can organizations enhance the change skills of their leaders? How should these skills be developed, measured, and rewarded?

Finally, additional investigation may reveal the most effective time(s) to measure leaders’ behaviors during the change life cycle, along with their subordinates’ perceptions of leaders at differing points. What skill sets are necessary at varying phases in the change initiative? Do the skill requirements change pre-, during, or post-change? Furthermore, does the employee’s personal response to or phase of change (Scott & Jaffe, 1988) affect his or her perception of leadership? Further research may yield valuable insight into respondents’ stages in change at the time of measurement and corresponding perceptions of leader change effectiveness.

Conclusion

The global competitive landscape has changed dramatically over the past few years, which has forced organizations to engage in frequent changes large and small. As a result, the need for competent change leadership is clear. Our research reveals the importance of certain leader skills and abilities necessary for successful organizational change, in the opinion of employees. This study suggests the value of interpersonal skills in successfully implementing change, specifically the abilities to motivate, communicate, and create environments supportive of teams. Leaders who possess and demonstrate these skills are perceived as more effective in driving change.

The business terrain is littered with the remains of organizations and their leaders who lacked the requisite skills to successfully drive change, and they have become statistics in the rate of failure of change. A firm’s leadership drives all aspects of operations throughout all levels, in concert with employees. As a consequence, effectively leading change requires deployment of interpersonal skills such as motivation, communication, and team building to fully engage employees and cultivate success. Organizations must continually and quickly change to adapt to a dynamic, rapidly changing global environment. Leaders’ deliberate and disciplined actions, grounded in a solid base of interpersonal skills, enable effective change.
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